

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

Type of School: (Check all that apply) Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal: Mr. Nate Monley

Official School Name: Aspire - Capitol Heights Academy

School Mailing Address:
2520 33rd Street
Sacramento, CA 95817-1943

County: Sacramento State School Code Number*: 34674390102343

Telephone: (916) 534-0033 Fax: (916) 739-8529

Web site/URL: http://aspirepublicschools.org/capitolheights/ E-mail:
nate.monley@aspirepublicschools.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*: Mr. Jonathan Raymond

District Name: Sacramento City Unified School District Tel: (916) 643-7400

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: Ms. Ellyne Bell

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)

60	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
10	Middle/Junior high schools
13	High schools
0	K-12 schools
83	TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 9420

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

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

4. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

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	20	24	44		7			0
1	23	17	40		8			0
2	22	19	41		9			0
3	23	21	44		10			0
4	10	16	26		11			0
5	7	10	17		12			0
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL								212

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
1 % Asian
72 % Black or African American
21 % Hispanic or Latino
 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
5 % White
 % 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: 13 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	16
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	15
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	31
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	234
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.132
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	13.248

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 16 %

Total number limited English proficient 34

Number of languages represented: 4

Specify languages:

- Spanish
- Russian
- Mandarin
- Ethiopian

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 85 %

Total number students who qualify: 180

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: 8 %

Total Number of Students Served: 16

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 Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>4</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>12</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>1</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

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

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>
Support staff	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>
Total number	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>

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 22 :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	96%	95%	95%	93%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Teacher turnover rate	40%	10%	20%	20%	20%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

- 2008/2009 96% student attendance- As Capitol Heights became more successful and fluid, there were incentives for perfect attendance by class.
- Daily Teacher Attendance is an estimate.
- Teacher Turnover Rate in 2008/2009 is high due to 40% of staff leaving to start a new charter school.
- Teacher Turnover Rate for 2004/2005 through 2007/2008 is an estimate.

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	0	%

PART III - SUMMARY

Capitol Heights Academy has been providing excellent, college-bound education to Sacramento's Oak Park neighborhood since 2003. 'College for Certain' is more than a motto at our school, it is the guiding vision for every student, teacher, and parent. The focus on college is reflected in everything from classrooms named Stanford and UC Davis to the daily college cheer that resounds in our gym as students walk to class. Beyond names and cheers, 'College for Certain' drives classroom instruction and student learning, where rigorous expectations and intense concern for student success are the norm.

Housed in a stately, three-story brick building built in 1932, Capitol Heights Academy is nestled into a quiet corner between Sacramento High School and Immaculate Conception church. Our students hail from all over Sacramento, though the majority comes from the local neighborhood. We serve a population in which 85% of our families qualify for free and reduced lunches. Our demographics are 72% African American, 21% Latino, and 7% White, American Indian, and Asian.

Capitol Heights has demonstrated tremendous academic success over the course of the last several years. From an API of 626 four years ago, we have grown 200 points to 826 during the 2008/2009 school year. Along with API growth, our parents voiced deep satisfaction with our school, 97% of parents state that Capitol Heights is a good place to learn, and is preparing students for college. Until the current year Capitol Heights has been a K-8 school, but with the opening of Aspire Alexander Twilight College Prep, our K-8 sister school in Sacramento, we have become a K-5. Currently we have 216 students in two classes per grade level at kindergarten through 3rd grade, and one class per grade level at 4th and 5th. Students meet with an art teacher once per week, a PE coach twice per week, and also have one computer lab session per week. We have a part-time counselor on-site and work with Sacramento City Unified to meet the resource education needs of our students.

As one of twenty five Aspire Public Schools serving students in California our academic program is driven by several key elements- data-driven instruction, small-group and individual learning based on student needs, and a high-quality after-school program that provides an extended learning day for more than half of our students. Our organizational structure of accountable grade level teams, instructional coaches, and constant support from the Aspire Home Office facilitates a smooth flow of decision-making that is always based on making 'College for Certain' for all of our students.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Capitol Heights Academy has demonstrated through multiple measures that we are making 'College For Certain' for our students by empowering them to excel in reading and math. California's fundamental school accountability measure is the API, (Academic Performance Index), in which an 800 is the measure of a 'proficient' school. Capitol Heights has shown constant and consistent growth over the course of the last five years- from a 626 API in 2005 to the 826 earned in 2009. Capitol Heights Academy beat the state target each year in moving toward its present level.

- 2005 State Target- **570**, 2005 Capitol Heights API- **626**
- 2006 State Target- **635**, 2006 Capitol Heights API- **675**
- 2007 State Target- **679**, 2007 Capitol Heights API- **758**
- 2008 State Target- **762**, 2008 Capitol Heights API- **789**
- 2009 State Target- **793**, 2009 Capitol Heights API- **828**

The success demonstrated in the overall API at Capitol Heights Academy is mirrored by the steady growth in math and reading.

% Proficient and Advanced on the California Standards Test in English Language Arts:

- 2005: 23.5%
- 2006: 27.9%
- 2007: 45.2%
- 2008: 44.6%
- 2009: 62.1%

% Proficient and Advanced on the California Standards Test in Math

- 2005: 23.5%
- 2006: 26.5%
- 2007: 58.1%
- 2008: 62.4%
- 2009: 75%

Significant jumps can be noted in 2007 and 2009, this can primarily attributed to the development of the cohorts that entered the school as kindergartners in 2005/2006 when a new principal and several new staff members came on board. The consistent and thoughtful application of guided reading, guided math, and guided writing bore fruit with significant gains.

Overall, the data tells a story of growth over the course of the last five years, an upward trajectory that sets the vision for our school moving forward, one of success, and of making 'College For Certain' for our students.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Capitol Heights Academy is one of 25 Aspire Public Schools in California. One of the strongest elements of the Aspire program is its constant and effective use of data. In grades 2-5 we take four benchmark assessments per year in reading, writing, and math. The results of these benchmarks are disseminated to

teachers, administrators, parents, and the Aspire Data Team. Our data managers send us detailed lists of the challenge strands for specific students, teachers, and grade levels. This data is turned around for us within three days of turning in the tests. Accountability is created at the school level to adjust and focus pacing guides and intervention to meet the academic needs of every student.

The Cycle of Inquiry is another way in which Capitol Heights Academy uses data to drive student achievement. The Cycle of Inquiry is a process in which teachers identify a challenge standard and give a pre-test to gauge student mastery. They then collaborate with colleagues to look at data and to generate creative ideas for moving students toward mastery. They set a timeline for the lessons, activities, and post-test, and then meet together to consider student growth. At Capitol Heights teachers run through one Cycle of Inquiry in math, and one in English Language Arts each month.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

As part of our Aspire Instructional Guidelines, results of every assessment are shared with students, and are reflected upon between students and teachers. Without a doubt, the metacognitive benefit of taking ownership of growth is of great service in driving student achievement forward. A weekly progress report is sent home by teachers that details homework completion, behavior, and progress on weekly assessments.

Like most schools, Capitol Heights Academy has a report card that is sent home every trimester. We require that all benchmark scores and progress towards standards be placed in every report card. Parents also have expressed great satisfaction with our Saturday School programs, which occur three times per year. At Saturday School we present progress as a school to our families, and take time to celebrate success and reflect upon challenges. At our most recent Saturday School, in January, all parents participated in a math lesson with their child based on the most challenging standard from our Winter Benchmark Test. After the lesson families participated in a contest that required them to explain their thinking around our most challenging math standards.

We feel strongly that data is only fully useful when it is communicated with students and families, and we make every effort to do so.

4. Sharing Success:

One important element of the mission of the Aspire Public Schools is that we work to 'catalyze change in public schools'. Our belief is that we can lead the way forward by demonstrating good practice, and then by being willing to share it with other educators. In that spirit Capitol Heights Academy has been open to sharing with the educational community in Sacramento since our inception. In the last two weeks alone our leadership has met with teams from two local charter schools to share best practices, specifically around instructional coaching for new teachers and the structure of our after-school program.

Inside of the Aspire system we set at least one professional development day each year for visiting and sharing ideas with other schools. Our teachers meet at least three times per year with grade-level partners inside of Aspire to look at data and plan effective ways to meet instructional challenges.

In the event that we are designated a Blue Ribbon School we would certainly be excited about using that recognition to assist other schools, especially schools working with families of similar backgrounds, to help move their students forward.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Our expectation is that all students at Capitol Heights Academy will be prepared to attend college through our rigorous curriculum and high expectations. Capitol Heights Academy is both an arts and California state standards-based school; we are completely focused on teaching all of the California State Standards at each grade level.

In terms of curriculum, we use a number of resources and the Aspire Math and Language Arts Instructional Guidelines (IG's) to teach both California Math and English Language Arts standards in K-5. The Aspire IG's include, but are not limited to teaching through mini-lessons, pulling groups for guided math and reading while the students are working in respective centers, practicing math facts, problem solving and student led solutions.

One area often highlighted as a strength by our teachers is the guided reading program. For 120 minutes each day, students are led through a series of rigorous reading activities, primarily based in groups, both heterogenous and homogenous. Teachers pull aside small groups of students each day for 20-40 minutes at a time to challenge them at their current instructional reading level. When coupled with a high-quality use of data, this amounts to a truly effective reading program.

We use the phonics and phonemic awareness portions of the Open Court curriculum in K-3, while our 4th and 5th grade multi-subject classrooms help prepare students for the rigors of middle school humanities, math, and science. Students in grades 4-5 receive reading intervention using Scholastic's Read 180 program.

Science is taught in the general education classroom through the use of FOSS kits and Delta Science Modules. Teachers ensure that California Science Standards are addressed through their literacy program as well.

Students have one session of visual arts each week with a trained art instructor in the 'Academy of Art'. Classroom teachers collaborate with our art teacher to ensure that concepts learned in the classroom are integrated into the art sessions.

While there isn't a formal foreign language program at Capitol Heights Academy, our students do participate in a weekly Spanish singing time, and learn basic greetings, parts of the body, and general Spanish vocabulary.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

(This question is for elementary schools only)

At Capitol Heights Academy, every student becomes an independent, driven reader and writer who is engaged in reading and writing activities for communication as well as artistry. Good communication – reading, writing, listening and speaking are essential tools for life. Language skills not only serve as a basis for learning throughout school and career, but also serve to enrich our lives, as well as foster independent, self-directed learners and concerned citizens. Learners who read well learn a structure and rhythm integral to lifelong learning.

Our three hour literacy block assures that each learner will become a fluent reader, skilled writer, confident speaker and thoughtful listener. Reading, writing, speaking and listening skills are personalized. In order to achieve our goal, we draw from a number of pedagogies all within the “workshop” format. Each pedagogy

provides a different piece of scaffolding to personalize literacy instruction for each learner. Within this model learners are provided rich literature, both literary and informational for required and choice reading to create links across content areas (i.e. social studies, math, science, visual and performing arts).

We address writing within the same “workshop” format. Process writing is taught with the thread of the Six Traits running through both required writing genres as well as choice writing assignments. This allows the teacher to use conferences; peer edits and direct instruction to customize the learning as needed for each student.

Within both the Reading and Writing Workshop, ongoing assessment drives the instruction. Teachers analyze this information independently and in grade level collaboration meetings to address the learners’ needs.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Math achievement has long been a point of pride at Capitol Heights. We deliver a strong and consistent math program through daily Guided Math. Through a synthesis of mini-lessons, student-led solutions, small group instruction, and engaging workshop activities, our students grow and excel.

This year we have made a special focus of raising the rigor of our math program through an emphasis on conceptual understanding and questioning that climbs the domains of Bloom’s Taxonomy. We have been aided in this endeavour by our use of Houghton Mifflin’s Math Expressions texts. The Expressions series emphasizes conceptual understanding over algorithm memorization, and quality over quantity. It fits well into our Aspire workshop program.

Teachers script the questions they plan to ask during math, and send them to the principal each week. One emphasis in professional development has been recording all questions asked during math lessons, and then collaboratively placing questions into a Bloom’s Taxonomy chart to measure where questions are being asked. Our goal is to ask 60% higher-order questions.

4. Instructional Methods:

Differentiation is an integral element of quality instruction. At Capitol heights Academy we believe that one of the most important aspects to differentiation is planning. Teachers are encouraged to thoughtfully plan to meet the needs of all students through thoughtful delivery of instruction, modification of materials, visual aids and graphic organizers, and the use of multiple modalities in activities.

The most obvious use of differentiation at our school is seen in our guided reading, guided writing, and guided math programs. Teachers plan for each group each day, in essence, making plans to meet the needs of every learner at their own instructional level. Inside of the guided reading model are daily running records. Teachers keep track of individual student progress each week, and use that information to effectively differentiate to meet their needs.

Effective use of data to drive instruction is another important element to differentiated instruction. At Capitol Heights Academy teachers review data collaboratively on a regular basis and share ideas to meet the needs of each student, taking special care to plan appropriate interventions for students who need them.

5. Professional Development:

Professional development at its best must be ongoing, applicable, and data-driven. At Capitol Heights Academy we strive to make professional development mean much more than an afternoon meeting.

A good example of this was our focus in the first half of this academic year on building classroom communities through the 'Morning Meeting'. One of our teachers attended a week-long training through a program called 'The Responsive Classroom' and brought back a series of ideas around how to improve intrinsic motivation and responsible behavior at our school. During our retreat before the school year started she ran teachers through a series of activities and then gave them time to plan similar activities for their first few weeks of school. Once the school year began teachers spent time doing peer observations of each other's morning meetings. The principal video taped a segment of every morning meeting and we watched them together as a team. In order to connect the morning meeting to our second professional development focus- Bloom's Taxonomy, the principal also recorded the questions being asked during morning meetings. At afternoon staff meetings teachers reflected on the questions they asked, and scripted questions for future meetings. Ideas generated through professional development was meaningfully used in the classroom, involved everyone, and had an immediate effect on the classroom communities built at our school.

Inside of Aspire there is a heavy emphasis on instructional coaching. Each school is assigned an instructional coach for math and one for literacy. Coaches meet with teachers on a regular basis to model lessons, look over plans, and examine data. They are 'boots on the ground' in professional development rather than workshop presenters who present abstract ideas to exhausted teachers in afternoon meetings.

6. School Leadership:

The organizational structure at Capitol Heights Academy of accountable grade level teams, instructional coaches, and constant support from the Aspire Home Office facilitates a smooth flow of decision-making that is always based on making 'College for Certain' for all of our students.

Teachers at Capitol Heights loop with their students for two years. This creates a two-grade 'team'. Teachers think of themselves as 'K/1' teachers rather than '1st grade teachers'. Each team has a lead teacher who meets on a weekly basis with the principal to discuss academic concerns, look at student data from their team, and reflect on instructional practice in their team.

In Aspire, principals meet on a weekly basis with their area superintendent to look at data, discuss forward vision, and to address pressing concerns. This hierarchy of responsibility and leadership creates timely accountability, especially around student data. Student achievement data is examined regularly and carefully in order to note patterns and to reallocate resources when necessary. Working as a team with lead teachers and the area superintendent also fosters a true sense of collaboration based on student needs.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	67	52	44	54
% Advanced	43	33	14	17	23
Number of students tested	40	18	21	18	13
Percent of total students tested	100	100	81	72	81
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	73	40	38	60
% Advanced	44	33	13	23	20
Number of students tested	34	15	15	13	10
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70		80		
% Advanced	43		10		
Number of students tested	23		10		
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92			27	
% Advanced	25			0	
Number of students tested	12			11	
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:

We don't have records of the number of students alternately assessed.

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	44	57	33	53
% Advanced	25	28	19	0	7
Number of students tested	40	18	21	18	13
Percent of total students tested	100	100	81	72	81
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	47	40	23	60
% Advanced	26	27	13	0	0
Number of students tested	34	15	15	13	10
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	56		80		
% Advanced	17		30		
Number of students tested	23		10		
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92			27	
% Advanced	25			0	
Number of students tested	12			11	
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:

We don't have data around alternate assessments

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	68	71	56	0
% Advanced	50	47	29	22	0
Number of students tested	16	19	28	9	7
Percent of total students tested	80	90	90	64	44
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77	62	71		
% Advanced	54	31	14		
Number of students tested	13	13	14		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		70			
% Advanced		70			
Number of students tested		10			
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			75		
% Advanced			19		
Number of students tested			16		
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:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	44	26	32	33	0
% Advanced	38	11	4	11	0
Number of students tested	16	19	28	9	7
Percent of total students tested	80	90	90	64	44
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	23	21		
% Advanced	38	15	7		
Number of students tested	13	13	14		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		30			
% Advanced		10			
Number of students tested		10			
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			13		
% Advanced			6		
Number of students tested			16		
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:

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	74	55	27	33
% Advanced	45	35	27	7	11
Number of students tested	20	23	11	15	9
Percent of total students tested	95	82	85	94	60
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	60			
% Advanced	47	27			
Number of students tested	15	15			
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90				
% Advanced	40				
Number of students tested	10				
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		67			
% Advanced		27			
Number of students tested		15			
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:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	43	45	27	22
% Advanced	35	17	18	0	11
Number of students tested	20	23	11	15	9
Percent of total students tested	95	82	85	94	60
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	20			
% Advanced	27	7			
Number of students tested	15	15			
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90				
% Advanced	50				
Number of students tested	10				
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		20			
% Advanced		7			
Number of students tested		15			
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:

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	50	44	33	10
% Advanced	31	14	17	8	10
Number of students tested	26	14	18	12	10
Percent of total students tested	100	93	86	92	71
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	65	70	30		
% Advanced	24	20	10		
Number of students tested	17	10	10		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71		45		
% Advanced	21		18		
Number of students tested	14		11		
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:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	43	50	33	42	50
% Advanced	15	7	0	0	10
Number of students tested	26	14	18	12	10
Percent of total students tested	100	93	86	92	71
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	29	60	20		
% Advanced	12	10	0		
Number of students tested	17	10	10		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	21		27		
% Advanced	7		0		
Number of students tested	14		11		
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:

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 6 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	54	15	71	63	13
% Advanced	0	8	6	0	0
Number of students tested	13	13	17	8	8
Percent of total students tested	87	87	77	89	62
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60	20			
% Advanced	0	10			
Number of students tested	10	10			
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 6 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	38	47	38	13
% Advanced	0	8	12	13	13
Number of students tested	13	13	17	8	8
Percent of total students tested	87	87	77	89	62
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	40	83	43	17
% Advanced	0	0	33	14	17
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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:

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 7 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	83	80	9	18
% Advanced	18	50	30	9	18
Number of students tested	11	18	10	11	17
Percent of total students tested	92	90	83	69	68
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73				14
% Advanced	18				14
Number of students tested	11				14
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 7 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	56	60	18	13
% Advanced	18	17	20	9	13
Number of students tested	11	18	10	11	16
Percent of total students tested	92	90	83	69	64
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64				8
% Advanced	18				8
Number of students tested	11				13
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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:

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 8 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	57	23	18	20
% Advanced	30	43	8	9	0
Number of students tested	20	14	13	11	15
Percent of total students tested	95	82	87	55	79
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				10	23
% Advanced				10	0
Number of students tested				10	13
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009

Grade: 8 Test: California Standards Test
Publisher: Educational Testing Service

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	50	38	18	29
% Advanced	30	36	15	9	7
Number of students tested	20	14	13	11	14
Percent of total students tested	95	82	87	55	74
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				10	31
% Advanced				0	8
Number of students tested				10	13
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: