

REVISED 3-21-05

2004-2005 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Cover Sheet

Type of School: Elementary Middle High K-12

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

Official School Name Meadow School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 880 Maria Drive
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Petaluma CA 94954-6837

City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Sonoma School Code Number* 49 70995 6110324

Telephone (707) 762-4905 Fax (707) 762-5751

Website/URL www.waughsd.org E-mail cwaller@waugh.k12.ca.us

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

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

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

District Name Waugh School District Tel. (707) 765-3331

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 Mrs. Julie Eitel
(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 2004-2005 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 1999 and has not received the 2003 or 2004 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
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: 2 Elementary schools
 Middle schools
 Junior high schools
 High schools
 Other
- 2 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$5,869
- Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,719

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
K	33	34	67	8	0	0	0
1	26	26	52	9	0	0	0
2	35	35	70	10	0	0	0
3	28	42	70	11	0	0	0
4	26	23	49	12	0	0	0
5	32	32	64	Other	0	0	0
6	32	26	58				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							430

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>75</u> | % White |
| <u>1</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>12</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>11</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>1</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% | Total |

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

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

(This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	15
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	16
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	31
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	419
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.074
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	7.4

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 7 %
32 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 11

Specify languages: Spanish, Mandarin, Korean, Japanese, Telugu, French, Tamil, Arabic, Loa, Cantonese, and Russian

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 8 %

Total number students who qualify: 34

10. Students receiving special education services: $\frac{13}{57}$ %
57 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>2</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>2</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>17</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>35</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>1</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	

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>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>18</u>	<u>4</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>0</u>	<u>31</u>
Support staff	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total number	<u>22</u>	<u>38</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 22

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.)

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Daily student attendance	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%
Daily teacher attendance	97%	97%	98%	97%	97%
Teacher turnover rate	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate (high school)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

14. (**High Schools Only**) Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2004 are doing as of September 2004.

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

Meadow School is one of two schools in the Waugh School District, located 35 miles north of San Francisco in the suburban city of Petaluma. Meadow School serves 430 children in grades K-6. Our school is 75 percent White, 12 percent Hispanic or Latino, 11 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, 1 percent Black or African American, and 1 percent American Indian/Alaskan Native. 8 percent of our students receive free or reduced lunch, and 7 percent of our students are English Learners. We run our own daycare program, which provides low cost and no-cost day care for our families who are in need of support, which we offer through a grant we wrote.

The vision that Meadow School holds for its students is to ensure that all children reach their maximum potential. Our school has captured this vision, which is proudly displayed in each classroom and in the office, with the motto: *Relentlessly Pursuing Success for All*. Our vision fuels the energies of the staff to provide the excellent instruction and necessary support so that *every child* attains the performance results outlined in the Waugh School District Strategic Plan. Since 1997, we have continued to live our vision, providing high levels of support for all students, while implementing a standards-driven system of curriculum and assessments. Our pyramid of interventions includes an intensive reading program in which our reading, resource, and English language specialists collaborate to provide an additional hour of reading instruction for students with intensive needs. We now utilize a Collaborative Academic Support Team process to review data and the progress of every child. Also, teachers collaborate at regularly scheduled meetings using Mike Schmoker's *Results* process of continuous improvement to ensure meetings are structured and productive.

Meadow School's staff is an unbelievable group of passionate, dedicated professionals who work well individually and as a team. They are committed to ensuring that the district's vision is achieved. The Waugh School District school board and administration's commitment to excellence results in a class size average of 20 students in grades K-3 and 24 students in grades 4-6. Despite the lack of state funding we have maintained our reading specialist and a 1:1 special friends program. Our community has also added another layer of support by organizing the Waugh Invests in Student Excellence Foundation (WISE) to provide financial support due to declining state revenue. We have instructional assistants in every classroom. Meadow School's Title I program provides direct instruction to need students by our credentialed teachers before and after school. The school also employs a Marriage and Family Therapy (MFCC) intern, who runs a social skills group for children having school difficulties. Meadow teachers differentiate instruction in each classroom. Further support in differentiation is provided through our Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program and our high quality special education program, which focuses on seamless integration of support between the resource room and the regular classroom. All students at Meadow School are provided exposure to the arts and technology, including classroom and

instrumental music programs, a classroom art program, an after school enrichment program, a computer lab staffed with a computer lab specialist, and a library-media specialist who operates a 13,000 volume library.

All Meadow School stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, students, the school board, and community members, work together to provide the absolute best possible education for our students. There is unanimous belief that Meadow School is a great place for children, teachers, support staff, and the entire community.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. MEANING OF SCHOOL ASSESSMENT RESULTS

California launched an exciting new student accountability endeavor in 1997. The Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program was designed to provide schools with data to measure student progress toward attaining proficiency with the California Learning Standards. Initially, only the Stanford Achievement Tests – 9th Edition (SAT-9) were utilized to assess student performance in English-Language Arts and mathematics in grades 2 - 11. Soon, the first California Standards Tests (CST's) were developed and administered along with the SAT-9 each year to provide schools with criterion-referenced achievement and accountability data. All school districts receive annual individual student reports, school reports with grade level data, and district summaries (<http://star.cde.ca.gov/star2004/viewreport.asp>).

Each school's performance on the STAR tests is summarized with an Academic Performance Index (API), which is a score between 200 and 1,000. Schools considered to be meeting state expectations should be at 800 or above. Meadow School was one of the only schools in Northern California to receive an API of over 800 the first year the index was reported (ours was 825). Since then, we have seen our API remain well above the 800 mark (825 to 880) (<http://api.cde.ca.gov/reports.asp>).

At the beginning of the STAR Program, most of the weight was given to the standardized tests (SAT/9 and then CAT/6). We have seen a fortunate and useful reversal in the weighting. Most of the weight for calculating the API is now with the CST's (80% last year; more this year). This allows us to really focus on our state standards as we develop and refine our curriculum, instructional delivery systems, local assessments, and interventions.

We analyze the reports we receive from the state to determine where our students fall, by subgroup, along a continuum of bands: Far Below Basic, Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced in English-Language Arts (grades 2-6), Mathematics (grades 2-6), Writing (4th grade), and Science (5th grade). California would like all students to be at Proficient or above in each assessed area. We find that most of our students are achieving at Proficient or Above levels, and almost none score at the Below Basic or Basic Levels in either English-Language Arts or Mathematics. This is true for all students tested, as well as almost half of our only statistically significant subgroup, Hispanic students. Since most of the students who are not yet at the Proficient level are at the Basic level (rather than Far Below Basic or Below Basic), we focus heavily on the data for this group of students to analyze group and individual student skill deficit areas. Doing this has allowed us to move more and more students from Basic to Proficient levels.

This past year in California, only 36% of all 6th grade students assessed scored at or above proficiency on the English-Language Arts CST's. At Meadow, 76% of all of our 6th graders were at or above proficiency. Similarly, while only 35% of California's 6th graders scored at or above proficiency on the CST math test, 57% of our 6th graders were considered proficient or above. We are very proud that our Hispanic students, as a group, have always significantly outscored Hispanic students across California in both English-language Arts and mathematics. For example, 42% of our Hispanic students scored At or Above Proficient on the English-Language Arts CST's last year (52% for math).

We typically see some degree of fluctuation in STAR scores each year as we analyze our assessment results. California's STAR program has had two different standardized tests (CAT/6 and

SAT/9) and newly developed CST's almost every year. Because the tests that yield student achievement data have changed so much over the past seven years, it has been difficult for us to accurately track the same cohorts from year to year. We have been relatively successful using the Edusoft data analysis software program we purchased to follow the same students from year to year not only in total reading and math, but also by specific skills in each major assessed area. Consequently, our most powerful use of data occurs at the individual student level, something that cannot yet be easily done using the STAR program, which is still evolving significantly each year.

We have welcomed accountability with open arms and use assessment data to strengthen what we offer for our students and community.

2. USE OF ASSESSMENT DATA

Meadow School uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance in several ways. First of all, data from the California Standards Test (CST) and assessments referenced against national norms (CAT6) are displayed on an assessment matrix along with our local multiple measure assessments. The results are analyzed and then disaggregated according to specific designations, including English Language Learners, special education students, and Title I. This desegregation helps us to determine the progress of students in each group and allows us to focus instruction and interventions to meet the needs of these students. These assessment results are first analyzed each year during Collaborative Academic Support Team meetings (CAST). CAST team meetings include the classroom teacher, principal, and all specialists. Every student in the school is discussed during these meetings, using assessment results as a basis for determining each student's academic program. When students are determined to have special needs based on assessment results, they may be referred to the Student Study Team to determine if additional testing and support is necessary.

Analysis of this data occurs again monthly as part of teachers' grade level meetings. During these meetings, we use Mike Schmoker's *Results* process to examine student data and develop concrete action plans to address gaps in student performance. Use of these assessments over the past five years has been instrumental in supporting a school-wide strengthening of reading/English Language Arts and math skills. On the basis of these in-depth assessments, teachers focus instruction specifically for each student and appropriately differentiate their curriculum and instruction.

3. COMMUNICATION OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Meadow School prides itself in providing regular, clear communication to parents, students, and the community. We communicate student performance, including assessment data, in several ways. Student assessment results on the California Standards Test are mailed home to each family before the school year begins. Teachers meet with parents or guardians of all students during the first month of school to review academic programs, assessment results, and expectations. Our standards based report card informs parents at the end of each trimester about their child's mastery, or progress towards mastery, of state grade level standards for each academic area. Parent/teacher conferences at the end of the first trimester provide further time to discuss the standards-based report card to parents.

Classroom teachers inform students of their progress in working toward grade level standards on a daily basis. The school principal sends home a monthly newsletter to all Meadow families, including assessment data and test scores. Classroom assessments provide clear data that guides the teachers' decisions about each student's progress toward state academic standards. Report cards also reflect the social, emotional, and physical development of the student. Reports cards and progress reports are provided to parents in their primary language.

Meadow School communicates overall assessment results of our students by sending out our School Accountability Report Card (SARC) during the school year. The SARC includes pertinent information such as student performance on the California Standards Test, teacher qualifications in relation to No Child Left Behind expectations, and school fiscal and expenditure data. Performance standards and

current assessments results are conveyed to the community through formal meetings. Formal meetings include monthly School Site Council (SSC), Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Bilingual Education Nights, Waugh Invests in Student Education (WISE Foundation), and the Board of Trustees. The Meadow Staff values these opportunities to ensure clear communication with parents, students and the community.

4. SHARING OF SCHOOL SUCCESSES

Meadow School regularly collaborates with other schools in Sonoma County, and understands the importance of sharing our success with other schools. The school principal participates in several countywide collaborative groups. These include the South County *Edusoft* pilot group, a group of school administrators from eight school districts who are piloting the Houghton Mifflin *Edusoft* assessment analysis program and data recordkeeping system. Assessment results, data trends, and other school successes are discussed and shared at the countywide Curriculum Council and Co-op, which includes representatives from 26 school districts. Meadow School is known throughout Northern California for having skilled teachers who are qualified to serve as curriculum trainers in other districts. Particular areas of expertise among our staff include Open Court Reading curriculum, CORE Literacy training, and the research based graphic organizer system called Organizing Student Thinking.

Additional opportunities for collaboration have focused on language arts, math, and facilitating effective meetings with the Schmoker method. Our Petaluma small schools consortium has united to explore the best strategies for increasing student achievement, in essence creating a local “think tank.” Our school website displays student test scores which are evidence of Meadow School’s continued progress. Meadow School has been featured for its academic achievements in Sonoma County newspaper and television stories. As professional educators and lifetime learners, we are committed to sharing best teaching practices and curriculum with other schools and districts.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. SCHOOL CURRICULUM

All students at Meadow School receive an outstanding education that is aligned with the California State standards in all academic areas. State approved curriculum materials have been adopted by our district, and are being utilized effectively in grades K – 6. Instruction is driven by these standards-aligned materials, as well as by current research and best teaching practices.

Reading/Language Arts: All grade levels at Meadow School utilize the Open Court Reading Program in order to ensure that all students are receiving balanced and comprehensive instruction in language arts and reading. This program follows the recommendations of the National Reading Panel by emphasizing explicit and direct teaching of skills and concepts, increasing teachers modeling, and providing students ample opportunities for practice. Teachers collaborate to set pacing charts for curriculum delivery based on student needs, set benchmarks, and develop and/or adapt assessments for measuring student progress towards the standards.

Mathematics: All grade levels at Meadow School use Harcourt Math, a research-based, comprehensive math program that provides thorough coverage of state and national standards. The curriculum offers lessons in all key content areas such as basic computation, critical thinking, and problem solving strategies. These lessons are supported and extended through a variety of means. Students who require extra support in math receive direct instruction by classroom teachers in small groups before and after school. Students who are prepared for a more advanced program are offered differentiated instruction through the Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program and through use of algebra software such as *River Deep’s*

Destination Math program. This software guides student through modeled lessons and provides them with practice and assessments that ensure understanding.

Social Science: Meadow School's uses Houghton Mifflin Social Studies curriculum. This curriculum provides a foundation for teachers to meet California state academic standards. It includes assessment materials that are used to assess student progress throughout the year. It also assists teachers in providing students with practice reading expository text, and provides ideas for projects that will bring history to life. Children are engaged in history, science, and other curricular areas through real-world experiences. Each grade level has at least on major and one or more smaller field trips directly aligned to the curriculum in order to further strengthen student understanding of topics presented in class. For example, all fourth-grade students participate in an overnight field trip to the California gold country in the Sierra Nevada foothills while studying the California Gold Rush, and fifth graders participate in a colonial days recreation.

Science: Meadow School uses the Full Option Science System (FOSS). The FOSS curriculum was developed by the Lawrence Hall of Science in Berkeley, California, and has been correlated to both California state standards and the National Science Education Standards. FOSS uses a combination of direct instruction, hands-on experiments, and group projects. This program is designed to provide students with educational experiences that build upon those taught at the previous and subsequent grade levels. Students also participate in a school wide science fair held each spring.

The Arts: Every student at Meadow School participates in regular classroom fine arts instruction with classroom teachers. An outstanding art docent program, funded by the Waugh Invests in Student Excellence (WISE) Foundation, provides additional instruction in art. The WISE Foundation has also contributed financially to allow Meadow School to continue to provide classroom and instrumental music for our students.

Physical Education: Classroom teachers provide regular instruction in physical education using the California Department of Education's *Physical Education Framework*. Students are encouraged through the physical education program to keep their bodies fit and strong. All upper grade students participate in the Fitness-gram, and progress reports are sent home each spring.

2.a READING CURRICULUM

The reading curriculum adopted by our district and used at Meadow School comes from the state-approved lists for materials and was previewed by a community of parents, teachers, specialists, and administrators before purchasing. We have adopted Open Court Reading as our language arts program. This is a highly challenging K-6 program that offers all children the opportunity to master grade-level standards through systematic, explicit, and direct teaching methods in order to introduce new skills and concepts in both language arts and reading comprehension.

Reading intervention for students with intensive needs is supported through the Focus on Reading Excellence (FORE) program. FORE serves students in grades 4 through 6 and offers students an additional hour of focused reading instruction from a team of teachers that includes the reading specialist, the resource specialist, and the English Language development specialist. Students spend twenty minutes with each teacher focusing on specific skills such as vocabulary development, fluency, and comprehension. These lessons are based on Open Court Intervention and English Language Development materials.

Our library is the heart of our Language Arts program. Our multimedia library resources fully support our curriculum. Meadow students are avid readers who check our books from the library, which is stocked with over 13,000 books for class assignments. Programs such as *Books and Beyond* and *Book It*

are enjoyed by all students. Three Governor's Awards for Reading, earned by students from 2000-2002, are evidence of the success of these programs.

2b. (Secondary Schools) Describe in one-half page the school's English language curriculum, including efforts the school makes to improve the reading skills of students who read below grade level.

N/A

3. MATHEMATICS CURRICULUM

In the 2000-2001 school year, Waugh School District adopted the Harcourt Math Series. This program was chosen after careful examination and piloting, to assure that it met all state standards while providing a variety of learning opportunities for students. This program incorporates vocabulary development as well as computation and critical thinking skills. These skills are assessed through frequent math fact tests, journals, projects, standards assessments (such as the San Diego Assessment of Mathematics), and portfolio reflections.

When we adopted Harcourt Math, we provided all teachers with the opportunity to attend the math Professional Development Institute offered through Sonoma County Office of Education. This training has contributed to teachers' efficacy in creating supportive learning environments, assessing students accurately, delivering explicit instruction, gaining a better understanding of the subject matter, and becoming familiar with research based practices.

At monthly grade level meetings, teachers analyze assessment data in mathematics to determine student proficiency and brainstorm support and extension strategies to effectively differentiate instruction. Flexible grouping during instruction periods allows teachers to specify instruction and adapt homework and classroom assignments. Students who require extra support in mathematics attend Math Club twice a week to receive additional instruction in grade level concepts.

4. INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS FOR STUDENT LEARNING

The teachers at Meadow School utilize a wide variety of research based instructional methods and techniques to ensure the success of all students. Classrooms combine the practice of whole group direct instruction, along with heterogeneous and homogeneous cooperative working centers. These smaller groups are then presented with project-based learning activities, set into Literature Circles, or pre-taught and re-taught core content areas. After frequent and authentic assessment, students are regularly placed into these flexible groups for the instruction of core curriculum.

Teamwork is a major component of our teaching methodology. Regularly, grade level teams collaborate to develop specialized skills in different content areas. For example, our fifth grade team rotates the entire grade level through specialized instruction in three content areas, each lead by a different member of the team.

In addition, students who are struggling to meet academic standards are then offered a myriad of supports through our pyramid of interventions. This is articulated through open communications between the classroom teacher and school specialists. Teachers, specialists, and the school principal meet in Collaborative Action Support Team (CAST) meetings to discuss student needs. Children identified for support are placed into small intervention groups that support our adopted programs. For example, reading students with intensive needs are supported through the Focus on Reading Excellence program, providing an additional hour of focused reading instructions daily. Math intervention is provided for needy students in the form of before school math classes taught by credentialed teachers and funded by Title 1.

5. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Meadow School's teaching and support staff actively and enthusiastically engages in ongoing professional development aligned with the California state standards and with the school's standards' based instructional materials. Our long-range comprehensive professional development plan is reflected in both the Strategic Plan and the Single Plan for School Improvement. Professional development activities are organized in order to achieve the goals in the school plan. These goals are determined by an analysis of student achievement data. For example, we identified a performance gap in vocabulary development between English learners and native English speakers and then instituted a specific plan and strategies to address this gap. Professional development has included two days of presentations for all teachers by experts in the area of language acquisition and vocabulary development. The effectiveness of Meadow School's professional development activities is evaluated by looking critically at student progress in meeting state standards. This discussion is included in the yearly evaluation report of the school plan and reviewed by the school site council.

Our staff development plan places the highest priority on in-depth staff development for teachers whenever we adopt new instructional materials. For example, last year when we adopted Open Court Reading, we trained one teacher per grade level and the principal in the AB466 training, which utilized a skilled trainer from the Consortium on Reading Excellence (CORE). Our teacher trainers then provided training to all teachers during three days prior to the start of school with two follow-up days during the year. The training also included modeling lessons and coaching in classrooms at each grade level. The impact of this professional development was especially striking in the progress of first grade students. At the beginning of the year, one third of our first graders were below benchmark for phonics. By the end of the year, all but three students made the benchmark in the Core Phonics Survey. During the 2004-2005 school years all teachers received additional training in Open Court, with teachers new to the district attending four days of language arts specific training during the academic year.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Public Schools

Each nominated school must show results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics for at least the last three years according to the criteria used by the CSSO to nominate the school. For formatting, if possible use or adapt the sample tables (no charts or graphs) at the end of this application.

If the state allows the use of the PSAT, PLAN, SAT, or ACT as part of its accountability system and at least 90 percent of the students in the appropriate classes must take the tests, schools must report the results. For these tests, schools must use national norms. The national school norms for the 90th and 60th percentiles can be found on the Department's website. If fewer than 90 percent of the students take a combination of the tests, that is, the ACT and the SAT or the PLAN and the PSAT, do not report the data.

The school must disaggregate all data for socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups that comprise sufficient numbers to be a part of the state's assessment reports or are of sufficient numbers to be statistically significant. Show how all subgroups of students achieved at high levels or improved dramatically in achievement for at least three years. Explain any disparity among subgroups. The school must specify the number and percentage of students assessed by alternative methods.

All test data tables should be attached to the end of the application, with all pages numbered consecutively.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

(Please note that the symbol “” is used to show years where less than five Hispanic students in a particular grade took the test, to ensure student anonymity).*

Subject English Language Arts Grade 2nd Test California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	95	98	97	92
% At or Above Basic	86	96	87	86
% At or Above Proficient	58	73	58	48
% At Advanced	20	45	19	16
Number of students tested	65	47	59	50
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	*	100	*
% At or Above Below Basic	75	*	100	*
% At or Above Basic	58	*	80	*
% At or Above Proficient	25	*	60	*
% At Advanced	17	*	20	*
Number of Hispanic students tested	12	4	5	2
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	87	87	85	92
% At or Above Basic	65	68	63	86
% At or Above Proficient	35	36	32	49
% At Advanced	12	12	09	16

Subject Math Grade 2nd Test California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	97	98	100	96
% At or Above Basic	89	92	76	84
% At or Above Proficient	74	90	51	62
% At Advanced	31	64	24	16
Number of students tested	65	47	59	50
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	*	100	*
% At or Above Below Basic	83	*	100	*
% At or Above Basic	58	*	80	*
% At or Above Proficient	50	*	40	*
% At Advanced	17	*	0	*
Number of Hispanic students tested	12	4	5	2
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	N/A
% At or Above Below Basic	96	96	92	N/A
% At or Above Basic	76	76	68	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	51	53	43	N/A
% At Advanced	23	24	16	N/A

Subject English Language Arts Grade 3rd Test California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	96	100	96	94
% At or Above Basic	94	97	89	84
% At or Above Proficient	68	69	76	57
% At Advanced	35	32	21	12
Number of students tested	48	63	53	49
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	*	100	*	*
% At or Above Below Basic	*	100	*	*
% At or Above Basic	*	83	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	*	50	*	*
% At Advanced	*	0	*	*
Number of Hispanic students tested	4	6	4	2
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	83	84	85	94
% At or Above Basic	61	63	62	84
% At or Above Proficient	30	33	34	57
% At Advanced	09	10	11	12

Subject Math Grade 3rd Test California Standards Test
 Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	98	100	96	98
% At or Above Basic	94	95	88	90
% At or Above Proficient	81	77	76	69
% At Advanced	60	33	23	22
Number of students tested	48	63	53	49
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	*	100	*	*
% At or Above Below Basic	*	100	*	*
% At or Above Basic	*	84	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	*	84	*	*
% At Advanced	*	16	*	*
Number of Hispanic students tested	4	6	4	2
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	N/A
% At or Above Below Basic	96	94	91	N/A
% At or Above Basic	73	71	65	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	48	46	38	N/A
% At Advanced	21	19	12	N/A

Subject English Language Arts Grade 4th Test California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	98	100	96	97
% At or Above Basic	98	94	92	96
% At or Above Proficient	72	60	58	77
% At Advanced	53	17	31	34
Number of students tested	59	53	45	67
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	*	100
% At or Above Below Basic	100	100	*	67
% At or Above Basic	100	100	*	50
% At or Above Proficient	66	50	*	0
% At Advanced	34	0	*	0
Number of Hispanic students tested	6	6	3	6
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	91	92	90	97
% At or Above Basic	73	74	71	96
% At or Above Proficient	39	39	36	77
% At Advanced	16	15	14	35

Subject Math Grade 4th Test California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	100	96	96	100
% At or Above Basic	98	90	92	93
% At or Above Proficient	83	63	60	58
% At Advanced	54	21	31	28
Number of students tested	59	53	48	67
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	*	100
% At or Above Below Basic	100	100	*	100
% At or Above Basic	100	100	*	33
% At or Above Proficient	67	84	*	0
% At Advanced	67	16	*	0
Number of Hispanic students tested	6	6	3	6
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	N/A
% At or Above Below Basic	97	93	93	N/A
% At or Above Basic	73	72	67	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	45	45	37	N/A
% At Advanced	18	18	13	N/A

Subject English Language Arts Grade 5th Test California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	98	100	100	96
% At or Above Basic	93	91	97	87
% At or Above Proficient	64	64	67	60
% At Advanced	24	30	24	21
Number of students tested	55	53	67	56
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	*	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	100	*	100	100
% At or Above Basic	100	*	72	86
% At or Above Proficient	50	*	43	29
% At Advanced	17	*	14	0
Number of Hispanic students tested	6	3	7	7
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	87	90	91	98
% At or Above Basic	71	72	71	89
% At or Above Proficient	40	36	31	61
% At Advanced	16	10	09	21

Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	95	94	100	91
% At or Above Basic	77	85	96	80
% At or Above Proficient	41	60	64	52
% At Advanced	05	21	28	20
Number of students tested	55	53	67	56
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	*	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	100	*	100	87
% At or Above Basic	100	*	100	58
% At or Above Proficient	17	*	28	29
% At Advanced	0	*	14	0
Number of Hispanic students tested	6	3	7	7
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	N/A
% At or Above Below Basic	90	87	90	N/A
% At or Above Basic	65	61	59	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	38	35	29	N/A
% At Advanced	12	10	07	N/A

Subject English Language Arts Grade 6th Test California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	95	100	97	91
% At or Above Basic	91	98	89	91
% At or Above Proficient	76	78	61	58
% At Advanced	25	42	20	16
Number of students tested	55	66	59	43
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	*	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	*	100	100	60
% At or Above Basic	*	83	89	60
% At or Above Proficient	*	17	33	40
% At Advanced	*	0	0	0
Number of Hispanic students tested	3	6	9	5
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	91	87	85	91
% At or Above Basic	72	71	66	91
% At or Above Proficient	36	36	30	57
% At Advanced	12	13	09	16

Subject Math Grade 6th Test California Standards Test
Edition/Publication Year 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001 Publisher ETS 2002-2004, Harcourt 2001

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	98	100	98	95
% At or Above Basic	87	100	91	88
% At or Above Proficient	57	66	65	59
% At Advanced	22	27	31	19
Number of students tested	55	66	59	43
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2	2	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	*	100	100	100
% At or Above Below Basic	*	100	100	100
% At or Above Basic	*	100	90	60
% At or Above Proficient	*	17	50	40
% At Advanced	*	0	20	20
Number of Hispanic students tested	3	6	10	5
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
STATE SCORES – All Students				
% At or Above Far Below Basic	100	100	100	N/A
% At or Above Below Basic	93	92	91	N/A
% At or Above Basic	66	64	62	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	35	34	32	N/A
% At Advanced	12	10	10	N/A

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

(Please note that the symbol “” is used to show years where less than five Hispanic students in a particular grade took the test, to ensure student anonymity).*

Subject Reading Grade 2nd Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)
 Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	57	68	71
Number of students tested	66	47	59
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	44	*	70
Number of Hispanic students tested	12	4	5
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Math Grade 2nd Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)
 Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	65	73	70
Number of students tested	66	47	59
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	48	*	68
Number of Hispanic students tested	12	4	5
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Reading Grade 3rd Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)

Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	75	66	72
Number of students tested	48	63	53
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	44	44	*
Number of Hispanic students tested	5	6	4
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Math Grade 3rd Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)

Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	77	70	76
Number of students tested	48	63	53
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	73	63	*
Number of Hispanic students tested	5	6	4
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Reading Grade 4th Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)

Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	64	63	69
Number of students tested	59	53	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	48	61	*
Number of Hispanic students tested	7	6	3
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Math Grade 4th Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)

Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	71	57	72
Number of students tested	59	53	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	59	58	*
Number of Hispanic students tested	7	6	3
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Reading Grade 5th Test CAT6 (2004, 2003) and SAT9 (2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)

Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	58	64	72
Number of students tested	55	53	67
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	51	*	54
Number of Hispanic students tested	7	3	7
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Math Grade 5th Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)

Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	57	67	79
Number of students tested	55	53	67
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	1
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	51	*	73
Number of Hispanic students tested	7	3	7
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Reading Grade 6th Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)

Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	63	75	67
Number of students tested	55	66	59
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic/Latino Students			
Total Score	42	47	46
Number of Hispanic students tested	5	6	9
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0

Subject Math Grade 6th Test CAT6(2004, 2003) and SAT9(2002)

Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition (CAT6), 9th Edition (SAT9)

Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill (CAT6), Harcourt (SAT9)

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

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES – All Students			
Total Score	71	78	76
Number of students tested	55	66	60
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2	0
SCHOOL SCORES – Hispanic Students			
Total Score	51	57	71
Number of Hispanic students tested	5	6	10
Percent of Hispanic students tested	100	100	100
Number of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of Hispanic students alternatively assessed	0	0	0