

**Revised March 22,2005**

**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: Mr. Edward H. Collett  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name: Rail Road Flat Elementary School  
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address: P.O. Box 217, 298 Rail Road Flat Road  
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Rail Road Flat California 95245-0217  
City State (Zi p Code+4 (9 digits total))

County: Calaveras School Code Number\*05 61564 6003420

Telephone ( 209 ) 293-4375 Fax ( 209 ) 293-7709

Website/URL: Calaveras Unified School District-Schools- RRF E-mail ecollett@calaveras.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\* Mr. James Frost  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Calaveras Unified School District Tel. (209)754-3504

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

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

Name of School Board  
President/Chairperson Mr. John Yerman  
(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**

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

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 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:       6   Elementary schools  
   1   Middle schools  
   0   Junior high schools  
   1   High schools  
   4   Other  
    12   TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:      \$ 6,480.00    
     Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:  \$ 6,881.82

**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.   7   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 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	8	4	12	8	0	0	0
1	10	12	22	9	0	0	0
2	6	7	13	10	0	0	0
3	6	4	10	11	0	0	0
4	8	6	14	12	0	0	0
5	3	6	9	Other	0	0	0
6	8	11	19				
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →</b>							<b>99</b>

[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- |                   |                                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>85</u>         | % White                          |
| <u>1</u>          | % Black or African American      |
| <u>3</u>          | % Hispanic or Latino             |
| <u>5</u>          | % Asian/Pacific Islander         |
| <u>6</u>          | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| <b>100% Total</b> |                                  |

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: 50 %

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

<b>(1)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	29
<b>(2)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	21
<b>(3)</b>	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	50
<b>(4)</b>	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	91
<b>(5)</b>	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.50
<b>(6)</b>	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	50%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 0 %  
0 Total Number Limited English Proficient  
 Number of languages represented: 0  
 Specify languages:

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 79 %  
 Total number students who qualify: 78

If this method does not produce an 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: 8 %  
8 Total Number of Students Served

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

<u>    </u> Autism	<u>    </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>    </u> Deafness	<u>    </u> Other Health Impaired
<u>    </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>  1  </u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>    </u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>  7  </u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>    </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>    </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>    </u> Mental Retardation	<u>    </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>    </u> Multiple Disabilities	

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>    </u>	<u>.5</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>  5  </u>	<u>    </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>    </u>	<u>.5</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>    </u>	<u>.75</u>
Support staff	<u>  2  </u>	<u>.80</u>
Total number	<u>  7  </u>	<u>1.55</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 20:1

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.)

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Daily student attendance	95%	96%	94%	95%	93%
Daily teacher attendance	93%	94%	95%	N/A%	N/A%
Teacher turnover rate	*20%	0%	0%	*20%	0%
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%

\*We had 5 teachers prior to the 2004 school year. We lost 1 teacher due to budget constraints.

## **PART III - SUMMARY**

---

Rail Road Flat School is the focal point of a community that it has served since 1896. Our motto is “The Little School That Can”. Our mission is to use the strengths of a proud and independent community to help each child develop the skills, habits, and attitudes needed to be successful throughout life. We believe that resilience and self-esteem are products of successfully meeting challenges. We recognize that our success is measured by the academic progress of our students, but we believe our greatest responsibility is to develop each child’s capacity to set goals and to persevere. The community we serve is rural and isolated. A large number of our students come from economically challenged families. It is common for students to move frequently. Housing arrangements are often temporary, and many of our students live with family friends or relatives other than parents. During the 2003-04 school year, nearly 80% of our students qualified for free or reduced lunches. The actual number of students living in poverty is probably higher than our free and reduced lunch counts indicate: Many of our families take pride in their independence, or do not feel comfortable completing the required forms. Our school site houses an advocacy center that offers assistance to parents and other caregivers. We feel a great sense of accomplishment when stakeholders tell us that our school is the first “bureaucracy” that has welcomed them as equal partners. Our vision includes a comprehensive network of support that addresses the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of each student. We are a community based school, and our community is involved with every aspect of our program. Our students benefit from the care and mutual respect of our “extended family” culture.

If you had the opportunity to visit Rail Road Flat, you would quickly see that our town has no significant business center. We have a small restaurant, a traditional country store, a church, a bar, a post office, and our school. If you need gas, you drive to a neighboring town. The store cashes checks, extends credit, relays messages to families without phones, and is the primary source of groceries for much of the community. The school is the place that brings all community factions together. Our efforts to improve student success emphasize community participation. Our academic program is built around all students having access to a research based core curriculum. We are a School Wide Title I school that carefully monitors every student’s progress. Student achievement is measured with curriculum based criterion referenced tests, analysis of work samples, performance tasks, and data obtained from the annual administration of California’s Standardized Testing and Reporting system. Our small staff makes up for what it lacks in size with a high level of caring, dedication, and energy. Efficiency of scale allows daily communication between every teacher. Every stakeholder is invited to be involved in the educational process, and mediocrity is not an option.

## **PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

---

1.

Rail Road Flat School assesses student progress using a variety of measures. Each student’s day-to-day progress is gauged using frequently administered assessments that we refer to as “formative” testing. Formative assessments drive our day-to-day instructional process in language arts, mathematics, and all other curricular areas. We also participate in California’s Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program. The STAR Program allows us to give formal assessments annually that provide a snapshot of student performance which can be used to evaluate the yearly progress of individual students, specific groups of students, and our program as a whole. The STAR Program was established in 1999. When STAR was first implemented, it relied on a single test that was not aligned to our adopted standards, and gauged student performance against the performance of a randomly selected sample of students. In its current stage of evolution, STAR emphasizes student performance on the California Standards Test (CST). The CST measures mathematics and language arts progress toward mastery of grade level specific

standards. Performance on the CST is used to rank students using five performance levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic. Students must score in the Advanced or Proficient range to be considered at-standard.

California has also developed an Academic Performance Index that uses formulas to convert STAR performance into scores ranging from a low of 200 to a high of 1000. API scores are used to track school progress and to rank schools in performance categories ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 10.

When California first implemented its accountability system, Rail Road Flat was ranked among the highest performing high poverty schools with an API score of 724. Subsequent performance has resulted in our score growing to 789. These scores were based on assessment in the areas of mathematics and language arts. California's emphasis on the criterion referenced California Standards Test is relatively new, and it is difficult to make comparisons across time. The fact that the size of our test population is so small we have entire grade levels with results deemed statistically invalid, and not reported by the California Department of Education, requires us to consider every child by name. Our only statistically significant subgroups are white students, male, female, and economically disadvantaged; with a pattern of 70%-80% of the 65-75 students typically tested considered economically disadvantaged, the data on our white and non-economically disadvantaged students is based on a very small sample. We can accurately make the following statements about student performance: 1. The Academic Performance Index has been statistically adjusted to allow performance tracking over time. Through the 2003-04 school year, the API has been based on combined math and language arts scores. Our API has increased from 724 to 789. We have exceeded our cumulative growth target by over 40 points. 2. A review of data presented on the California Department of Education website shows that student performance has only been presented using the current five reporting categories since the 2002-03 school year. During the only two years that we can make direct comparisons, the fifth grade class of 2002-03 had 50% of its students at or above standard in language arts and 72% at or above in math. In 2003-04, the same class had 65% at or above standard in language arts and 80% at or above in math. Because of the ever evolving history of STAR, no other direct comparisons can be made using the California Standards Test for both math and language arts.

1. *Show in one-half page (approximately 300 words) how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.*

Multiple sources of data are used to evaluate student progress, target students for intervention, adjust our curriculum delivery systems, and to establish plans for program improvement. The small size of our staff facilitates daily discussions about student progress. Staff members have completed extensive training in data analysis through a program called DataWorks. The fact that we must creatively group students to provide grade specific instruction, with only four teachers to deliver seven levels of curriculum, requires teachers to collectively review student progress at least weekly. Our high rate of student mobility has created a school culture that depends heavily on data obtained from analysis of student work. Data from curriculum embedded assessments and work samples are reviewed, and coordinate strategies are used by all teachers. Performance tasks developed by district level grade-alike groups are administered each trimester in the areas of mathematics and language arts.

Standardized rubrics are used to evaluate performance tasks, and the results are compiled on a data base. Results are disaggregated by subgroups and used to focus curriculum delivery and pacing. The results of state level summative assessments are disaggregated and reviewed at the beginning of each school year.

The analysis of summative data is one variable used to evaluate program effectiveness. All staff members participate in the process of analyzing disaggregated data and setting goals for program improvement. Program data is regularly reviewed at monthly School Site Council meetings. A detailed analysis of disaggregated data pertaining to academic performance, behavior infractions, student mobility, curriculum delivery, attendance patterns, and the effectiveness of current strategies linking resources to prioritized needs is done between March and May of each year. Data from the current year is compared with data collected from prior years to identify trends. Our staff and our School Site Council use the data to set goals and establish a blueprint for school improvement. The findings of the analysis are included in a Single Plan for Student Improvement, and submitted to our school board each May.

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

An annual School Accountability Report Card containing a summary of site performance data and other indicators of student success is distributed to all parents. It is also available on the Calaveras Unified School District website (<http://www.calaveras.k12.ca.us>), and is distributed through selected local businesses. Group results of annual assessments are published in local papers and shared at community meetings. Individual meetings are scheduled with the parents or other caregiver of each child. Assessment data specific to each child, including worksamples, is explained at these annual meetings. Teachers discuss individual assessments, including grades with each child. Standards based report cards are sent home each trimester, and individual conferences are scheduled with the parents of any child that is in danger of being retained.

- 3. Describe in one-half page how the school has shared and will continue to share its successes with other schools.*

As a small and rural school, we have only four district contracted teachers responsible for teaching seven levels of standards aligned curriculum. Being selected as a Blue Ribbon School will give us the opportunity to continue promoting our belief that efficiency of scale is as important as the economy of scale found at larger schools. Our success is the result of a team effort, and it reflects the opportunities we have had to collaborate with schools of all sizes. We actively participate in forums provided by California's State Wide System of School Support, our County Office of Education, the Calaveras Unified School District, and exchange visitations with schools in other areas. Small and rural schools face unique challenges that often require adapting research based models designed for large and urban schools.

Every school in our district has individual strengths, and collaboration is a common and mutual practice. Beyond the local level, our School Wide Plan was used as a model for other small and rural schools throughout the state. We welcome visiting staff members from other schools, and enjoy the opportunities we have to share and learn. Being named a Blue Ribbon School would help us develop a more comprehensive network that expands our awareness of best practices for helping all students achieve at higher levels. We would passionately embrace the opportunity to use the honor of being named a Blue Ribbon School to expand our opportunities to address the needs of the rapidly declining number of small, rural schools.

## PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

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

The rigorous California Content Standards provide the core content for each of our curricular offerings. A highly qualified staff, using research based strategies and standards aligned materials, supports each student's progress toward mastering our adopted standards. Meeting the expectations at each grade level provides the foundation for success at the next level.

In the area of language arts, each grade level has standards that address the ability to read, write, listen, and speak. Content for each level is clearly defined, and skills sequentially build as students progress through the grades. Instruction is systematic and sequential. Our adopted core curriculum is Houghton Mifflin's Legacy of Literature and it was selected from state approved materials that align with the standards for each grade. All teachers have received training in research based strategies for teaching language arts. Instructional planning is assessment driven and achievement is validated through criterion referenced testing. All students receive a minimum of 90 minutes of language arts instruction each day.

Our core adoption for mathematics is Harcourt Math, 2002. As with reading, instruction is sequential, aligned to grade specific California Content Standards, and assessment is on-going. Each grade level covers grade appropriate strands including computation skills, number sense and mathematical concepts, math problem solving, geometric concepts, foundation skills for algebra, measurement, time, data analysis, graphing, charts, math terms, math symbols, and making connections between mathematical ideas and their real-life applications.

Social Science is organized around grade specific themes and aligned to adopted standards. Our core adoption is Harcourt-Brace. Our social science instruction helps students acquire core knowledge about geographical regions, eras, civilizations, political systems, and to understand themes and dilemmas that have reoccurred throughout history. At the primary level, basic units of social organization, socialization skills, and group dynamics are important concepts. Social science is linked to other disciplines and offers many opportunities to help students see that skills learned in one contest have value in other areas. California Content Standards help provide continuity across grade levels and assure that all students are exposed to essential concepts.

Our science instruction is based on grade specific content standards. We strive for a balance between hands-on learning and developing each student's ability to gain information from our adopted text. Our rural environment offers many unique opportunities that allow us to include a variety of experiential learning in our science program. A large herd of buffalo graze across from our school, gold mining and the existence of large caves that offer guided tours are wonderful resources for teaching concepts related to physical science, and we are surrounded by forests with a wide variety of animals and plants.

Music instruction is provided to all of our students. We have itinerant choral and band instructors that are on campus one day each week. Every fourth grade student learns to play the recorder. Instrumental band is available to all of our fifth and sixth grade students. 100% of our students participate in at least one public performance each year. We have a partnership with our local arts council that gives us access to visiting artists. This allows us to provide a limited amount of high quality instruction in the area of visual arts. We also have a community volunteer who is in our primary classes daily to do craft projects that are aligned with instructional units in language arts, math, social science, and science.

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

The adopted core reading program used by Rail Road Flat School is Legacy of Literacy published by Houghton Mifflin. In our district, core curriculum is adopted through a committee process, and all schools use the agreed upon materials. The State of California did an extensive review of literacy programs and placed those that they determined to be aligned to the California Content Standards on the State Adoptions List. Inclusion on the adoptions list was the first requirement for selecting our adoption. At the district level, Legacy of Literacy was selected because it offered a comprehensive literacy program with a systematic and sequential skills sequence, a strong component for including parents in the instructional process, above average embedded assessments, and resources for providing training to our teachers were readily available.

The program places a strong emphasis on phonemic awareness at the Kindergarten level. Blending, segmenting, concepts of print and explicit phonics instruction provide a good foundation for our students. As students progress through the grades, the program aligns with the standards for each grade level. All areas of language arts are addressed. Student anthologies provide skills development and a variety of opportunities to engage students in direct instruction, provide guided practice, and activities that can be assigned as independent practice/homework are included. The series provides teachers with a variety of ways to keep parents informed and involved. Leveled books and theme related novels motivate students to read and help develop fluency. Comprehension is specifically addressed at all levels.

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

An analysis of work samples, formative assessments, summative assessments, mobility rate, and community resources indicated that a high percentage of our students enter school with deficits in the ability to organize their thoughts. Lack of exposure to activities that promote language development has been identified as a weakness through surveys. We have no preschool programs in our attendance area, and some students do not even have electricity in their homes. Exposure to quality literature is often limited prior to Kindergarten.

As students progress through the grades, assessment data indicates that they are mastering the mechanics of writing, but coherently organizing their thoughts on paper is a consistently weak area. Our mission includes providing all students with the skills needed to be successful adults. We believe that being able to logically sequence and present ideas on paper is an essential skill that can be systematically taught. To address this weakness, we have implemented a program called *Step Up to Writing*. The program uses a multi-modality approach to organizing written language that includes a color coded system that supports logical thinking that can be applied to the writing process. Our teachers have participated in formal training, support training is on-going, and application is consistent from grade-to-grade. The program includes terms and strategies that are used in all instructional settings, and the strategies are easily understood by the majority of parents. Transference of learning between settings is easily accomplished, and the use of common language by everyone providing instruction facilitates consistent and systematic application. *Step Up to Writing* supports our mission to provide all students with the skills needed to be successful adults through targeted instruction that allows them to see short-term improvement while sequentially building skills as they move through the grades.

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

Logistically, providing seven levels of grade specific instruction with four or five teachers is a difficult task. When your student population has a mobility rate of 50%, addressing the needs of students coming and going without compromising the exposure to grade appropriate instruction requires creative solutions. We have been fortunate enough to find fully credentialed, and highly qualified under No Child Left Behind, retired teachers who are willing to work on an hourly basis and who also regularly volunteer their time. Our teachers have worked with these individuals to establish a schedule that includes 3 hours of “sacred time” daily which is devoted to language arts and mathematics. Direct instruction is our primary instructional method. Our adopted core materials include the use of multiple-modality instruction. Specific strategies are taught to help students take notes, recall information, and organize their thoughts. Computer based instruction, co-operative learning, graphic organizers, and modeling, and scaffolding are examples of some of the other instructional strategies used. With the help of the credentialed hourly teachers, we are able to group every student by grade. This allows us to focus on grade specific standards and to integrate social science and science activities with our language arts instruction. Credentialed volunteers and credentialed hourly employees are also be used to work with high risk students outside the block of sacred time to provide interventions without compromising the student’s access to core instruction.

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

Teachers, paraprofessionals, site administrators, and district personnel work together to access needs, identify resources, and to provide opportunities for all staff members to learn new skills. Honoring the belief that permanent change will not take place unless those implementing the new practices can validate their efforts with clearly observable results, one of our primary goals for professional development is to improve assessment skills and our ability to analyze data. This improves our ability to focus our instruction and gives feedback that reinforces our commitment to practices that get results. We use a peer coaching model that allows teachers to share special skills and training. Every elementary school in our district has added instructional time to the day Monday through Thursday to allow early student dismissal on Fridays. This provides a block of time for teachers to collaborate, attend grade-alike meetings that include teachers from other schools, and to do research on best practices. An example of effective staff development at our site involved teachers reviewing data and noting that our student suspension rate was high and that our practices were not changing student behavior. A site team attended a workshop on alternatives to suspension and shared the information with other staff members. A plan to implement the new information was developed. Suspension rates decreased by over 60%, students were in class more often, data validated the effectiveness of our new practices, and our school climate is noticeably better.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### Language Arts

#### State Criterion Referenced Test

**Subject:** Language Arts    **Grade:** 6    **Test:** California Standards Test (CST)

**Edition/Publication Year:** Specific to year given    **Publisher:** California Department of Education

Testing Year	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested	100%	100%	100%
Number Tested	20	12	11
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	15%	8%	9%
% Proficient	65%	41%	45%
% Basic	95%	83%	63%
% Below Basic	100%	91%	81%
% Far Below Basic	100%	99%	99%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	17%	*	*
% Proficient	67%	*	*
% Basic	86%	*	*
% Below Basic	100%	*	*
% Far Below Basic	100%	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month: State Testing date is based on completion of the 85% of the school year.	Variable	Variable	Variable
<b>State Average</b>			
% Advanced	12%	13%	9%
% Proficient	36%	36%	30%
% Basic	71%	71%	66%
% Below Basic	90%	87%	85%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Comparable State Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	4%	4%	2%
% Proficient	19%	19%	14%
% Basic	59%	57%	60%
% Below Basic	85%	80%	89%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%

\* California does not report data when a sample includes ten or fewer students. No official data is available for groups when an asterisk is used in a chart. Performance is evaluated at the site level using the philosophy of "Every child by name".

**Language Arts**  
**State Criterion Referenced Test**

**Subject:** Language Arts

**Grade:**5

**Test:** California Standards Test

**Edition/Publication Year:** Specific to the year given.

**Publisher:** Ca. Dept of Ed.

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested	100%	100%	100%
Number Tested	10	18	14
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	*	17%	0%
% Proficient	*	50%	29%
% Basic	*	83%	93%
% Below Basic	*	94%	100%
% Far Below Basic	*	100%	100%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	*	*	*
% Proficient	*	*	*
% Basic	*	*	*
% Below Basic	*	*	*
% Far Below Basic	*	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month: Based on completing 85% of school days.	Variable	Variable	Variable
<b>State Scores</b>			
% Advanced	16%	10%	9%
% Proficient	40%	36%	31%
% Basic	71%	72%	71%
% Below Basic	90%	90%	91%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Comparable Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	6%	4%	2%
% Proficient	24%	22%	14%
% Basic	60%	49%	56%
% Below Basic	82%	82%	85%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%

\* Test sample too small to be considered statistically significant. Data is evaluated at the site level using the philosophy of "Each child by name".

**Language Arts  
State Criterion Referenced Test**

**Subject:** Language Arts

**Grade:**4

**Test:** California Standards Test

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2003-04

**Publisher:** Ca. Dept. of Ed.

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested	100%	100%	100%
Number Tested	15	8	15
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	13%	*	13%
% Proficient	60%	*	40%
% Basic	100%	*	93%
% Below Basic	100%	*	100%
% Far Below Basic	100%	*	100%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	15%	*	*
% Proficient	67%	*	*
% Basic	100%	*	*
% Below Basic	100%	*	*
% Far Below Basic	100%	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month: Varies, based on completing 85% of the school year	Varies	Varies	Varies
<b>State Scores</b>			
% Advanced	16%	15%	14%
% Proficient	39%	39%	36%
% Basic	73%	74%	58%
% Below Basic	91%	92%	77%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100 %	100%
<b>Comparable Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	7%	6%	4%
% Proficient	25%	24%	19%
% Basic	63%	64%	57%
% Below Basic	87%	89%	83%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%

\* Sample group was ten or less. No official data available.

**State Criterion Referenced Test**

**Subject:** Language Arts

**Grade:** 3

**Test:** California Standards Test

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2003-04

**Publisher:** Ca. Dept. of Education

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested	100%	100%	100%
Number Tested	12	18	8
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	0%	0%	*
% Proficient	8%	35%	*
% Basic	50%	64%	*
% Below Basic	67%	93%	*
% Far Below Basic	100%	99%	*
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	*	0%	*
% Proficient	*	41%	*
% Basic	*	71%	*
% Below Basic	*	100%	*
% Far Below Basic	*	100%	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month: Varies, based on completing 85% of the school Calendar	Varies	Varies	Varies
<b>State Average</b>			
% Advanced	9%	10%	11%
% Proficient	30%	33%	34%
% Basic	61%	63%	62%
% Below Basic	83%	84%	85%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	3%	4%	3%
% Proficient	17%	20%	18%
% Basic	49%	51%	47%
% Below Basic	77%	77%	77%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%

\* The number of students tested was ten or less. California does not provide data for such a small sample.

**State Criterion Referenced Test**

**Subject:** Language Arts                      **Grade:** 2                      **Test:** California Standards Test  
**Edition/Publication Year:** Specific to the year given                      **Publisher:** Ca. Dept. of Ed.

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested (1 student was exempted by parent 03-04)	93%	100%	100%
Number Tested	14	13	14
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	7%	0%	0%
% Proficient	7%	23%	36%
% Basic	43%	54%	57%
% Below Basic	64%	92%	93%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	*	*	*
% Proficient	*	*	*
% Basic	*	*	*
% Below Basic	*	*	*
% Far Below Basic	*	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month: Based on completing 85% of the school year.	Varies	Varies	Varies
<b>State Scores</b>			
% Advanced	12%	12%	9%
% Proficient	35%	36%	32%
% Basic	65%	68%	63%
% Below Basic	87%	87%	85%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Comparable Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	5%	5%	3%
% Proficient	22%	23%	18%
% Basic	54%	58%	50%
% Below Basic	82%	83 %	78%
% Far Below Basic	99%	100%	100%

\* The number of students tested was below the required sample required by the State of California to be considered reliable. No official data is available for this group.

## Mathematics

### State Criterion Referenced Test

**Subject:** Mathematics

**Grade:** 6

**Test:** California Standards Test

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2003-04

**Publisher:** California Department of Ed.

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested	100%	100%	100%
Number Tested	20	12	11
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	50%	33%	9%
% Proficient	80%	58%	45%
% Basic	95%	83%	72%
% Below Basic	100%	91%	90%
% Far Below Basic	100%	99%	99%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	50%	*	*
% Proficient	75%	*	*
% Basic	95%	*	*
% Below Basic	100 %	*	*
% Far Below Basic	100%	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month			
<b>State Averages</b>			
% Advanced	10%	10%	10%
% Proficient	33%	34%	32%
% Basic	64%	64%	62%
% Below Basic	93%	92%	91%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Comparable Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	4%	3%	4%
% Proficient	21%	19%	19%
% Basic	54%	50%	50%
% Below Basic	90%	88%	89%
% Far Below Basic	99%	100 %	100%

\*Number tested was 10 or less. California does not provide data on populations this small.

**State Criterion Referenced Test**

**Subject:** Mathematics                      **Grade:**5                      **Test:** California Standards Test  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2003-04                      **Publisher:** California Department of Education

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested	100%	100%	100%
Number Tested	10	18	14
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	*	33%	7%
% Proficient	*	72%	43%
% Basic	*	83%	86%
% Below Basic	*	100%	100%
% Far Below Basic	*	100%	100%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged	*		
% Advanced	*	*	*
% Proficient	*	*	*
% Basic	*	*	*
% Below Basic	*	*	*
% Far Below Basic	*	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month: Variable depending on when each district/school completed 85% of the years instructional days,	Variable	Variable	Variable
<b>State Average</b>			
% Advanced	12%	10%	7%
% Proficient	38%	35%	29%
% Basic	65%	61%	59%
% Below Basic	90%	87%	90%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	99%
<b>Comparable Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	5%	4%	2%
% Proficient	25%	22%	16%
% Basic	53%	49%	46%
% Below Basic	85%	82%	86%
% Far Below Basic	99%	100%	100%

\* The number of students tested in this group was 10 or less. Sample too small for Ca. to provide data.

**State Criterion Referenced Test**

**Subject:** Mathematics    **Grade:** 4    **Test:** California Standards Test

**Edition/Publication Year:** Specific to the year given.    **Publisher:** California Department of Ed.

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested	100%	100%	100%
Number Tested	15	8	15
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	20%	*	20%
% Proficient	60%	*	47%
% Basic	87%	*	100%
% Below Basic	100%	*	100%
% Far Below Basic	100%	*	100%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	*	*	*
% Proficient	*	*	*
% Basic	*	*	*
% Below Basic	*	*	*
% Far Below Basic	*	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month: Based on when the school/district completed 85 % of their instructional days	Varies	Varies	Varies
<b>State Averages</b>			
% Advanced	18%	18%	13%
% Proficient	45%	45%	37%
% Basic	73%	72%	67%
% Below Basic	97%	93%	93%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Comparable Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	10%	10%	6%
% Proficient	32%	33%	24%
% Basic	63%	63%	55%
% Below Basic	95%	91%	90%
% Far Below Basic	100 %	100%	100%

\* Indicates that the number in the test sample was below what the State of California feels is needed for reliability. No official data is available for this group.

**State Criterion Referenced Test**

**Subject:** Mathematics

**Grade:** 3

**Test:** California Standards Test

**Edition/Publication Year:** Specific to year given

**Publisher:** California Department of Ed

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested	100%	100%	100%
Number Tested	12	18	9
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	8%	6%	*
% Proficient	41%	41%	*
% Basic	58%	82%	*
% Below Basic	100%	100%	*
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	*
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	*	*	*
% Proficient	*	*	*
% Basic	*	*	*
% Below Basic	*	*	*
% Far Below Basic	*	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month: Determined by each school/district finished 85% of instructional days.	Varies	Varies	Varies
<b>State Average</b>			
% Advanced	21%	19%	12%
% Proficient	48%	46%	38%
% Basic	73%	71%	65%
% Below Basic	96%	94%	91%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100 %	100%
<b>Comparable Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	12%	11%	6%
% Proficient	36%	34%	25%
% Basic	65%	62%	53%
% Below Basic	95%	29%	77%
% Far Below Basic	100 %	100%	100%

\* 10 or less students tested in this group. No official data is available.

**State Criterion Referenced Test**

**Subject:** Mathematics

**Grade:** 2    **Test:** California Standards Test

**Edition/Publication Year:** Specific to the year given.    **Publisher:** California Dept. of Ed.

	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April	April
% Tested (One parent exempt in 03-04)	93%	100%	100%
Number Tested	15	13	16
<b>School Scores</b>			
% Advanced	14%	0%	0%
% Proficient	35%	31%	19%
% Basic	64%	77%	69%
% Below Basic	93%	92%	94%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	*	*	*
% Proficient	*	*	*
% Basic	*	*	*
% Below Basic	*	*	*
% Far Below Basic	*	*	*
	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month			
<b>State Average</b>			
% Advanced	23%	24%	16%
% Proficient	51%	53%	43%
% Basic	76%	76%	68%
% Below Basic	96%	96%	92%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
<b>Subgroup Scores</b>			
Socio-economically Disadvantaged			
% Advanced	13%	14%	8%
% Proficient	39%	41%	30%
% Basic	67%	68%	58%
% Below Basic	93%	93%	89%
% Far Below Basic	100%	100 %	100%

\*The group or subgroup included ten or less students, and no official data is available.



