

2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Public Private

Cover Sheet

Type of School (Check all that apply) Elementary Middle High K-12
 Charter Title I Magnet Choice

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

Official School Name Victor Hugo Hartsfield Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 5001 Perry Street
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

Houston Texas 77021-5001
City State Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Harris State School Code Number* 101912168

Telephone (713) 746-8280 Fax (713) 746-8283

Web site/URL Houstonisd.org/Hartsfield E-mail jwillia3@houstonisd.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date
Principal's Signature

Name of Superintendent Dr. Abelardo Saavedra
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Houston Independent School District Tel. (713) 556-6000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date
(Superintendent's Signature)

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

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

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

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

Mail by commercial carrier (FedEx, UPS) or courier original signed cover sheet to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 5E103, Washington DC 20202-8173.

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 for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not 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 2007-2008 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have 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 2002 and has not received the No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district wide compliance review.
6. 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 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. Throughout the document, round numbers to the nearest whole number to avoid decimals, except for numbers below 1, which should be rounded to the nearest tenth.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 180 Elementary schools
 48 Middle schools
 _____ Junior High Schools
 35 High schools
 30 Other
 293 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 6703
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 7436

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 are
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural are
 Rural
4. 2 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
8 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 |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Pre K | 21 | 18 | 39 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 37 | 17 | 54 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 28 | 38 | 66 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 23 | 23 | 46 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 28 | 28 | 56 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 27 | 22 | 49 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 24 | 23 | 47 | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL | | | | | | | 357 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 0 | % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| 0 | % Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 80 | % Black or African American |
| 20 | % Hispanic or Latino |
| 0 | % White |

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 18 %

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

| | | |
|--------------|--|------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year | 25 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year | 40 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 65 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 357 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.18 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 18 |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 20 %
- | | |
|----|---|
| 67 | Total Number Limited English Proficient |
|----|---|

Number of languages represented 1

Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals 97 %

Total number students who qualify: 336

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: $\frac{8}{28}$ % Total Number of Students Serve

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------------|-----------|--|
| <u>0</u> | Autism | <u>0</u> | Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> | Deafness | <u>0</u> | Other Health Impairment |
| <u>0</u> | Deaf-Blindnes | <u>19</u> | Specific Learning Disabilit |
| <u>1</u> | Emotional Disturbanc | <u>6</u> | Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> | Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> | Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>6</u> | Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> | Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</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>2</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Classroom teachers | <u>21</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Special resource teachers/specialist | <u>2</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>5</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Support Staff | <u>7</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total number | <u>37</u> | <u>0</u> |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of 17 : 1 students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Please explain a high teacher turnover rate. 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 in attendance, dropout or the drop-off rates. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates, and only high schools need to supply drop-off

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 95 % | 95 % | 95 % | 94 % | 94 % |
| Daily teacher attendance | 96 % | 95 % | 96 % | 98 % | 96 % |
| Teacher turnover rate | 1 % | 1 % | 1 % | 1 % | 1 % |
| Student drop out rate (middle/hig | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % |
| Student drop-off rate (high school | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % |

Please provide all explanations below

PART III - SUMMARY

Hartsfield Elementary School is dedicated to meeting the individual needs of all students. It is our goal to promote high expectations and facilitate a positive and creative learning environment where all children are expected to learn and perform to their highest potential.

Hartsfield Elementary parents, faculty, staff, community, and business partners continue to work together in a collaborative and cooperative effort to enable students to reach their fullest potential and become contributing productive members of society. Realizing that 'Attitude is Everything' with regard to daily instruction, our school motto is: 'We Strive to Achieve.'

Hartsfield is an urban school-wide Title I campus with a predominantly African-American population. It is located in the South Park area of southeast Houston. The school is within 10 minutes of both the University of Houston Central Campus and the historic Texas Southern University. It is also less than 10 minutes from the world renowned Texas Medical Center. The school opened in 1954 and has undergone two major renovations since its inception.

Hartsfield is one of several neighborhood elementary schools that make up the Yates Vertical Feeder Pattern in the Central Region of the Houston Independent School District. Hartsfield is a relatively small school with a population of 357 students (Pre-K-5). The ethnic distribution is 80% African-American and 20% Hispanic. The student attendance rate is 95% and the teacher attendance rate is 96%.

The free/reduced lunch and breakfast program at Hartsfield serves 97% of the students. Currently 8% of it's students are Special Education, and 12% are limited English speaking. Ninety percent (90.0) of the students are considered economically disadvantaged and/or At-Risk. The mobility rate is 6%.

Hartsfield's professional staff includes 17 classroom teachers, 4 Ancillary members, a Title I Coordinator, one 60% staff counselor, one nurse, of whom are Texas certified. Approximately 96% of the staff members are black, 1% white, and 3% Hispanic.

CLEAR is the curriculum base instruction for Hartsfield students. As a result of on-going technology training, staff members are now demonstrating the ability to integrate the computer in their daily teaching as a diagnostic and prescriptive tool to provide meaningful instruction and to use appropriate software to track and monitor student achievement. Students are also becoming computer proficient, and are able to write compositions on Microsoft Word, Claris Works, and other related software programs. Parents are offered workshops through our Parents Advisory Council, and students participate in many programs including 21st Century After School Program, as well as Cops and Kids. Students receive services through the School-Wide Title I Program.

To ensure all of our students attain high academic success, Hartsfield Elementary provides a learning environment that maintains high expectations and a curriculum that is highly differentiated and challenging.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1 Assessment Results:

Texas state mandated tests provide a single 'snapshot' of the performance of Hartsfield's students in reading and math skills. High expectation and support for all of Hartsfield's students focuses on specific needs and deficits. Both performance and participation in reading and in math is evaluated in terms of all students and six student groups 'African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged, Special Education, and Limited English Proficiency. At Hartsfield, our teachers integrate instruction using assessment results. Daily reading and math activities are integrated through lessons to help students gain deeper meaning and greater understanding of their skills. Although, disparities exist among student subgroups, there are improvements in the achievements of major student groups both Hispanic and African-American. These improvements reflect the concerted efforts of teachers, parents, and students here at Hartsfield to meet the expectations of the accountability system.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) Accountability System is a method of evaluating schools in which Hartsfield participates with regard to our school's assessment performance. We are assigned an accountability rating based on the testing evaluation of our students. The TEA Accountability System is based on an improvement model in which districts and campuses must meet either an absolute standard or an improvement standard for each accountability measure. The four possible performance levels for districts and individual schools which meet district standards are Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, or Academically Unacceptable. Assessment results provide our school with an evaluation of Hartsfield's student performance which enables us to pinpoint where improvements are needed and benefits all of Hartsfield's students. The following is the Web site where information on the state assessment may be found:

www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/index.html

After taking the 2007 TAKS test, Hartsfield students made sufficient gains and growth earning them the recognized status in the area of Reading (82%) and Math (75%) according to TEA accountability. Although Hartsfield made sufficient gain and growth in Reading and Math the overall TEA rating for the school was acceptable. This was due to the fourth grade acceptable rating in Writing (74%) and fifth grade Science (59%).

Hartsfield achieved high performance in fifth grade with 100% of all students meeting state standard in the area of math and reading. Science and Writing was the content areas that kept Hartsfield from the recognized status. Hartsfield continues to drive instruction based on student data.

TAKS is a criterion reference test used by the state to assess the TEKS (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills). There are other assessments used for analysis of student achievement which include the following:

Stanford 10 - a norm reference test that compares student performance in the same grade across the nation. TPRI-Texas Proficiency Reading Interventions and Campus Base Common Assessments.

Our assessment results are used as a tool for learning rather than as just a measure of our students' achievement. Assessments help to determine what our students know and how to change the instruction to help students learn what they need to know. When our assessment results suggest that our students are having a difficult time mastering a skill, our teachers implement alternate instructional strategies and materials to help students improve their performance: Informal teacher observations, structured assessments, and reading and writing evaluations provide a comprehensive picture of our students' growth and improvement.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Our teachers professional judgment is key to the evaluation process and assessments are not just based on one or two measures. The students are continually involved in the process of self-assessment as they engage in text-based, and knowledge-based questions which improve student and school performance. Data derived from common assessments, teacher generated curriculum based assessments, district generated and Central Region Benchmarks, TPRI, Stanford and TAKS is used by teachers for instructional pacing, flexible grouping, lesson differentiation, and student motivation. Teachers analyze this data and collaborate during PLC time to determine where we are? What we need to do new and how will we move forward to meet our goal. Hartsfield scored 82% on the Reading TAKS, and the scores

written our ethnic break downs; African American (83%) and Hispanic (80%) were good with a 8% point increase from 2005-2006 school year. Math scores were 75% overall with the Hispanic sub group being the lowest (66%). There was a 5% point increase from 2006.

Hartsfield functions as a professional learning community shifting from a focus on teaching to focus on learning. Common assessments are developed to ensure there is alignment between curriculum, instruction and assessment. Assessment data is used to support teams in the pursuit of quality improvement at all levels. Assessments of learning allows teachers to make bold changes in instruction and strategies focused on student learning standards and student learning styles.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

A variety of responses promote family and community involvement and provide the opportunity for evaluation of the student's school performance. Letters are written in English and in Spanish that explain to families what the students are learning in the classroom and how family and extended members of the community (grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.) can assist them in their classroom performance. Family surveys provide research and ideas for the school and for the family's role as a valuable part of the child's learning team. Flyers and monthly school calendars show daily and weekly activities and progress reports go home which promote dialogue and discussion between teachers, parents, and students. Written communication, as well as school marquee contain pertinent information that informs parents, students, and community members about upcoming test dates and school events. Parents, students, and community members are kept abreast and invited to all school events including Open House, PAC meetings, parents workshops and PTO meetings to keep all interested parties informed about student performance and their progress. The instructional program includes teacher review of TAKS Summary Reports, monthly and weekly benchmark tests and in-services help teachers understand and interpret test data in order to improve student performance. Classroom participation and communication from the teacher allows students to gage individual performance and daily progress and students are given immediate feedback. Students see actual test results and repeat activities and correct deficiencies in areas that need improvement. Parents and interested parties attend student teacher conferences and review and understand students' classroom performance and discuss how improvements can be made.

4. Sharing Success:

Hartsfield's principal and administrative staff collaborates to improve professional practices and communicates with other schools and shares ideas about what works to promote school success during workshops, campus visits, and district in-services. School CDs and audio/videos are used to highlight instructional goals, classroom successes, and to show student growth and school achievement. Our teachers network and exchange ideas through workshops and other gatherings in which they come together to look at strategies and programs that help students to achieve goals. School successes are shared through Houston Independent School District's (HISD) Connect Website which recognizes and celebrates school growth through district-wide communication. The district's secure website allows schools to maintain contact and to offer support and encouragement to each other and disseminates information through For Your Information (FYI) Newsletters about school successes across the district. These are vehicles that Hartsfield has used to support our school's growth and educational process and will continue to provide useful information to the community and to other schools to support our school and the success of its performance.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Our assessment results are used as a tool for learning rather than as just a measure of our students' achievement. Assessments help to determine what our students know and how to change the instruction to help students learn what they need to know. When our assessment results suggest that our students are having a difficult time mastering a skill, our teachers implement alternate instructional strategies and materials to help students improve their performance: Informal teacher observations, structured assessments, and reading and writing evaluations provide a comprehensive picture of our students' growth and improvement. Pre-and post- tests at each grade level is evidence of student performance and is used to guide classroom instruction. Our teachers professional judgment is key to the evaluation process and assessments are not just based on one or two measures. The students are continually involved in the process of self-assessment as they engage in text-based, and knowledge-based questions which improve student and school performance.

Fine arts education is a strong catalyst for elevating student achievement at Hartsfield Elementary. Students are immersed in a rich fine arts curriculum in the general music classroom. Instruction through the Kodaly methodology of teaching music encourages creativity, cultivates motivated learners, creates life-long connoisseurs of fine arts and makes all students stewards of their own cultural heritage. Fine Arts instruction also supports academic success among all students at Hartsfield Elementary. This is achieved through rich fine arts instruction as it promotes multiple intelligences, Bloom's Taxonomy of higher order thinking skills, neuron stimulation, memorization, literacy, linear thinking, and critical thinking skills. Examples of concrete academic applications in music instruction include providing a rich print environment, phonemic awareness, context clues, word meaning, summarization, chronological ordering, categorizing, math operations, science concepts and vocabulary, history and social studies, composition, grammar and language usage.

In addition to receiving general music instruction in the classroom setting, students experience other fine arts disciplines through concert choir/show choir, rhythm ensemble tone chime ensemble, dance ensemble presentations and dramatic productions. Performance groups serve as leaders in the community through performances which include an invitation to sing for The City of Houston Health Department, various district showcases and Universal Studios in Orlando, Florida.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

It is our desire to have our students at maximum reading levels in all grades, and to set forth guidelines that will allow them to maintain a consistency which will permit them to achieve exemplary reading standards. Our core curriculum, Open Court, in conjunction with Reading First, were chosen because each offers a scientifically based reading and research program that emphasizes a combination of word recognition skills and reading comprehension strategies with opportunities to apply and to practice these reading skills in our students. Open Court offers the explicit teaching of sounds, the blending of sounds into words, and the use of this foundation to develop reading and writing skills in the students. Open Court and the support intervention Reading First includes Regional Technical Assistant(RTA) and Program Mentor Trainer(PMT) support staff which supports the use of fidelity of the core reading curriculum, Open Court, which is designed to provide a solid foundation in reading instruction for our students. In addition to explicit skills, reading instruction in both Open Court and Reading First is balanced with phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, comprehension and text fluency. Thus, our reading curriculum is designed with systematic skills of instruction to empower our students as they practice the skills they are learning and gain confidence in their reading abilities as they become fluent in reading and in writing skills.

In reviewing all areas of our instructional programs, it is evident that greater emphasis must be placed on improvement in the area of reading vocabulary. We are faced with challenges when we ask students to memorize and learn specialized vocabulary for content reading. One of the best ways to facilitate greater independence in vocabulary growth is through the strategic integration of vocabulary learning opportunities in multiple curricular areas. Students struggle or make no attempt to learn content vocabulary that could help them be successful in their content reading.

Teaching and learning new words can have many purposes, especially when teaching diverse populations. Teaching vocabulary becomes not a simple process of teaching words but one of teaching particular words to particular students for a particular purpose. When shared reading becomes a foundation for content

literacy, we are then able to support word learning. When content vocabulary is taught in the context of reading a text with the shared reading approach, students immediately have the opportunity to see and hear the word at the same time.

The use of vocabulary as an instructional approach for readers at all levels of language proficiency provides for building from shared reading to increase students' literate experiences in a variety of curricular and instructional learning.

As with all learning, success breeds success. As teachers feel successful with the improvement in a student's vocabulary, they become dedicated to finding ways to help students unlock the printed word.

Maya Angelou says, 'Words mean more than what is set down on paper. It takes the human voice to infuse them with the shades of deeper meaning.'

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Our mission statement at Hartsfield is to meet the individual needs of all students. It is our goal to promote high expectations and facilitate a positive learning environment where all children are expected to learn and perform at their highest potential.

Hartsfield Smart Goal for science is for 85% of all students and all student sub-groups taking TAKS Science will meet the passing standard. Hartsfield experienced a 5% decrease in total science compared to last year. Therefore, Hartsfield created a smart goal for science and developed initiative and strategies to increase student performance. Hartsfield provides interventions to ensure that all ESL and ELL students experience academic success. To increase student performance Hartsfield opened a science lab on campus in order to reinforce our science classes. There was a gap between our Hispanic and Africa-American students (60% Africa-American) and (57% Hispanic).

Hartsfield overall science score was 59% for 2006-2007 school year. This made us realize that we need to add hands on reinforcement in the area of science. Hartsfield overall science score was 59% for 2006-2007 school year. This made us realize that we need to add hands on reinforcement in the area of science. Our science lab is a student center, learner-friendly science lab. While science is still taught in the classroom the reinforcement comes in the lab where the lab teacher and classroom teacher is present and works collaboratively to ensure that students understand concepts and their application.

4. Instructional Methods:

Hartsfield offers a variety of teaching techniques to meet the instructional needs of the students in order to improve learning. We provide meaningful instruction to monitor student achievement by TAKS objectives and by Stanford 10 proficiencies. Whole-class instruction is initially presented to all the children, rather than breaking the class into ability groups. It is only after our students have been presented with the material, that those who do not understand are singled out for extra help and encouragement through Tier 2 reading instruction. Small group 'pull out' instruction by the reading interventionist is offered as a means of re-teaching in order to strengthen knowledge and needed skills once problem areas are identified. Hartsfield's ESL program is a valuable resource that provides stability to our Hispanic population and as reinforcement to our students. In addition, we continue to benchmark our students through weekly checkups and through monthly school-wide testing. Research based materials are purchased to provide up to date practice to build skills. The literacy coach is available on a daily basis to offer assistance to teachers and to students in K-3rd grades and tutoring programs are set up to give students additional reading instruction. A record of bi-weekly assessments which are done on the palm pilot is maintained as a valuable progress monitoring instructional technique that is proven effective in teaching our students to become strong, competent readers. Overhead projectors allow for visual graphic organizers and computer technology expands the student knowledge of concepts which are presented in the classroom. These are the instructional methods at Hartsfield which gives our students multidimensional avenues of review and practice.

5. Professional Development:

Workshops and professional development programs are district and school requirements throughout the school year which allow teachers to develop classroom instructional strategies for student achievement and student progress. Professional development is implemented on an on-going basis and allows teachers and staff to receive first hand instructional information which enhances performance for teachers and for their students and keeps staff abreast of current teaching strategies and classroom instructional techniques. An Open Court reading consultant provides on-site campus training of differentiated instruction and strategy building reading activities for all learners in a classroom setting. The principal provides additional training for teachers and for staff during Fridays after school early dismissals. Teachers and staff are given the time to reflect consistently and frequently on student achievement and to collaborate to improve professional practices to enhance student learning. Professional development and instructional strategies maximize support for literacy skills and offers instruction to reinforce skills to meet the needs of all our students. Our professional practices are in use daily which covers important content areas and offers multiple academic areas of differentiated instruction which improves student achievement and impacts student learning.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (ELA) Grade 4 Test Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills

Edition/Publication Year 2004-2007 Publisher Texas Education Agency

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 65 | 59 | 72 | 76 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 7 | 3 | 20 | 14 | |
| Number of students tested | 43 | 37 | 46 | 37 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 90 | 82 | 74 | 82 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 10 | 20 | 19 | 20 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. African-American | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 63 | 63 | 75 | 73 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 10 | 3 | 18 | 13 | |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 30 | 40 | 30 | |
| 2. Hispanic | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 69 | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 0 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 13 | | | | |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 64 | 56 | 70 | 77 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 7 | 3 | 14 | 14 | |
| Number of students tested | 42 | 34 | 43 | 35 | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 89 | 73 | 82 | 98 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 44 | 48 | 34 | 48 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 83 | 87 | 81 | 87 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 17 | 4 | 21 | 22 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. African-American | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 91 | 74 | 86 | 98 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 34 | 39 | 29 | 42 | |
| 2. Hispanic | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 70 | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 0 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 10 | | | | |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 88 | 71 | 81 | 98 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 42 | 45 | 32 | 45 | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 100 | 79 | 74 | 84 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 26 | 0 | 3 | 20 | |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 35 | 38 | 44 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 79 | 66 | 82 | 73 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 12 | 0 | 17 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 18 | 23 | 16 | 28 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. African-American | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 100 | 82 | 72 | 88 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| Number of students tested | 23 | 33 | 32 | 32 | |
| 2. Hispanic | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | | | | 75 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | | | | 25 | |
| Number of students tested | | | | 12 | |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 100 | 78 | 72 | 83 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 28 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| Number of students tested | 27 | 36 | 36 | 42 | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 63 | 63 | 85 | 98 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 9 | 4 | 6 | 51 | |
| Number of students tested | 46 | 49 | 34 | 47 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 87 | 89 | 81 | 85 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 13 | 2 | 17 | 24 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. African-American | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 67 | 65 | 86 | 98 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 9 | 5 | 7 | 46 | |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 37 | 29 | 41 | |
| 2. Hispanic | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 54 | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 8 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 13 | | | | |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 61 | 63 | 84 | 98 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 7 | 2 | 6 | 50 | |
| Number of students tested | 44 | 43 | 32 | 44 | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 68 | 73 | 85 | 79 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 7 | 11 | 13 | 15 | |
| Number of students tested | 44 | 37 | 47 | 33 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 92 | 82 | 76 | 73 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 12 | 13 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 8 | 20 | 19 | 29 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. African-American | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 71 | 73 | 85 | 77 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 6 | 10 | 7 | 12 | |
| Number of students tested | 31 | 30 | 41 | 26 | |
| 2. Hispanic | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 68 | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 8 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 13 | | | | |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 67 | 74 | 84 | 81 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 7 | 12 | 14 | 16 | |
| Number of students tested | 43 | 34 | 44 | 31 | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 100 | 82 | 78 | 79 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 30 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 39 | 32 | 43 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 79 | 75 | 73 | 72 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 12 | 12 | 18 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 18 | 23 | 27 | 30 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. African-American | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 100 | 85 | 74 | 74 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 35 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Number of students tested | 23 | 33 | 27 | 31 | |
| 2. Hispanic | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Economically Disadvantage | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| 'Meeting' | 100 | 81 | 77 | 78 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| 'Exceeding' | 28 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| Number of students tested | 27 | 36 | 30 | 41 | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

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

Subject Reading (E) Grade 3 Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills
 Edition/Publication Year 2004-2007 Publisher Texas Education Agency

Scores are reported here as _____

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | March | March |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| Total Score | 84 | 75 | 86 | 99 | 98 |
| Number of students tested | 44 | | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | | 88 | 83 | 76 | 88 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 16 | 22 | 26 | 40 | 24 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 12 | 15 | 17 | 24 | 12 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Economically Disadvantaged | 88 | 83 | 82 | 76 | 87 |
| Number of students tested | 117 | 118 | 82 | 122 | 161 |
| 2. African-American | 87 | 85 | 82 | 74 | 88 |
| Number of students tested | 90 | 105 | 82 | 103 | 145 |
| 3. Hispanic | 94 | 82 | 81 | 86 | 86 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 22 | 17 | 86 | 25 |
| 4. | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| NATIONAL MEAN SCORE | | | | | |
| NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO | | | | | |