

**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: Ms. Teresa Stetler

Official School Name: Carl Harvey Elementary School

School Mailing Address:  
1635 South Center Stree  
Santa Ana, CA 92704-4111

County: Orange    State School Code Number\*: 30-66670-6030225

Telephone: (714) 430-6200    Fax: (714) 430-6299

Web site/URL: sausd.us    E-mail: teresa.stetler@sausd.us

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\*: Ms. Jane Russo,

District Name: Santa Ana Unified School District    Tel: (714) 558-5501

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. Audrey Yamagata-Noji

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)

|           |                                   |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| 36        | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
| 9         | Middle/Junior high schools        |
| 10        | High schools                      |
|           | K-12 schools                      |
| <b>55</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>                      |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 5355

**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. 5 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          | 0            | 0           |  | 6     |            |              | 0           |
| K  | 50         | 40           | 90          |  | 7     |            |              | 0           |
| 1  | 38         | 32           | 70          |  | 8     |            |              | 0           |
| 2  | 37         | 34           | 71          |  | 9     |            |              | 0           |
| 3  | 42         | 36           | 78          |  | 10    |            |              | 0           |
| 4  | 32         | 35           | 67          |  | 11    |            |              | 0           |
| 5  | 31         | 35           | 66          |  | 12    |            |              | 0           |
| <b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL</b> |            |              |             |  |       |            |              | 442         |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
1 % Asian  
0 % Black or African American  
98 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
1 % White  
0 % 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: 12 %

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.   | 24     |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 28     |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].   | 52     |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1.  | 435    |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).                          | 0.120  |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.   | 11.954 |

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 81 %

Total number limited English proficient 359

Number of languages represented: 2

Specify languages:

Spanish and Vietnamese.

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 90 %

Total number students who qualify: 399

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: 12 %

Total Number of Students Served: 53

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>1</u> Autism                | <u>7</u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>0</u> Deafness              | <u>1</u> Other Health Impaired                 |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u>19</u> Specific Learning Disability         |
| <u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>20</u> Speech or Language Impairment        |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment    | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>4</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>15</u>        | <u>0</u>         |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>3</u>         | <u>0</u>         |
| Paraprofessionals                     | <u>0</u>         | <u>0</u>         |
| Support staff                         | <u>2</u>         | <u>0</u>         |
| Total number                          | <u>21</u>        | <u>0</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 29 :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%       | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       |
| Daily teacher attendance | 97%       | 97%       | 96%       | 96%       | 96%       |
| Teacher turnover rate    | 1%        | 1%        | 1%        | 1%        | 1%        |
| Student dropout rate     | %         | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |

Please provide all explanations below.

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 | % |
| <b>Total</b>                               | 0 | % |

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

Located in the heart of Santa Ana, Carl Harvey Elementary is a neighborhood school devoted to creating a safe and welcoming educational environment for its students and a unifying center of enrichment and extended learning opportunities for the diverse community surrounding it. Its staff is wholly dedicated to empowering its students to become confident, productive citizens, independent thinkers and creative problem solvers. The overarching vision is that all students at Carl Harvey will achieve academic success and become life-long learners through the school's mission to:

- **Promote**
- **Resourcefulness**
- **Intellectual**
- **Development and**
- **Empowerment**

Collaborative leadership has been the keystone in building the educational program which has supported the school's vision and mission. It begins with a clear understanding of the students as well as a careful sensitivity to the community the school serves. At Carl Harvey, 93% of all students receive Title I services, and 84% of all students are English learners. Teachers, parents, and administrators work together as a team to prioritize effective instructional strategies that promote academic success for all students. Recognizing the diverse academic and English language learning needs of their students, teachers work diligently to ensure success for their entire pupil population. Their goal is to provide instruction which is both challenging and engaging for every student and accommodates the variety of academic achievement and English proficiency levels present in the school's population in an educational environment which values and respects each student as an individual.

Parents play an integral role in the success of the collaborative leadership model employed at Carl Harvey. They participate in monthly parent meetings, parent staff organization (PSO) and parent trainings. They preside at English Learner Advisory Council (ELAC) meetings and hold office in School Site Council (SSC) meetings where their voices influence the creation of the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA); a document which directs the expenditure of categorical funds to improve student achievement. Parent trainings focus on leadership skills, good parenting and strategies to help their child succeed in school. Teachers truly value the contributions of parents and consider them as partners in the success of all students. In turn, the parents recognize the critical influence and impact their involvement has on their child's academic success.

Carl Harvey Elementary is renowned for its proud tradition of celebrating academic success and achievement. At the beginning of the year, the much anticipated "Red Carpet" CST ceremony celebrates the success of students who have moved up a performance band or have scored at the proficient or advanced levels on the most recent California Standards Test. At this assembly, students earn certificates and medals for their academic achievement. With his or her medal proudly worn, each student's picture is taken and the photographs distinguish the school's halls as a daily reminder of the rewards, both intrinsic and extrinsic, of academic success. In addition, each trimester students receive special recognition for outstanding citizenship and academic achievement at a special assembly attended by parents and classmates. Recognition and celebration of individual academic achievement is now permanently woven into the cultural climate of Harvey and contributes to the continued success of its students.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### 1. Assessment Results:

Carl Harvey Elementary School is justifiably proud of the success it has achieved on meeting the annual targets on the federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and state of California's Academic Performance Index (API) and the hard work behind that success. California's AYP and API are state accountability systems used to measure student, school and district achievement. The California State Standards Test (CST) in English language arts and mathematics is given each year to students in grades 2 – 12 and measures students' individual progress as well as schools' and districts' progress towards achieving NCLB, AYP and API goals. Achievement on the CST is recorded in one of five performance levels with the following ranges:

- Advanced (401– 600): Exceeds the standard
- Proficient (350 – 400): Meets the standard
- Basic (300 – 349): Does not meet the standard
- Below Basic (299 – 201): Does not meet the standard
- Far Below (200 – 150): Does not meet the standard

Each year schools and districts are assigned a target score, reflecting a combination of both an average ELA score and math score, which must be achieved or exceeded in order to meet AYP. Information regarding the California state assessment system along with summaries of school and district progress can be found under Testing and Accountability at: [www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov).

To meet AYP requirements in California, a school must achieve or exceed not only its assigned school-wide target score, but also achieve or exceed the target score for all its significant subgroups. To be considered a "significant subgroup," a school must have 100 scores for students who fall within a recognized subgroup category as defined by the California Department of Education (CDE). The three significant subgroups at Carl Harvey Elementary parallel the three most numerically significant subgroups for the district: Hispanic, English learners and Socio-economically disadvantaged.

After several years of hard work and steady growth, Harvey Elementary successfully reached the AYP target school-wide and for all its significant subgroups on the 2008-2009 CST. The progress towards English language arts (ELA) and mathematics proficiency over the last five years has been encouraging.

English Language Arts (ELA) Proficiency Rates and Growth from 2004 – 2009:

- School Wide: From 26% to 46% proficient (+20%)
- Hispanic: From 25% to 47% proficient (+22%)
- English Learners: From 13% to 39% proficient (+26%)
- Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: From 24% to 45% proficient (+21%)

The growth in proficiency in Mathematics over this same five year period has been even more encouraging:

Mathematics Proficiency Rates and Growth from 2004 – 2009:

- School Wide: From 49% to 70% proficient (+21%)
- Hispanic: From 49% to 69% proficient (+20%)
- English Learners: From 38% to 67% proficient (+29%)
- Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: From 48% to 69% proficient (+21%)

Examining the results within grade levels yielded some enlightening data. In looking with a critical eye, third grade has proven to be the biggest challenge. It showed the lowest proficiency gains with an overall increase of only 6 percent. On the other hand, fourth grade showed the highest gains in improvement, nearly doubling their growth moving from 42 percent of students scoring proficient or advanced in 2004 – 2005, and by 2008 – 2009 82 percent were at or above proficient. Harvey is using these results to build upon the successes at the fourth grade with Mathematics throughout the entire school.

The significant growth in proficiency for English learners in both ELA and mathematics is an especially profound one which merits an exceptional sense of achievement for Harvey. Together, these achievements have inspired a renewed determination to continue the hard work which has yielded these positive results.

## **2. Using Assessment Results:**

Harvey directly links its academic success to the effective and meaningful analysis of the results of a variety of assessments systematically employed in all its operations. Thoughtful discussion and reflection on the results of state standards tests, district benchmark tests, writing assessments as well as grade level common assessments are interwoven into everything from all-hands staff meetings, to grade level instructional team meetings to parent trainings, meetings and conferences as a matter of practice.

Data-Driven Instruction (DDI) is the driving force used in the decision-making process to improve teaching strategies and learning. In staff and grade level instructional team meetings, assessment results are analyzed to determine effectiveness of the instructional strategies utilized to teach the targeted skills for that time period. Strengths are celebrated and built upon, while weaknesses are identified and strategies and supplementary materials for re-teaching are identified and sought. If the weakness is deemed to be systemic, this weakness becomes a potential subject for future professional development. Opportunities for reflection on assessment results are structured into weekly staff meetings held on early release Wednesdays and grade level release days throughout the year. In addition, grade level teams meet twice a month to collaborate and plan interventions for specific troubling trends in achievement identified through the analysis of the data.

Identifying individual students in need of instructional interventions both inside and outside of the classroom has also been facilitated through the processes of Data Driven Instruction. Students scoring at the Far Below Basic (FBB) or Below Basic (BB) levels on state and district assessments are offered the opportunity to receive supplemental academic instruction at the After School Learning Center (ALSC). ASLC staff and classroom teachers work collaboratively to provide small group instruction for these students in order to close the achievement gap.

## **3. Communicating Assessment Results:**

Central to the success of any educational program is support and buy-in from parents and students. At Harvey this begins with the very first parent meeting at Back to School Night. An in-depth explanation of API and AYP results are shared with parents. Primary language support is provided orally and in all text, charts and graphs used to illustrate current achievement levels and growth targets. The academic goals for the current year are presented along with strategies to achieve these goals. All subsequent parent meetings incorporate the dissemination of current assessment results along with revisiting the goals set forth at the beginning of the school year.

In the classroom, students' awareness and ownership of their academic achievement is built into the instructional program. This begins with teacher led data chats which focus on fostering a clear understanding of the levels of achievement, and their ranges, reported on the CST. Students are issued data binders to record their current achievement level and set goals for CST, quarterly district benchmarks and classroom assessments. They regularly enter the results of these assessments, chart their growth, and adjust goals as the year progresses. The students share these results with their parents throughout the year. The data binder is a

meaningful tool at parent conferences where students reflect upon the results recorded in the data binder with their parents.

Communication of assessment results with the surrounding community occurs in a variety of mediums. Results are shared in the monthly newsletter. School Site Council meetings are open to the public and, by law, must include the discussion of assessment results to determine ways to improve student achievement. The School Accountability Report Card (SARC) is available on the district's website and includes a three-year comparison of the school and district assessment results with state performance averages.

#### **4. Sharing Success:**

It is said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. The imitation of many of the practices and programs initiated at Harvey which are now present throughout the district is, indeed, sincerely flattering. But more significantly, it is testimony to Harvey's sincere dedication to sharing the wealth of knowledge acquired through their experiences in order to expand those successes with their peers. The sharing of these successful practices and programs has been facilitated through a number of forums.

SAUSD has emphasized research-based instructional engagement strategies for English learners as a district-wide focus for its professional development. Harvey's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) has been instrumental in providing knowledgeable, collaborative leadership with other schools within the district who are anxious to duplicate the successes achieved at Harvey within their instructional programs and practices. They have provided peer-to-peer assistance at district level meetings on establishing Strategic Schooling and Data-Driven Instruction at other schools around the district. Teachers and students have shared a number of presentations at school board meetings. School administration has reached out to other administrators throughout the district to provide consult and assistance with fostering effective instructional practices and sharing resources.

In print, Harvey has been pleased to share information regarding its performance and successes through the school's monthly newsletter. The district's website is another forum through which Harvey has been able to share news about upcoming events which have contributed to its success such as teacher or parent trainings and workshops.

Finally, Harvey has become an established demonstration site for the district and surrounding school districts. Visitors observe teachers implementing Harvey's Data Driven Instruction and research-based instructional strategies. Should they be honored with a Blue Ribbon School award, Harvey's staff would enthusiastically continue this open door policy to support all teachers and administrators in their pursuit of academic excellence.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

### 1. Curriculum:

From its special education students to its gifted learners to its English learners, Harvey is a school with a diverse student population. A wide net must be cast in order to meet the specialized educational needs of all its students in the curricular areas of reading/language arts, English language development, math, science, social studies, and visual and performing arts. Therefore, research-based instructional engagement strategies are employed as the means through which instruction is delivered to meet the specialized educational needs of all its students. Strategies from Project GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design), Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), Thinking Maps, Write from the Beginning, and the Focused Approach are used to provide scaffolding for English Learners. The Response to Intervention (RTI) program is used to provide assistance to students in kindergarten, first and second grade who are struggling. Special Education teachers collaborate with general education teachers to provide instructional assistance for special education and non-special education students alike to help all students achieve academic success. Systematic Instruction in Phoneme Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) is utilized to assist primary grade students who are struggling with reading. Teachers utilize results from classroom, district and state assessments to determine weaknesses in order to provide opportunities for re-teaching or extra practice on mastering essential foundational skills.

In addition to employing the best in research-based strategies to deliver instruction, the careful and deliberate selection of primary instructional materials is essential to building an educational program which is rigorous, engaging and accessible to all students. The process of adopting new texts involves staff, parents, and community members at local sites as well as throughout the district. Materials must first be approved by the state as appropriate then districts may employ their own protocols to select which materials will work best for their students and maintain the acquisition of high standards. The McGraw/Hill Series for Science and the Scott Foresman Series for Social Studies are employed to deliver instruction. The *Open Court Reading Series* (OCR) was selected for English Language Arts instruction. To support English language development, *Carousel of Ideas* along with supplemental materials from Okapi publishers, *Explorations* (3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>) and from National Geographic/Hampton Brown: *Vocabulary Builders* (K) and *English to a Beat!* (1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup>) are utilized to deliver effective instruction and meet the specialized educational needs of all students at Harvey. These materials are coordinated to develop the required, essential foundational skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Students in Kindergarten through fifth grade utilize the Saxon Math series. Each lesson is cited on the student's daily practice sheet and textbook and is aligned with state standards. Daily teacher-directed lessons include guided practice with manipulatives, as well as independent practice activities to be completed in-class and at home. Incorporation of computers into the math program is engaging and motivating for students. Two supplementary programs which support math instruction through computers are the Mind Institute and Successmaker. Both have provided individualized instruction for math enrichment or remediation through a motivating medium for students.

Harvey's performing arts program begins in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade. Here, they are exposed to vocal music and taught about the basic components of songs. In 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, all students participate in an instrumental music program learning to play the recorder. This is where they begin to read music, understand notes and rhythms. In the upper grades, students may audition for choir or they may select an instrument to extend their learning of the elements of music. Students demonstrate their skills at least once every trimester at performances for their peers and parents. The performing arts program at Harvey prepares students for the more rigorous music programs at the intermediate and high school levels.

## 2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

(This question is for elementary schools only)

At the elementary level, the challenges for teaching reading are two-fold: Learning to read at the primary grades and reading to learn in the upper grades. Added to these are the challenges of teaching students to read who are also learning English, or who may be struggling to keep up with their grade level peers. The *Open Court Reading Series* (OCR) was selected as the best program to meet the diverse learning needs of the students at Harvey.

All students receive two hours of language arts instruction daily. Explicit word analysis and vocabulary development, intensive English language development, reading fluency, and reading comprehension are taught across all grade levels. Each reading block within the OCR program focuses on reading skills specific to each grade level. OCR provides a strong focus on phonics and phonemic awareness which is essential for English learners. To address higher level comprehension skills needed at the upper grades, OCR provides specific practice and instruction on building fluency, vocabulary skills including synonyms, context and multiple meaning words, as well as, the critical reading skills of interpretation and critical analysis.

To meet the needs of students who may be struggling to keep up with their grade level peers in reading, additional practice in the area of reading is provided through the RTI program. These students receive daily, specialized instruction for 30 minutes in the areas of fluency, phonemic awareness, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension.

Student progress on reading skills is monitored and reassessed every 6-8 weeks using data from district, state and OCR assessments. As success in reading is essential to success in all other curricular areas, teachers meet regularly to discuss assessment results, standards, instructional pacing, effective instructional strategies, and coordinate services in the area of reading to improve school-wide academic achievement.

## 3. Additional Curriculum Area:

The science curriculum at Carl Harvey Elementary exemplifies the school's mission to promote resourcefulness, intellectual development and empowerment. Science instruction begins with the district adopted, McMillan/McGraw Hill *California Science* series which emphasizes earth, physical and life sciences, but goes far beyond the boundaries of that program alone. Science instruction is also supported through the Open Court Reading program which integrates science standards into much of its expository text. Online resources and interactive learning models such as Brain Pop, GLAD strategies, and hands-on labs also support science instruction.

Partnerships with organizations outside the district have provided a rich assortment of resources and learning experiences to enrich science instruction at Harvey. Through the partnership with the University of California at Irvine (UCI), teachers and students have access to exciting and engaging standards-aligned lessons and resources for all students such as Beckman Science kits, which promote independent thinking and problem solving as students work through hands-on science experiments. Santa Ana's Discovery Science Center also provides learning opportunities through its labs, lessons, and demonstrations that take place during our after-school program, Think Together. The wide variety of educational opportunities and resources facilitated through these partnerships provided new mediums to enrich, re-teach and reinforce grade level science standards, making them accessible to the diverse learning styles and needs of the student population.

Extra-curricular opportunities at Harvey empower life long learning in a way no mere classroom experience can duplicate. Upper grade students may participate in an after school science club which provides opportunities to review key science standards in highly motivating demonstrations connected to weekly lessons. Finally, the highlight of every fifth grade student at Harvey is "Outdoor Science School." A myriad

of interactive demonstrations and experiments on the scientific method are structured into the memorable overnight fieldtrip to the San Bernardino Mountains.

#### **4. Instructional Methods:**

A variety of research-based instructional strategies and methodologies are employed to address the diverse educational needs of the microcosm of learners at Harvey. In general, students are grouped heterogeneously. The one exception to this are identified Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) students. Teachers are trained on methods and strategies to support depth and complexity, as well as enrich and accelerate instruction to satisfy the specialized educational needs of this student population.

The challenge for English learners, who make up nearly 84% of the total school population, is to keep them caught up with their grade level peers in core content, while supporting their English language learning needs. Using flexible grouping for levels of English proficiency, providing language pattern and sentence frames, incorporating Specially Design Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies, are all methods of differentiating instruction for this population of students. In addition, thirty minutes of daily systematic English language development are structured into the educational program for English learners.

The majority of special education students at Harvey are mainstreamed into general education classes. Strategies such as choral response, visual diagrams, proximity, and modeled thinking are employed to provide all students, special education or typical, the opportunity to be engaged, active participants in their learning. The research-based best practices such as Thinking Maps' *Write from the Beginning* along with GLAD and Focused Approach instructional learning methods also utilized at Harvey make it possible to provide students with a variety of learning modalities the opportunity to achieve academic success.

Finally, for all students to be successful it is necessary to monitor progress regularly. An essential method to support achievement at Harvey has been Data-Driven Instruction. The analysis of student progress yielded through this method has made it possible to truly differentiate instruction for individuals, subgroups and the entire student population.

#### **5. Professional Development:**

The professional development program for Carl Harvey Elementary centers on research-based instructional strategies which support access to the core curriculum, meet the diverse learning needs of its students and improve student achievement. Weekly modified days provide opportunities for staff development by district trainers, and/or resource staff. Teachers who have attended content area workshops and trainings can also share new learning and strategies during staff meetings and grade level meetings on these days. The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meets twice a month to plan and guide professional development selection to address identified instructional needs.

To support access to the core curriculum, all new teachers are provided training on programs which have been implemented at Harvey: Open Court Reading, the Focused Approach, Data-Director, SIPPS, Thinking Maps: *Write from the Beginning*, Science and Social Studies. Continuing teachers may also participate in these professional development sessions to refresh or reinforce their instruction on these core-curricular programs.

Training on strategies for GATE students, Systematic ELD, and Response to Intervention (RTI) are activities which support the learning needs of specific subgroups of students within the school population. These professional development opportunities focus on strategies and methods which address these students' specialized educational needs while supporting the instruction of grade level content standards.

A school-wide focus on professional development to improve student achievement is the Strategic Schooling model. This model incorporates the identification and support of effective learning strategies for language arts and math instruction. These strategies are implemented school-wide and incorporated into administrative walk-through observations.

A number of staff at Harvey are certified as trainers for Thinking Maps or are particularly adept with Strategic Schooling, RTI, Systematic ELD and Open Court. These teachers provide powerful professional development support to their colleagues through model lessons at staff meetings or by opening their classrooms to peer observations.

## **6. School Leadership:**

Carl Harvey's leadership incorporates the perspectives of all members in its diverse professional learning community. Each subgroup is represented by its own leadership group and shares as stakeholders in supporting the school's mission and vision. They consist of: The School Leadership Team, composed of the principal and grade level chairs, SSC, ELAC, and PT. Constant communication and collaboration between groups facilitate the consistent refinement of the school's vision. The School Leadership Team acts as a liaison to the entire professional learning community. They convey all conclusions and "next steps" established through their meetings to all subgroups. Ideas brought forth from the various groups are shared with all stakeholders - teachers, staff members, parents, and the community. The collaborative model of leadership at Harvey is one where issues are discussed and creative solutions and resources are found to solve problems. Every accomplishment is a team effort.

The principal leads as a learner, a manager and facilitator in shaping the culture of the school. She is sincere, has a strong knowledge of curriculum and provides a sense of direction that focuses on the school vision. The feedback she provides to teachers and students through her daily observations reinforces grade level standards and promotes student achievement. The positive educational environment she creates fosters a desire in the staff, students and parents to contribute to the success of the school's vision.

The principal's open door policy encourages members of the school community to talk with her on any matter of importance to them. The collaborative decision-making process she models throughout the school supports high expectations and results in positive outcomes. She builds leaders among the students, teachers and parents by encouraging and coaching them to use their talents to the fullest. She inspires all around her to do their personal best.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2

Test: CST Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Publisher: ETS

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 62        | 40        | 50        | 45        | 43        |
| % Advanced  | 33        | 8         | 22        | 5         | 14        |
| Number of students tested   | 91        | 72        | 81        | 73        | 87        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 97        | 98        | 95        | 100       | 98        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 2         | 2         | 4         |           | 2         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 1         | 1         |           | 1         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 61        | 42        | 51        | 44        | 43        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 87        | 67        | 77        | 68        | 84        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 61        | 40        | 49        | 46        | 42        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 88        | 72        | 79        | 72        | 85        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           | 8         |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           | 12        |           |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 63        | 37        | 52        | 42        | 38        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 82        | 65        | 64        | 65        | 78        |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |

**Notes:**

California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Test (CST) reports only % Proficient and Above in the subgroup disaggregated data reports. It does not specify % of the students who are advanced.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 2 Test: CST English Language Arts  
Publisher: ETS

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 49        | 36        | 45        | 30        | 22        |
| % Advanced  | 13        | 4         | 7         | 7         | 5         |
| Number of students tested   | 92        | 72        | 81        | 73        | 87        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 98        | 97        | 95        | 100       | 98        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 2         | 2         | 4         |           | 2         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 1         | 1         |           | 1         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 47        | 37        | 45        | 31        | 21        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 88        | 67        | 77        | 68        | 84        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 50        | 36        | 46        | 31        | 22        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 89        | 72        | 79        | 72        | 85        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           | 17        |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           | 12        |           |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 49        | 34        | 45        | 29        | 19        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 83        | 65        | 64        | 65        | 78        |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |

Notes:

California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Test (CST) reports only % Proficient and Above in the subgroup disaggregated data reports. It does not specify % of the students who are advanced.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: CST Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Publisher: ETS

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 58        | 65        | 57        | 46        | 49        |
| % Advanced  | 28        | 38        | 16        | 23        | 15        |
| Number of students tested   | 64        | 73        | 65        | 87        | 63        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 91        | 95        | 100       | 98        | 93        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 3         | 4         |           | 2         | 5         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 1         |           | 1         | 2         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 58        | 65        | 55        | 45        | 47        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 62        | 69        | 57        | 85        | 61        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 58        | 65        | 56        | 45        | 48        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 64        | 71        | 65        | 86        | 62        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 33        | 18        | 18        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           | 13        | 11        | 11        |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 56        | 63        | 55        | 39        | 42        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 57        | 57        | 59        | 76        | 56        |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |

Notes:

California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Test (CST) reports only % Proficient and Above in the subgroup disaggregated data reports. It does not specify % of the students who are advanced.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 3 Test: CST English Language Arts  
Publisher: ETS

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 19        | 22        | 16        | 13        | 13        |
| % Advanced  | 6         | 8         | 0         | 3         | 0         |
| Number of students tested   | 64        | 73        | 65        | 87        | 63        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 91        | 94        | 100       | 98        | 93        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 3         | 4         |           | 2         | 5         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 1         |           | 1         | 2         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 18        | 22        | 14        | 13        | 13        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 62        | 69        | 57        | 85        | 61        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 19        | 21        | 16        | 14        | 11        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 64        | 71        | 65        | 86        | 62        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 17        | 0         |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           | 13        | 11        |           |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 12        | 21        | 14        | 9         | 4         |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 57        | 57        | 59        | 76        | 56        |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |

Notes:

California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Test (CST) reports only % Proficient and Above in the Subgroup disaggregated data reports. It does not specify % of the students who are advanced.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4

Test: CST Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Publisher: ETS

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 82        | 68        | 68        | 43        | 42        |
| % Advanced  | 52        | 30        | 28        | 16        | 18        |
| Number of students tested   | 56        | 53        | 88        | 64        | 71        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 95        | 98        | 99        | 94        | 96        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 3         | 1         | 1         | 4         | 2         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 81        | 71        | 67        | 41        | 40        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 54        | 49        | 85        | 61        | 63        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 82        | 68        | 68        | 40        | 43        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 55        | 53        | 87        | 62        | 70        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 44        |           | 27        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           | 16        |           | 15        |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 84        | 57        | 64        | 33        | 24        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 44        | 30        | 74        | 54        | 46        |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |

Notes:

California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Test (CST) reports only % Proficient and Above in the subgroup disaggregated data reports. It does not specify % of the students who are advanced.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 4 Test: CST English Language Arts  
Publisher: ETS

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 59        | 44        | 43        | 34        | 30        |
| % Advanced  | 23        | 8         | 15        | 14        | 13        |
| Number of students tested   | 53        | 53        | 88        | 64        | 71        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 90        | 98        | 99        | 94        | 96        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 3         | 1         | 1         | 4         | 2         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 57        | 45        | 44        | 33        | 25        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 51        | 49        | 85        | 61        | 63        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 60        | 43        | 43        | 32        | 30        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 52        | 53        | 87        | 62        | 70        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           | 19        |           | 0         |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           | 16        |           | 11        |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 57        | 27        | 38        | 22        | 11        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 42        | 30        | 74        | 54        | 46        |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |

Notes:

California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Test (CST) reports only % Proficient and Above in the subgroup disaggregated data reports. It does not specify % of the students who are advanced.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5

Test: CST Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Publisher: ETS

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 76        | 58        | 41        | 59        | 63        |
| % Advanced  | 36        | 25        | 26        | 22        | 26        |
| Number of students tested   | 45        | 80        | 54        | 68        | 82        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 92        | 99        | 95        | 97        | 94        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 2         | 1         | 3         | 2         | 5         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 2         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 76        | 57        | 40        | 56        | 62        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 42        | 77        | 50        | 57        | 79        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 76        | 57        | 41        | 59        | 61        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 45        | 79        | 54        | 68        | 80        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           | 0         | 0         |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           | 12        | 10        |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 63        | 37        | 33        | 43        | 47        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 27        | 43        | 46        | 46        | 47        |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |

Notes:

California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Test (CST) reports only % Proficient and Above in the Subgroup disaggregated data reports. It does not specify % of the students who are advanced.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 5 Test: CST English Language Arts  
Publisher: ETS

|   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 58        | 40        | 28        | 34        | 38        |
| % Advanced  | 18        | 9         | 4         | 12        | 5         |
| Number of students tested   | 45        | 80        | 54        | 68        | 82        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 92        | 99        | 95        | 97        | 94        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed                                   | 2         | 1         | 3         | 2         | 5         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed                                  | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 2         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 57        | 42        | 26        | 32        | 38        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 42        | 77        | 50        | 57        | 79        |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 58        | 39        | 28        | 34        | 36        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 45        | 79        | 54        | 68        | 80        |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           | 0         |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           | 12        |           |
| <b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  | 37        | 12        | 20        | 11        | 17        |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 27        | 43        | 46        | 46        | 47        |
| <b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |

Notes:

California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Test (CST) reports only % Proficient and Above in the subgroup disaggregated data reports. It does not specify % of the students who are advanced.