U.S. Department of Education
2010 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) [] Charter [**X**] Title I [**X**] Magnet [**X**] Choice

Name of Principal: Ms. Valerie Hatcher

Official School Name: University Preparatory

School Mailing Address:
16925 Forrest Avenue
Victorville, CA 92395-3713

County: San Bernardino State School Code Number*: 3667934-0110064

Telephone: (760) 243-5940 Fax: (760) 951-2803

Web site/URL: http://163.150.180.252/UPS/ E-mail: vhatcher@vvuhsd.org

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

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Dr. Marilou Ryder

District Name: Victor Valley Union High School District Tel: (760) 955-3201

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

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Judy Munoz

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it 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.*
The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of 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.

3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2009-2010 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2004.

6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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: (per district designation)

0	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
3	Middle/Junior high schools
5	High schools
0	K-12 schools
8	**TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 9021

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

[ ] Urban or large central city
[X] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
[ ] Suburban
[ ] Small city or town in a rural area
[ ] Rural

4. 4 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position 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	**6**			0
K			0	**7**	77	124	201
1			0	**8**	70	131	201
2			0	**9**	78	119	197
3			0	**10**	59	103	162
4			0	**11**	68	64	132
5			0	**12**	36	62	98
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					991

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

1	% American Indian or Alaska Native
6	% Asian
10	% Black or African American
53	% Hispanic or Latino
4	% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
25	% White
1	% Two or more races
100	**% Total**

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 11 %

This rate is 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.	27
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	59
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	86
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	801
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.107
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	10.737

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 3 %

Total number limited English proficient 32

Number of languages represented: 6

Specify languages:

Arabic, Gujarati, Korean, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 55 %

Total number students who qualify: 547

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 free and reduced-price school meals 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: 0 %

Total Number of Students Served: 3

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

0	Autism	1	Orthopedic Impairment
0	Deafness	0	Other Health Impaired
0	Deaf-Blindness	0	Specific Learning Disability
0	Emotional Disturbance	0	Speech or Language Impairment
0	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
0	Mental Retardation	2	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0	Multiple Disabilities	0	Developmentally Delayed

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

	Number of Staff	
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	2	0
Classroom teachers	33	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	0	0
Paraprofessionals	0	0
Support staff	11	0
Total number	46	0

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 **30 :1**

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Daily student attendance	97%	98%	98%	98%	99%
Daily teacher attendance	95%	95%	96%	96%	98%
Teacher turnover rate	3%	6%	0%	0%	0%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

Data reported for 2004-2005 based on new school opening, and staff & students, being pre-identified for the 2005-2006 school year

Teacher daily attendance rates are estimated based on school records, as the district does not maintain this information.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

Graduating class size	0	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0	%
Enrolled in a community college	0	%
Enrolled in vocational training	0	%
Found employment	0	%
Military service	0	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0	%
Unknown	0	%
Total	**100**	%

PART III - SUMMARY

In the fall of 2004, as a response to parental demands for a specifically rigorous learning environment, Victor Valley Union High School received authorization to open a school of choice serving students in grades seven to twelve. A principal was hired, staff selected, curricular materials identified, and a group of then seventh grade students were identified to be the first 8th grade class of the school. These then seventh grade students were housed at a single middle school for the 2004-05 year. Since these students were pre-identified for University Prep (UP) they were grouped together.

When University Preparatory officially opened in the fall of 2005, these previous seventh grade students entered the school as our first eighth grade class. Thus, University Preparatory has reliable longitudinal data on a group of students from 2004-05 through 2008-09. Other than the initial year when these students were housed at the middle school, these students have been enrolled at University Prep, completing grades eight, nine, ten, and eleven while here. These remarkable student will be our first graduating class of 2010.

Our propelling philosophy is to provide *no excuse* academic attainment for all of our students towards university admissions. Our mission is to promote academic and character excellence, to foster effective instruction, support, and to tailor resources such that each student is able to access a world-class education. Our vision is to ignite a passion for learning, and illumine paths for its obtainment.

UP now accommodates 972 students from a district-wide field of 7 th-12th graders, and is comprised of 53% Hispanic, 25% Caucasian, 10% African American, 6% Asian, and 6% other. Students elect to attend UP, and are typically highly motivated. Teachers are hand-chosen as much on the strength of their love of kids as their field of study expertise. Confidence and optimism abounds on campus and is immediately obvious to all, from after-school programs to Staff Sports Games, from field trips to *Shout Outs* illumining extraordinary actions.

Our stakeholders play an integral role in the governance of University Preparatory. Staff adheres to professional standards, including dress and demeanor policies, and students adhere to uniform and comportment policies. We have seven classes rotated through a six period format beginning with, and dropping a different class each day, thereby allowing for an expanded curriculum. This format affords students extra classes and it affords a focus of studies with less repetition, boredom and stagnation. It presents the ability to more quickly earn high school credits, and potentially up to a year's worth of college credits through completion of AP classes.

Five years ago our intent was to create a college-going climate in which every student has access to a rich and rigorous curriculum. Today, the depth and breadth of our determination to prepare our students for university admittance remains unaltered. Changing demographics bring the inevitability of challenges, both academic and social. Our students are not excuses, but rather inspirations for us to work collaboratively both within and across grades, systems and disciplines to make our mission realities. Our adoption of a *no excuses* approach for all students, using inquiry-driven methodologies, drilled-down data analysis, and teaching strategies germane to the changing demographics and learning proclivities have netted greater student achievement and greater stakeholder satisfaction.

Our academic accomplishments and recognitions distinguish us as a notable institution and engender pride and satisfaction that we are on a proven course of success. We have consistently scored over 800 on the California Standards Tests (CST). Our 2008-09 API score of 868 earned us the highest ranked high school in San Bernardino County, and places us in the top 5% within the state of California. In 2008, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission (WASC), awarded us a three-year accreditation upon its initial visit, and in 2009 and 2010, we received both the Title-I Academic Achievement Award, and in 2009 the California Distinguished School Recognition Award.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

State and federal indicators are used to show students' academic progress. The Academic Performance Index (API), Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) criterion are used to measure student academic success. The API is a state accountability system, used to rank school and district performance the previous year. NCLB standards require schools to make progress towards the AYP based on California Standards Tests (CST) and CAHSEE results. California uses five performance levels to report student achievement on the California Standards in all core subjects: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic performance.

University Preparatory performs well above both sets of standards. Our API scores exceeded the state's guidelines of 800 for the past three consecutive years: In 2006-2007 University Prep scored 837; in 2007-08, 840, and 868 in 2008-2009. We met the state's Adequate Yearly Progress standards every year for each significant subgroup. In 2007 and 2008, our statistically significant subgroups consisted of White, Hispanic/Latino, and Socio-economically Disadvantaged, and in 2009 we added English Learners to our list of significant subgroups.

Over the last three years, University Preparatory has found great success in overall student achievement with steady growth and improvement in our API score. Our largest success has been in English Language Arts proficiency. In said period, the percentage of our students scoring Advanced, or Proficient has risen from 71.52%, in the 2006-2007 school year to 77.55%, in 2008-2009. This is a result of data-driven instruction and interventions decisions at the school. Having students in grades 7-12 allows us the unique opportunity to track student data quickly and effectively from middle to high school. Where most high schools do not receive student CST data on in-coming freshman until late in the school year, University Prep has this data by the first week of the new school year. Teachers are given their rosters along with their students' CST data to help drive instruction. As a result, while most schools are experiencing declines in their 9th grade English Language Arts scores, our freshman classes have demonstrated tremendous growth. UP Freshman English Language Arts CST scores have increased from 79.85% in 2006-2007 to 84.85% in 2008-2009.

The California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) was enacted as law, in 1999, and mandates all high school students to pass both Math and English Language Arts sections, in order to receive a high school diploma. 350 is the minimum passing score, however, currently a score of 382 denotes Proficiency, and 406 marks Advanced standing. In 2008, all University Prep students passed the CAHSEE-ELA, with 91% at a Proficient level. In addition, 67% of the students scored the maximum Advanced score. In 2009, 97% of students passed CAHSEE-ELA section, with 70% at the Proficiency level. 99.5% of our students have passed the CAHSEE math section. Our overall CAHSEE passing rate for the two years the test has been offered has been 98% with proficiency levels increasing from 85% to 89%.

Research shows that having high expectations for students from marginalized communities increases the likelihood of their increased achievement. At UP the achievement gap in math has been decreased between Caucasian students and African American students to within 10 percentage points, and Caucasian and Hispanic students by 5 percentage points. Our 2008-09 CST Math proficiency rates were: Caucasian (45%), African American (35 %), Hispanic (40%), Asian (69%), and ELA proficiency rates: Caucasian (86%), African American (74 %), Hispanic (72%), and Asian (92%). This level of success is directly attributable to identifying and supporting students a their levels of academic need.

Website for state assessment information: http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Our research committees focus on the whole being only as strong as its distinct components, and resolve to understand all of our components through detailed disaggregation of data, drilled down to its most discreet units of student measurement in order to illumine and inform teaching/learning decisions. Student achievement is monitored and evaluated by using various assessment data. CST scores are disseminated in department meetings early in the school year. CST scores identify students who tested at the Basic and Below Basic level, allowing teachers to proactively formulate strategies to both assist students in jeopardy of underperforming in their courses and illumine area where content teaching may need strengthening, while maintaining a stringent, standards based curriculum. Regular and routine department and teacher/student meetings facilitate collaborative planning, implementation and necessary adjustments to teaching strategies, and continuous monitoring of student progress. Supplemental district-created assessments for math, science, English and social science are administered to assure uniformity of standards based curriculum, and pacing concurrent with state testing dates.

CST scores and Practice CAHSEEs are used to spot students who might not pass the exam, or achieve a rank of proficient or better on state assessments. These students are encouraged to participate in Saturday and after school Math and English academies, where credentialed instructors provide supplemental instruction.

Student GPAs are used to identify students with averages below 2.5 who potentially might not test at the proficient level. These students are required to participate in an intervention program and meet with a counseling staff on a daily basis for homework and recording services. This program also requires daily parental participation and signatures of assignments. The intervention program provides daily one-to-one mentoring for students with demonstrated performance and/or assessments needs. Participation in any of our programs is based on individual academic indicators and not a perceived assumption of belonging to an "at risk" subgroup.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

University Preparatory utilizes a variety of tools and strategies to communicate assessment results to students, parents, staff, and community members. Key to this process is our school-wide use of the Aeries Browser Interface (ABI), an attendance, grade, assessment, and other student information browser. ABI is a web portal that allows teachers to input, organize, view and retrieve distinct student records, while simultaneously presenting a format that is conducive to clearly communicating said information to students and parents. These organized reports are routinely printed and sent home with students, or emailed directly to parents, students, and other relevant contacts. Through protected passwords, parents/guardians and students also have access to ABI data in order to view current grades, performance and assessment information. Academic records are kept current, such that students and parents have access to academic information immediate to its input.

Where families may not have Internet access, progress reports are made available to students every two weeks. Progress reports, grade reports, and academic warnings are used to give students, and their families, opportunities to assess student academic performance, and seek remediation via after school tutoring, re-teaching, and intervention, as needed.

Assessment results are posted on our school website immediate to their release from the state; they are published in our local newspaper, and *Education Matters*, a district newsletter mailed to every community household. Our API score is broadcasted on our school marquee for several weeks following the state's release of CST results. Our newly forming PTA will be a place where results are both shared and explained to parents. Additionally, our district publishes its assessment results through various public forums.

4. **Sharing Success:**

At the San Bernardino County Superintendent of School (SBCSS) site, our school shared signature practices with other schools that were considering submitting applications for the California Distinguished Schools award. There, we shared our successes, and internal practices that secured them. We also shared teaching strategies and position reports regarding latest educational reform and research with other schools through written contributions to *Education Matters* a quarterly publication distributed by the Victor Valley Union High School District.

We have regular articulation with local elementary schools regarding curriculum and teaching methodologies; we visit other schools within our district and share educational/instructional best practices, as well as provide teacher/site training on theories, philosophies, management strategies, uniform policies, content instruction and collaboration-building. Teachers and administrators from other sites visit our campus and classrooms typically seeking methodological approaches, scheduling, and instruction information. We also share successes via local television interviews, and subject level meetings within the district.

Although we have a strong philosophic commitment to share the values, theories and practices that have netted such positive educational success for our students, as a budding institution, we have not as yet institutionalized a systemic praxis for such a delivery of inter-school professional sharing. However, we are currently engaged in a school leadership dialogue regarding both the benefits and responsibilities for a consistent modeling of our success to the wider educational community.

If granted the Blue Ribbon School award, we would categorically, consistently and routinely share our pedagogic values**,** and teaching methodologies with other schools and teaching institutions.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

By means of a rigorous high school and Advanced Placement curriculum, University Preparatory provides students access to coursework in preparation for college admission. The demanding curriculum is aligned with government mandates, and presented to, and expected of all of our students. Students have open access to the courses of their choices, except where grade level limitations exist. Self-selection to Advanced Placement (AP) classes comes with tutorial support, where needed. All curricular areas are taught to state standards, by subject-credentialed instructors utilizing state adopted textbooks and materials. Teachers monitor student progress and tailor learning strategies needed to assure equal access.

7th and 8th grade core instructional program consists of English language arts, math, social studies, and science. 7th graders are allowed to enroll in pre-Algebra or Algebra I, and 8th graders: Algebra I, or Geometry. Our elective program consists of classes such as: Spanish, band, choir, orchestra and leadership. Each student participates in a physical education class. 98% of all 7th and 8th grade students complete high school Spanish I & II, or Spanish for native speakers I & II.

English: All 9th graders are required to take Honors English I, (supported/enhanced by SDAIE/GATE strategies, as applicable), and 10th graders take Honors English II. In the 11th and 12th grades, students choose from: English III, English IV, AP English Language, and AP English Literature.

Mathematics: All students are required to have three years of mathematics to graduate, with four years recommended. A minimum of Algebra I, Geometry and Algebra II required. Pre-Algebra is the most basic, and students can pursue math studies through Calculus AB and AP Statistics. Two levels of Algebra II, and two levels of Pre-Calculus provide additional support for students.

Foreign Language: Spanish is taught with the full range from Spanish-I through AP Spanish-IV. Written and oral skills are stressed, and Spanish for native Spanish speakers is offered.

Science: All students must pass one year of life science and one year of physical science in order to graduate. 9th graders take Biology, with most proceeding to either Chemistry or Honors Chemistry. Following Chemistry, students may pursue Physics, AP Biology, Anatomy, Physiology, Microbiology, and AP Environmental Science.

Social Science: All students must meet the World History, US History, US Government, and Economics requirements for graduation. Other social science offerings include: Advanced Placement European History, AP US History, AP Government, AP Economics, and Psychology.

Visual and Performing Arts (Music, Drama):

Visual: Fiscal constraints hamper the implementation of a visual/digital arts component; however, we hold a value and vision for its eventual inclusion.

Music: The Music Department has three full-time teachers, and offers: Instrumentals: Beginning Bands, Wind Instruments, Concert Band, Marching Band, and two levels of Orchestra. Vocal offerings include: Beginning Choirs, Intermediate and Advanced Madrigals (Early Baroque), and a select audition group.

Drama: Beginning Drama and Intermediate Drama complement the fine arts program providing students a full spectrum of show productions.

Physical Education: The Physical Education program employs a variety of assessment methods, including portfolios, written assessments, and physical fitness tests. Inquiry is used to assess students' knowledge of a particular sport/activity, followed by verbal explanation of skills and use of handouts, visual aids, and use of hands-on activities. We are in our second year of organized sports as an independent school, but have been accepted into a league for the 2010-11 school year.

2b. **(Secondary Schools) English:**
(This question is for secondary schools only)

Our English department emphasizes reading, writing, and higher order thinking. All approved texts and delivery modalities are employed using grade-level literature, of various genres, and supplementary novels from the contemporary literary canon. Middle school curriculum is focused on preparing students with skills basic to success at the high school level and beyond. At the foundation of Middle School English lies the ability to analyze and organize texts for deeper meaning. Thinking and writing are the foundational emphasis of the High School curriculum where analysis and evaluation of novels, and critical and creative writing are paramount.

Ninth grade English, surveys World Literature and focuses on future AP English placement. This model has been instrumental in our students' English achievement. Tenth grade instruction goes into a greater depth and breadth of surveying World Literature, and has an emphasis on CAHSEE and AP English preparation. The 11th grade curriculum covers American literature from the 14th through 21st centuries, with analysis and accompanying essays emphasized. Additional prominence is placed on PSAT/SAT preparation. Lastly, 12th grade curriculum surveys British Literature, supports students with college application processes, and continues emphasis on literary analysis at college level.

University Prep chose to focus on novels for reading material patterning our model on a typical college level format. In order to support the mission of preparing students to succeed at the college level and beyond, students need exposure to the type of literature they will be asked to read and analyze in college. This model presents the additional challenge of supporting students who read below grade level. Several strategies are used to help bring students up to grade level reading and comprehension: flexible learning groups, Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies, native language translations, technological support, discussions, role-playing, one-to-one tutoring, Socratic Seminars, audio books, graphic organizers, and supplemental writing practices.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

The Science Department utilizes a hands-on approach to learning. Access to a stringent science program is afforded all via differentiated lessons considering the many learning styles and cultural preferences. Textbooks, assignments, projects and laboratory experiments are all standards-centered. Our classes focus on academic language, reinforced through project-based tasks, and outside assignments. Students conduct dissections, assess scientific videos, manipulate models; participate in Roller Coaster Derby, Chemical Name Plates, genetics diversity projects, electrophoresis, distillation, and many others. Through learning activities students acquire many cross-discipline and pro-social skills such as: communication, leadership, time management, team building, conflict resolution, cooperative planning, marketing, critical thinking, and math and technology applications. These are academically exact courses aimed at scholarship, mastery of state assessments and college admittance.

UP Science teachers reinforce subject matter content through collaboration, conferences, seminars, and lectures, enabling the most current concepts to become accessible to our students. The teachers meet

throughout the year to discuss CST test score results in order to create: standard-based lessons, cross curricular projects, common assessments, general overviews of student data, and discuss current and future science needs for students. Teachers attend conferences such as: National Science Teachers' Association (NSTA), Biological and Environmental Research (BER) – Biology and Life Science, University of California at Riverside (UCR) lectures, UCLA-Nanoscience Institute workshops, and Biology and Chemistry Advanced Placement Summer workshops. Our science teachers collaborate to address the requirements of our students at all levels 7th through 12th grade and provide opportunities for academic growth through lectures, trips, and university visits. Teachers have received grants through the Rotary Club and Mojave Environmental Education Consortium (MEEC) for classroom projects, and transportation to science related excursions, and they both support and sponsor student organizations, and clubs such as UCR's Math Engineering Science Achievement (MESA), and the "Jaguars Go Green" environmental club.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

Authentic assessment drives our instructional methodologies. District Academic Coaches work with teachers on standards interpretation, data analysis, effective strategies, lesson pacing, and relevant issues.

Vertical and lateral articulation, both within our school and with our feeder elementary district, inform a continuous recalibration of instructional strategies, program implementation, and assessments that assist us in meeting the needs of all students. Articulation with our feeder elementary district, netted the implementation of *Thinking Maps*: their visual aids better support our English Learners (EL), and linguistically diverse students to organize and generate ideas. For struggling students, *Write to the Future* provides a model for effective communication through writing. Vertical articulation also provides helpful information regarding academic deficiencies for 7th grade students by providing analyzed assessment data to both preload and drive instruction.

Students requiring extra support receive differentiated instruction including the following methods, materials, and strategies: cooperative learning and flexible grouping, peer and cross-age tutoring, Explicit Direct Instruction, multicultural and native language support, accessing prior knowledge, modeling, re-teaching, SDAIE strategies, Socratic Seminars, Reciprocal Teaching, Act Out a Problem, Exit Slips, Thinking Maps, realia, dialogue, guided writing, and peer editing give students better access to academic content through alternative modalities of learning. Our statistically significant subgroups are all supported by these strategies and methodologies. Socio-economically Disadvantaged students are academically supported by extra-allotted time and individualized attention. More direct access to content, academic vocabulary support, and one-on-one teaching have enabled increased achievement, as evidenced by our Title-I Academic Achievement Awards two consecutive years. Culturally responsive and socio-historic contextualization of material affords extra support to our Hispanic subgroup. Additionally, Socratic Seminars, flexible grouping, and realia are instructional strategies used to ensure that this subgroup receives access to the same content information irrespective of prior knowledge. Practicing proven and pioneering innovative interventions for "at-promise" students who need alternative approaches to guarantee learning and achievement is key.

5. **Professional Development:**

As part of our commitment toward shared accountability for student success, department chairs and teaching staff meet at least monthly to review learning needs, teaching practices, review adherence to state standards, adjust pacing guides, peer modeling, and share resources. We also discuss the applicability of current practices to our mission and goals.

Within the universal approaches of our success lie strategies and relational modalities specific to our cultural and linguistic subgroups that require mindful intention, and focused delivery of services to ensure their continued success. Administration, faculty, and support staff each meets twice monthly to reflect, plan, and implement programs designed to further enhance individual, and distinct groups of student achievement.

Data collection and review via interim assessments, CST scores, GPA review (by individual student, grade level, between and across distinct groups, and course offerings), evaluation of student work, and progress reports guide discussion and shape interventions that are used to benefit individual students and address achievement gaps between diverse groups. Open communication and transparency of intent and practices among staff are cultivated through coaching, mentoring, and peer observations.

Certificated and classified staff stays current on educational research by attending professional development workshops provided by the county, district, site, and professional organizations. This includes, but is not limited to reading and discussing trade journals and books like: What Great Teachers Do Differently (Whitaker, T., 2004); The Speed of Trust (Covey, M.R., 2008), and The Education Trust: Closing the Achievement Gap, (Ed Trust Foundation, 2010). A system of peer support is inherent in the University Prep culture as demonstrated by teachers modeling lessons, coaching each other, cross-scoring student work, discussing student needs and using assessment data to plan departmental, classroom and individual instruction. Additionally, district subject-area coaches provide substitute release time so teachers can either observe outside, or invite to the classroom a more experienced teacher to model a lesson. Collaboration creates rigorous instruction and more enriched opportunities that go beyond the regular classroom activities.

6. **School Leadership:**

Valerie Hatcher and Gerald Shaw, principal and assistant principal respectively, established a UP environment where all students are nourished and encouraged to reach their highest potential. Under their leadership, UP understands that providing world class opportunities, and modeling democracy in action for all students require that we see, acknowledge and plan for the distinct strengths and needs of our diverse subgroups, and not merely include them in a widely cast net of *all* students. The school culture supports and upholds beliefs that student success is achieved through all stakeholders --teachers, support staff, students, parents, and community -- working together to both differentiate the needs and teaching approaches at University Prep.

Under the principal's leadership and direction, the Leadership Team, Department chairs, and School Site Council meet regularly to disaggregate data for the development and facilitation of strategies needed to meet distinct learning success. Building relationships through transparency, high visible accessibility and interaction with staff, and students alike are key factors for student sense of belonging, acceptance and enhanced learning environment. Daily classroom *walk-throughs* support effective instruction and ensure high expectations. Leadership discusses learning objectives with students, engages in classroom activities, and promotes the vision and mission of our school.

The Leadership Team meets monthly to ensure programmatic integrity aligned to mission. Administration and counselors meet weekly to monitor student progress. School Site Council meets monthly to discuss, review/approve expenditures of Title I funding, and shape policies and procedures that impact students with the greatest needs.

Guiding criterion for leadership selection is: 1) viewing University Prep as a safe place where student needs are paramount, 2) belief that all children can and will learn in our institution, 3) availability for regular reviews and recalibrations of teaching practices adapted to meet the changing needs of students and their families, and 4) possessing an unswerving willingness to work collaboratively.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 10 Test: California High School Exit Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2007-2009 Publisher: ETS

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Mar			
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient	99	99			
% Advanced	0	0			
Number of students tested	142	108			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient	99	98			
% Advanced					
Number of students tested	79	48			
2. African American Students					
% Proficient	94				
% Advanced					
Number of students tested	18				
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient	99	98			
% Advanced					
Number of students tested	74	54			
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes: 2007-2008 was first year for 10th grade; 2007-2008 African American student data was not reported due to the number of students taking the exam did not meet the reporting criteria;
Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested. Only "% Proficient" is reported on state website. Advanced is not reported.

Subject: Reading Grade: 10 Test: Califoria Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2007-2008 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr			
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	79			
% Advanced	31	43			
Number of students tested	140	109			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	76			
% Advanced	19	41			
Number of students tested	78	49			
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	70			
% Advanced	50	20			
Number of students tested	18	10			
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	76			
% Advanced	22	36			
Number of students tested	73	55			
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	36				
% Advanced	9				
Number of students tested	11				
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
2007-08 was first year for 10th grade, so data is reported for 2007-08 and 2008-09.

Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 11 Test: California Standards test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: 2008-2009 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr				
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	37				
% Advanced	8				
Number of students tested	99				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students alternatively assessed	0				
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	33				
% Advanced	6				
Number of students tested	49				
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	9				
% Advanced	0				
Number of students tested	11				
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	55				
% Advanced	15				
Number of students tested	20				
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
2008-2009 was first year for 11th grade; Our school has several math courses for this grade level, so the disaggregated data is the sum of all the math courses reported into a single indicator.

Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested.

Subject: Reading Grade: 11 Test: California Standards Test (CST)

Edition/Publication Year: 2008-2009 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr				
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79				
% Advanced	43				
Number of students tested	99				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students alternatively assessed	0				
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74				
% Advanced	27				
Number of students tested	49				
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63				
% Advanced	27				
Number of students tested	11				
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70				
% Advanced	40				
Number of students tested	20				
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
2008-2009 was first year for 11th grade;

Data is not calculated or reported when 10 or less students are tested

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 7 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	48	55	64	72
% Advanced	22	9	11	14	39
Number of students tested	195	187	199	226	57
Percent of total students tested	100	96	99	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	43	49	58	63
% Advanced	15	8	7		
Number of students tested	103	81	78	97	30
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	20	52	67	
% Advanced	14	5	12		
Number of students tested	15	20	25	27	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	59	45	50	60	71
% Advanced	8	3	13		
Number of students tested	114	91	101	93	24
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	56		50	58	
% Advanced	12		10		
Number of students tested	25		10	12	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested. Our school has several math courses for this grade level, so the disaggregated data is the sum of all the math courses reported into a single indicator. Data reported for 2004-2005 is based on student records. See summary for complete explanation. In 2004-2005 & 2005-2006 school year, the data for the subgroups is not disaggregated for proficient and advanced on the website. The state provides only a combined percent of proficient and advanced.

Subject: Reading Grade: 7 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	69	74	65	78
% Advanced	31	29	26	19	32
Number of students tested	195	192	199	227	57
Percent of total students tested	100	99	99	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	66	62	68	58	53
% Advanced	20	22	19		
Number of students tested	103	85	78	98	30
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	62	68	67	
% Advanced	20	29	28		
Number of students tested	15	21	25	27	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	66	62	69	62	68
% Advanced	18	23	18		
Number of students tested	114	92	101	93	22
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	48	9	0	33	
% Advanced	12	0	0		
Number of students tested	25	11	0	12	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data reported for 2004-2005 is based on student records. See summary for complete explanation. In 2004-2005 & 2005-2006 school year, the data for the subgroups is not disaggregated for proficient and advanced on the website. The state provides only a combined percent of proficient and advanced.

Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 8 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	48	29	22	36	
% Advanced	36	5	3	14	
Number of students tested	168	190	195	105	
Percent of total students tested	99	99	98	99	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	42	27	17	37	
% Advanced	8	4	14		
Number of students tested	90	78	97	38	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	42	23	10	8	
% Advanced	8	3	5		
Number of students tested	21	26	21	12	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	48	23	14	38	
% Advanced	8	3	2		
Number of students tested	69	93	93	39	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			7		
% Advanced			0		
Number of students tested			14		
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes: No eight grade until 2005-2006. Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested. Our school has several math courses for this grade level, so the disaggregated data is the sum of all the math courses reported into a single indicator.

The advanced data was not available for the 2005-2006 school year from the website

Subject: Reading Grade: 8 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	72	64	62	
% Advanced	30	28	16	30	
Number of students tested	169	191	200	105	
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	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	62	52	64	
% Advanced	24	14	10		
Number of students tested	91	85	98	39	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	66	65	55	58	
% Advanced	33	23	18		
Number of students tested	21	26	22	12	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	65	58	58	
% Advanced	25	18	12		
Number of students tested	81	93	93	40	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			29		
% Advanced			0		
Number of students tested			14		
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
No eight grade until 2005-2006; Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested.

Subgroups advanced data not available for 2005-2006

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 9 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr		
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	34	16	35		
% Advanced	7	3	16		
Number of students tested	164	163	126		
Percent of total students tested	99	99	94		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	36	10	34		
% Advanced	5	0	11		
Number of students tested	78	78	62		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	30	10	71		
% Advanced	17	10	12		
Number of students tested	23	21	17		
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	36	10	33		
% Advanced	5	1	9		
Number of students tested	92	84	63		
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		16			
% Advanced		0			
Number of students tested		12			
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
2006-2007 was first year for 9th grade.

Our school has several math courses for this grade level, so the disaggregated data is the sum of all the math courses reported as a single indicator. Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested.

Subject: Reading Grade: 9 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009 Publisher: State of California

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr		
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	79	81		
% Advanced	42	39	42		
Number of students tested	165	164	134		
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	72	82		
% Advanced	54	25	44		
Number of students tested	78	80	62		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	81	71		
% Advanced	52	38	12		
Number of students tested	23	21	17		
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	73	76		
% Advanced	34	33	37		
Number of students tested	92	85	63		
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		42			
% Advanced		0			
Number of students tested		12			
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
2006-2007 was first year for 9th grade.

Data not calculated when there are 10 or less students tested.