

U.S. Department of Education
2011 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program
A Public School

School Type (Public Schools): Charter Title 1 Magnet Choice
(Check all that apply, if any)

Name of Principal: Mr. Mark Arnold

Official School Name: Katherine Finchy Elementary School

School Mailing Address: 777 East Tachevah Drive
 Palm Springs, CA 92262-4903

County: Riverside State School Code Number: 33671736032437

Telephone: (760) 416-8190 E-mail: marnold@psusd.us
Fax: (760) 416-8201 Web URL: http://www.psusd.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*: Dr. Lorri S. McCune Ed.D. Superintendent e-mail: lmccune@psusd.us

District Name: Palm Springs Unified District Phone: (760) 416-6000

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: Mr. Justin Blake

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

11CA22

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 2010-2011 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 2005.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010.
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

1. Number of schools in the district: 16 Elementary schools
 (per district designation) 4 Middle/Junior high schools
3 High schools
0 K-12 schools
23 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 7827

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 3
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2010 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total			# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	25	7	32			6	0	0
K	56	43	99			7	0	0
1	56	47	103			8	0	0
2	54	50	104			9	0	0
3	50	53	103			10	0	0
4	59	60	119			11	0	0
5	47	45	92			12	0	0
Total in Applying School:								652

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
5 % Asian
10 % Black or African American
52 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
30 % White
3 % 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 2009-2010 school year: 22%

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, 2009 until the end of the school year.	68
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.	71
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	139
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2009	628
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.22
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	22

8. Percent limited English proficient students in the school: 31%

Total number of limited English proficient students in the school: 195

Number of languages represented, not including English: 8

Specify languages:

Spanish, Arabic, Persian, Filipino, Gujarati, Italian, Khmer, and Vietnamese

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 68%
 Total number of students who qualify: 428

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-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 15%
 Total number of students served: 101

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>31</u> Autism	<u>16</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>5</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>6</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>42</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</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>27</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>
Support staff	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
Total number	<u>48</u>	<u>15</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: 24:1

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

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Daily student attendance	95%	96%	95%	95%	94%
Daily teacher attendance	96%	94%	97%	95%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	3%	9%	3%	13%	17%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If these data are not available, explain and provide reasonable estimates.

The 94% Daily student attendance in 2005-2006 was due to the flu and colds. The 94% Daily teacher attendance in 2008-2009 was due to the flu and a maternity leave. The 17% turnover rate in 2005-2006 was due to one teacher transferring to be a speech therapist, one teacher retiring, one teacher becoming a Teacher On Special Assignment in the District, one probationary teacher being non-relected, and one teacher transferring to a new school site. The 13% turnover rate in 2006-2007 was due to one teacher taking a leave of absence, two teachers resigning, and one teacher transferring to a new school site.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools): Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2010 are doing as of Fall 2010.

Graduating class size:	<u>0</u>
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	<u>0%</u>
Enrolled in a community college	<u>0%</u>
Enrolled in vocational training	<u>0%</u>
Found employment	<u>0%</u>
Military service	<u>0%</u>
Other	<u>0%</u>
Total	<u>0%</u>

Katherine Finchy Elementary School, a member of the Palm Springs Unified School District (PSUSD), is located in an established neighborhood in Palm Springs, California that was created in the 1930s and 40s, known as the “Movie Colony.” The school’s namesake was an educational pioneer who came to teach in this desert community in 1921. Her legacy of dedication and determination is alive today in the hearts of the educators who serve in the building that bears her name. The original school was dedicated in 1951, but a new award-winning building was dedicated in 1998.

At our school our mission is to provide a safe and orderly environment dedicated to helping every child meet the rigorous California state standards and reach maximum cognitive potential. We hold high academic and behavioral expectations for all 650 students. Our staff differentiates instruction through research-based instructional strategies to meet the diverse needs of our population. For students who are struggling to meet academic standards, instructional time is extended into recess, as well as before and after school programs. Our Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program challenges with higher levels of depth and complexity.

Historically, Katherine Finchy has had a primarily white, English-speaking and affluent population. The demographics, however, have changed dramatically over the past decade bringing new challenges. Currently, 68% of the students at the school are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, 52% are Hispanic, and 31% are English Learners. Our professional learning community continually adjusts, striving to meet the needs of all students by expanding our knowledge/skills base through high-quality professional development, careful assessment and data analysis, and reaching out to the surrounding neighborhood to pull in the expertise of volunteers, community professionals, and parents.

At Katherine Finchy, our professional development builds upon the expertise that is within our own staff. For example, two years ago our entire staff attended multiple trainings on Thinking Maps for the purpose of improving comprehension. Since then, all teachers share their classroom experiences in professional development meetings using these graphic organizers. This sharing has stimulated a high level of interest among teachers to go beyond just using the Maps to improve reading comprehension. Teachers help one another to incorporate the Maps cross-curricularly in such areas as writing, math, science, and social studies. Last summer, three of our teachers attended Enhanced Thinking Maps training to focus on the needs of English learners. These teachers then organized a series of workshops, training the entire staff to use Enhanced Thinking Maps.

By using careful assessment and collaborative data analysis, we strive to meet the needs of all learners. Over the past three years, our school has participated in data-driven decision making by implementing PSUSD’s SMART goal protocol. As a part of the SMART goal protocol program, each grade-level team selects 18 Essential Standards and then pretests students on those standards. This data is analyzed and then the grade-level teams choose which standards need their focus. Then, teachers set goals for mastery and brainstorm/agree on teaching strategies. After a four-to-six week period, the students are retested on the focus standards. Again, the data is analyzed by the grade-level teams. If mastery is not achieved, the obstacles to achievement are identified. Teachers then agree to new strategies to overcome those obstacles. New goals are set and the process begins anew until mastery is achieved.

Parent and community involvement is critical to our success. We have an active fundraising Parent Teacher Organization. Many parents volunteer in classrooms and at school functions. Our School Site Council helps guide our academic plan and expenditures. Latino Literacy and our English Language Acquisition Committee help our Hispanic population to realize their contributions are vital. Community involvement is evident in our partnership with the Palm Springs Evening Rotary Club which aids us with numerous events.

Academic excellence continues to be a top priority at Katherine Finchy. This is evidenced by the growth in our Academic Performance Index (API) of 106 points over the past three years. Last year, our API score was up 18 points to 854; all subgroups met or exceeded their growth targets. In February 2010, Katherine Finchy Elementary was named by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell as a recipient of the 2009-2010 Title I Academic Achievement Award. To meet the criteria for this distinction, the school had to demonstrate that all students are making significant progress towards proficiency on California's content standards. Additionally, Katherine Finchy's Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students doubled the achievement targets set for them for two consecutive years.

The Katherine Finchy Falcons are a learning team; all stakeholders including administration, staff, parents and students are encouraged to participate with an all-out effort, from kindergarten orientation through fifth grade promotion. Katherine Finchy stakeholders remain dedicated to meeting the needs of each individual student to promote the achievement of maximum potential.

1. Assessment Results:

California's integrated accountability system uses CST scores to determine the school's Academic Performance Index (API) and the federal government's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The API is a numeric index ranging from 200 to 1000 points. The target for California schools is an API score of 800 or more. API is a growth model; school wide API is determined by a summation of individual student scores from one year to the next. Achievement on the California Content Standards Test (CST) is reported in one of five performance bands: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic. If students increase in proficiency levels, points are gained; if they decrease, points are lost. The AYP measures the percentage of students who score Proficient or Advanced. More information regarding the state assessment system can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov>

Prior to 2007-08, Katherine Finchy's API performance was inconsistent. In 2004-05, Katherine Finchy stakeholders were pleased to see our API score rise 21 points to 774. But in 2005-06, we dropped to 764, and lost points in our Hispanic, SED, and EL subgroups. Then, in 2006-07, we were even more disheartened to see a drop again, this time losing 13 points to 751 and falling below our 2003-04 scores.

This disappointment brought a renewed determination and vigor to the educators at Katherine Finchy. We resolved that even with unprecedented budget cuts, we would make a difference in the lives of our students. Thus began the era of consistently asking ourselves the question, "Without additional funding, what else can we do increase student achievement?" Every staff meeting, we brought our current assessment data, analyzed it collaboratively, and asked that same question again, brainstormed the possibilities, and resolutely set about to implement our plan. We found that even small changes could have a big impact. For example, a cross-age tutor program was implemented that sent a few fifth-graders to the kindergarten playground daily during their common 20-minute recess-time to play letter identification games with the struggling emergent readers. The impact was far beyond our anticipations. The kindergarteners hero-worshipped the cross-age tutors, engagement was high, and rapid learning was the result. This is just one example of the many small changes that were tried at every grade level.

This spirit of experimentation and action orientation percolated through our school climate and culture. In 2007-08, we began to see the effects as our overall API score went up 57 points to 808. In 2008-09, we began to embrace and fully implement PLC and RTI in earnest, always continuing with that question, "...what else can we do?" We continued to see positive, steady growth as our overall API score increased 28 points to 836.

In 2009-10, we added another 18 points to raise our API score to 854. We are especially pleased that our significant subgroups are all above or very near 800 (Hispanic, 811; White, 920; SED, 820; EL, 798). We continue to ask the same question as education budgets continue to shrink. With the strength of our collective experience, we will continue to use the power of innovation and imagination in stretching our resources to create the optimum learning environment for our students. The old adage "necessity is the mother of invention" is being proven right here on our campus.

Our steady growth from 2006-07 to 2009-10 is summarized below:

English/language arts Proficiency Rates and Growth

- Overall: From 41-60% (19% growth)
- Hispanic: From 28-46% (18% growth)

- White: From 57-81% (24% growth)
- English Learners: From 20-29% (9% growth)
- Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: From 21-52% (growth of 31%)

Mathematics Proficiency Rates and Growth

- Overall: From 48-77% (29% growth)
- Hispanic: From 38-70% (32% growth)
- White: From 62-88% (26% growth)
- English Learners: From 28-62% (34% growth)
- Socio-Economically Disadvantaged: From 32-71% (growth of 39%)

Our overall growth has been rewarding for all the stakeholders at Katherine Finchy, justifying the intensity of effort expended to achieve it. Our growth within the Socio-Economically Disadvantaged subgroup is notable, gaining 31 percentage points in ELA and 39 percentage points in math. This subgroup has doubled the achievement targets set for them two years in a row.

We continue to strive to improve the achievement of all subgroups, but our current focus is on the needs of English Learners, since the 2009-10 gap between the ELA overall proficiency level and this subgroup is 31 points. Our current strategies include the use of Thinking Maps to graphically organize and analyze information, establishing language objectives for every lesson in every subject, and focusing on writing throughout the curriculum. The structural models of PLC and RTI that have proven to be so empowering for teachers, parents, and students will continue to be implemented and refined in our educational environment.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Over the past three years, the teachers in our school have moved from simply reporting data to excavating and then utilizing the data to drive instruction, to create flexible student groups, and to make decisions about professional development needs.

Our grade-level PLC teams are continually collecting and analyzing formative assessment data to facilitate student mastery of Essential Standards (ES). The PSUSD SMART goal protocol provides a pathway to effective collaboration. First, grade-level teams select Essential Standards based on previous years' data, input from vertical teams, and information about the weight of each standard on the upcoming CST tests. Then students are pretested on the ES. This data is analyzed and then grade-level teams choose which of the standards need immediate focus to maximize student achievement. Next, teachers set SMART goals and brainstorm/agree on teaching strategies. After a four-to-six week period, a post-assessment is administered on those focus standards. Again, the data is analyzed collaboratively by the grade level team to see if the SMART goals were met. If the team decides that mastery was not achieved, the obstacles to achievement are identified and new strategies to combat those obstacles are researched, discussed and agreed upon. Revised SMART goals are set and the process begins again.

Our grade-level teams use both summative and formative data to create flexible groups for pyramids of intervention, leveled instruction and Universal Access (UA). Teachers share "ownership" of all students throughout the grade-level, so students are flexibly regrouped with different teachers in the course of the day to facilitate greater access to the curriculum. PSUSD benchmark tests in math and language arts are a particularly rich source of formative data to help teachers identify and work towards filling gaps in the

student knowledge profile. At Katherine Finchy, data-driven decision-making systems have led to greater student achievement.

As our ILT explored our 2009-10 CST data, we determined that as a staff we must learn new ways to reach the needs of our EL students, since the achievement gap between the overall API score and the API score of the EL subgroup is 31 percentage points. We are committed to closing that gap. With that commitment, our ILT chose to focus our professional development on improving UA in every classroom. With full utilization of the UA model, we are able to identify and address student needs in small, flexible groups within our own classrooms.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Effective communication is a key to Katherine Finchy's success. Stakeholders are continually updated on our progress. Our school communicates student performance data, both generally and specifically. We also celebrate our successes with all stakeholders.

In the late summer of each year, the local newspaper (*The Desert Sun*) publishes CST results for every school in the Palm Springs Unified School District. The highlights of these results are also reported by the three local television stations and by many local radio stations. Additionally, Katherine Finchy publishes an annual School Accountability Report Card on the PSUSD website. Utilizing all forms of media helps us to communicate generalized data to the larger community, as well as to our immediate stakeholders. Other ways that we share general student data with parents and students are at the annual Back-To-School Night, the Family Reading, Math and Science Nights; and in the school newspaper that is published monthly through a partnership between the principal and the Katherine Finchy Parent Teacher Organization.

Student-specific data must be communicated as well as general data. Individual state test results (CST and CELDT) are mailed home to parents. Parents of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 discuss their child's CST results from the preceding year during the first parent-teacher conference of the year. To optimize relevancy, teachers individualize information regarding proficiency levels and range of scores.

Each fall, after pre-assessments are completed, each grade-level team compiles a list of students that are identified as "at-risk" in either reading/language arts or in math. As a part of the intervention process, the parents are notified during a student-led conference. The grade-level teams provide the parents with strategies that can be employed at home and explain what is being done to provide intervention for the student at school. These twice-yearly student-led conferences also give teachers and students the opportunity to explain the student's progress towards mastery of all essential standards using the standards-based report card as a tool to guide the discussion with parents.

Teachers also communicate specific data to parents and students through letters, flyers and notes sent home, emails, phone calls and specific parent meetings. All communication is made readily available in both English and Spanish. Students and parents especially appreciate our Caught Being Good program which celebrates success through weekly school-wide announcements for good behavior, academic and behavior awards at monthly assemblies, and other individual classroom recognitions.

4. Sharing Lessons Learned:

The Palm Springs Unified School District encourages the teachers to share "what is working." Some of the venues that they have provided for this sharing are the PSUSD Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) training days, English Language Professional Development training in math and reading (ELPD), the K-12 Alliance for Science and Math, Kindergarten Teachers Network, GATE Teachers Network, RSP Special Education Teachers Network, and ILT District Site Support Days. Additionally, the District provides a drive on the shared PSUSD computer network (the Q drive) that hosts documents, teaching strategies, PowerPoint presentations and assessments that teachers in PSUSD have found useful and wish

to share. Teachers are also encouraged to use the INSPECT test question bank contained within the District subscribed Online Assessment Reporting System (OARS) to share standards-based test questions and teacher-created assessments.

In fall of 2010, our district began to implement a new reading curriculum, *Treasures*. The District recognized that implementing any new curriculum is challenging, so they invited teachers to create a website for teachers and by teachers. Although the site is only a few months old, already a wealth of well-organized information can be found there including PowerPoint presentations, songs, and other lesson plan supplements. Katherine Finchy teachers are contributors and beneficiaries of this site. This online resource may be found at <http://teachers.psusd.us/curriculum>.

One of the best ways to share what is working is to invite other educators into our classrooms. Katherine Finchy has a long history of mentoring student teachers. Many of these protégées have finished their preservice development and gone on to be hired by other schools in PSUSD. These excited new teachers help us to disseminate our strategies throughout the District. As word of our success has spread, many teachers from other schools within PSUSD have asked to come observe our learning teams in action. After observing, we take time to debrief thoroughly so the experience can be as meaningful as possible.

Katherine Finchy teachers also share successful strategies with the educational world outside of our District. Our teachers are affiliated with the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), the SENG organization (Supporting the Emotional Needs of the Gifted), Future Problem Solving of California (FPS), and the California Association for the Gifted (CAG). Our teachers also welcome opportunities to present at conferences both here in California and in surrounding states.

1. Curriculum:

The rigorous California State Standards form the foundation for curriculum and instruction at Katherine Finchy Elementary. State and district adopted materials that align to the standards are skillfully implemented in each classroom. We create a climate of passionate engagement by inviting learners to achieve academic excellence through the research-based instructional strategies that are used to deliver core and supplementary curriculum.

English/language arts instruction is integrated through all subjects, but a focused two and a half hour block of ELA instruction is a significant part of the daily schedule. *California Treasures* (CT) is the PSUSD's newly adopted reading curriculum. Currently, first and second grades are in their first year of CT. Kindergarten, third, fourth, and fifth grades will transition from *Open Court Reading* (OCR) into CT over the next two years. Learning to read begins even before the first day of school as enrolling kindergarten students are given a DVD to take home, watch and learn foundational concepts such as the alphabetic principle, rhyming, and letter identification. With three months of daily viewing, many kindergartners enter school with a strong emergent reader foundation. Once students learn to read in the primary grades, they begin to read to learn. A focus on expository text and Thinking Map analysis of the underlying text structures helps our students to improve comprehension. Lifelong reading for pleasure is encouraged by weekly library time for each student. Assistance for struggling readers is provided through the Pyramid Response to Intervention (PRTI) model. English Language Development is taught to our English Language Learners everyday using CT, OCR and the Santillana Language program.

Our school subscribes to the philosophy of writing throughout all grade levels and all content areas. Students write word problems, justify answers and explain mathematical concepts. Science calls for a grasp of academic vocabulary that is strengthened during the writing process. Unit writing helps students process the "Big Ideas" of social studies and history. Teachers integrate Thinking Maps, the Six Traits of Writing, and components of OCR/CT to facilitate our writing achievement.

Envision Math, a spiraling concept-based curriculum, addresses the need for differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students. Our teachers embrace distributed practice by adherence to strict daily mathematical routines, by using hands-on activities and games, and by using technology to support development of mathematical skills. Explicit instruction, relentless progress monitoring, and safeguarding instructional time are all factors in our mathematical success.

Our progress towards scientific literacy is guided by our *California Science* curriculum. Science Content Standards form the core with the Investigation and Experimentation strand integrated throughout the program. Cross-curricular connections are made between science content and our non-fiction focus in reading/ELA. Our Annual Science Fair and other Science Spectacular Events are designed to sustain a high level of excitement in the subject.

Our social studies curriculum, *Reflections*, was designed specifically to address the California State Standards through the development of "Big Ideas" and the related social sciences analysis skills. Our teachers integrate the geographical and chronological themes of social studies topics with units in the reading program, making real life connections with the students.

Student engagement is enhanced by our utilization of technology. We use our computer lab and computers in the classrooms to support our core curriculum with programs such as Accelerated Reader, Starfall, and KidBiz. Our computer lab teachers instruct students on internet safety skills and carefully monitor their usage. Every classroom also has an ELMO and LCD projector to assist teachers in engaging students in the content. Many of our students create their own PowerPoint presentations using images,

text and video. This project requires that students perform on-line research, evaluate the reliability of the sources, and cite the sources using APA format. They also use Excel to organize and quantify data. To enhance our educators' effectiveness in using technology, site-based professional development is on-going.

The arts are very much in evidence at Katherine Finchy. The PSUSD partners with the YMCA to offer the After School Enrichment and Safety program (ASES) at our school. This free daily three-hour program encourages students to explore dance, theater, vocal music, drawing, multi-media collage and sculpture. All students at our school receive 40 minutes a week of music instruction. The Palm Spring Art Museum and the McCallum Theatre provide Eyes-On/Hands On field trips and lesson guidance to teachers to integrate art into the core curriculum.

In 2005, the PSUSD adopted a child wellness program. Under this program, students are guided in making more nutritionally-sound choices for snacks and meals. Our teachers support this program by using materials supplied by the California Dairy Council to incorporate nutrition education into our reading, math, and science. Teachers also provide students with 100 minutes of physical education each week. Our fitness activities have included track, salsa and square dancing, yoga, tai chi, and the Governor's Challenge.

2. Reading/English:

Katherine Finchy's reading curriculum is driven by the California ELA Content Standards and our experienced teachers focused on ensuring the reading success of each of our students. Due to the California state budget crisis, PSUSD's adoption of a new reading curriculum has been slowed. Currently, grades 1 and 2 have adopted *California Treasures* (CT). Grades K, 3, 4, and 5 continue to use *Open Court Reading* (OCR), but will implement CT over the next two years.

California Treasures was selected by PSUSD because it was specifically created to address California State Standards in reading, writing, science and social studies. With a focus on non-fiction text, teachers are able to teach content-rich material within the two and a half hour reading block each day. All CST-tested standards are taught and reviewed in the student edition so teachers do not have to suspend teaching to get ready for the CST. ELLs benefit from a research-based ELD program that includes Visual Vocabulary Resources and Interactive Question-Response Routines. Additionally, CT has collaborated with Writer's Express, a non-profit organization with over 14 years of rigorous research, to create writing instruction that improves test scores in both reading comprehension and writing, effective in lowering the gap for ELLs. Whole-group core instruction, universal access, and small-group instruction are color-coded and amalgamated into the Teacher's Edition to facilitate differentiation.

Both OCR and CT support the five pillars of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Both programs are systemic, explicit and include a professional development component. Both focus on learning to read in the primary grades and then reading to learn in the intermediate grades.

Our multi-faceted approach to reading instruction is enhanced by our technology connections. Our school uses Accelerated Reader, Discovery Education United Streaming, and KidBiz to improve students' background knowledge, reading fluency, and comprehension. Students and their families explore a wealth of digital reading instruction resources that are available on-line at our Annual Family Reading Night, including the CT website designed for families.

Katherine Finchy provides Universal Access, Extended Day, Tri-Tier Interventions (RTI), cross-age and peer tutoring, Thinking Maps, and Reciprocal Teaching as supports for students who are struggling in reading. These students are carefully monitored and nurtured so that every child will reach full potential.

3. Mathematics:

Katherine Finchy is in our third year of the PSUSD adoption of Envision Math. This program was selected because of a strong research base and personalized curriculum. It spirals by teaching new information and connecting it to prior knowledge with a persistent focus over time. It is a program that approaches the teaching of math conceptually with procedural skills embedded in each lesson. Our teachers also appreciate that with 130 lessons, they can teach all the state standards before the CST in the spring.

The instructional design includes explicit daily essential understandings, lesson objectives, and a focus on the identified “Big Idea.” These explicit components let the students know the purpose of the lesson from the start which improves lesson retention. Every lesson includes a Daily Spiral Review and Problem of the Day which together provide the distributed practice that leads to improved mastery and maintenance. Students enjoy the opportunities to cooperate with each other and work with manipulatives/games during the Interactive Learning/Universal Access component of the daily lessons. The Visual Learning Bridge Animation is presented using LCD projectors. It helps our visual learners and English Language Learners readily access the curriculum.

One of the secrets of our success in math is relentless progress monitoring. Daily Spiral Reviews, Quick Checks, Topic Tests, and Benchmark Tests all provide opportunities for teachers to track student progress, adapt instruction to reflect the data and assist students in being accountable for their own progress. After assessment, Envision Math prescribes Intervention with Leveled Activities, Leveled Homework and Leveled Digital Resources to give students access to the same content but intensify the instruction based on how much support is required. Our ELLs benefit from the instructional strategies that are in the Universal Access component and the specific EL strategies at the end of every lesson. We have retired education professionals from the community who volunteer to tutor at a 1:1 or 1:2 ratio for students who need extra support.

Teachers also use the strategies that they have developed within the PLC to enhance our student’s mathematical understandings. These strategies include strict daily routines, Thinking Maps, and music related to math patterns. The local casino donates used cards so teachers can help students practice math in an educationally sound, but exciting game format. Additional distributed practice occurs in the students’ homes when they play the games we provide at our popular Annual Family Math Nights.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

At Katherine Finchy, we believe that students must be scientifically literate in order to succeed to maximum potential and meet the rigorous California state academic standards. We recognize the potential for cross-curricular connections between reading, math and science. *California Science* (CS), our PSUSD-adopted curriculum, is aligned with the standards and integrates the investigation and experimentation strand throughout the series. Both directed and independent systematic inquiry activities provide hands-on experiences that allow students to construct scientific concepts. These activities help to prepare our students for the Annual Science Fair, which is a project-based competitive event for students at all grade levels designed to facilitate intensification of understanding in the scientific method. Katherine Finchy is always well represented at district and county levels by our school-wide winners.

Special student populations, such as students with disabilities and ELLs, are addressed in the CS program through the Universal Access component. Leveled Science Readers assist below-level, on-level, and advanced students to access the curriculum. These Readers also feature an audio text feature to support far-below-basic reading level students and ensure concept delivery. The program supports the reading curriculum by reinforcing vocabulary, fluency and building text comprehension. Instruction is modified for ELLs through such strategies as building background knowledge, scaffolded concept development, and vocabulary extensions.

Katherine Finchy students are provided with a variety of supplementary resources to aid in scientific inquiry and discovery. The Harcourt Learning Site allows students to access online versions of Student Editions and Science Content Readers, as well as experience “Science Up Close,” a collection of online simulations and investigations that are aligned with key lesson concepts. Our reading program, *California Treasures*, builds scientific background knowledge with a focus on non-fiction reading selections embedded into the program and are aligned with the CA Science Standards. Science Spectacular Events (SSEs) are created by the grade-level teams. The special education and primary grades’ SSEs include Farm Day, Living Desert Day, and Marine Biology Day. These summative unit celebrations feature live animals, visiting scientists, and a variety of learning experiences. Intermediate grades’ SSEs include a field trips, hikes, guest speakers, and after-dark astronomy activities. For fifth-graders, the pinnacle SSE is a four-day trip to science camp at High Trails Outdoor Science School. Experiments and content at science camp are based on the California State Standards. Student engagement in each SSE is very intense, as each event is carefully planned, well-executed, and highly anticipated.

5. Instructional Methods:

Like the other schools in PSUSD, Katherine Finchy subscribes to the Response to Intervention (RTI) model to assist us in meeting the diverse needs of our student population. This model works hand-in-hand with Data-Driven Instruction and encapsulates the core instructional practices as well as the differentiation that must be provided to support student achievement.

The foundation of our pyramid (Tier One) consists of delivering our systematic, explicit and research-based core curriculum with fidelity and differentiation within the regular classroom during universal access (UA) time. Our teachers implement the UA time daily, pulling flexible small groups of students to address their needs while the rest of the class works independently on meaningful educational activities.

Tier Two support is flexible and provided daily at every grade level by reorganizing students to address specific needs. General education teachers design and administer formative assessments, mine the data collaboratively, and adjust the program as needed. Additional support staff such as our RSP teacher and aide, speech therapist, Reading Focus Teacher, and bi-lingual paraprofessionals who are specifically trained to assist in curriculum delivery are carefully scheduled for maximum benefit to this strategic cluster.

Most of our Tier Three interventions are implemented by our RSP teacher and aide and are designed as temporary pull-out or push-in programs within the regular general education classroom. Many of these students are identified as special education students and have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). Students who have not been formally identified are also provided with these interventions. Progress is frequently monitored and all groups are fluid allowing us to target interventions on specific student needs.

English Language Learners are regrouped daily for English Language Development. We focus on helping this group to access the curriculum by employing research-based teaching strategies such as Enhanced Thinking Maps; Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE); identifying similarities and differences; providing outlines with partially completed notes; leveled questioning, sentence frames and language objectives, reinforcing effort and providing recognition; nonlinguistic representations; cooperative learning groups; setting objectives and providing feedback; generating and testing hypotheses; and Reciprocal Teaching. Although we primarily use these strategies to target our ELL population, all students benefit from these effective research-based strategies.

We are also cognizant of meeting the needs of those who are achieving above standard. Identified GATE students are clustered in classrooms with GATE certified teachers who use depth and complexity to expand and extend the curriculum.

6. Professional Development:

Professional development is a priority at Katherine Finchy. An evolution in our approach to professional development has occurred over the past three years. In the past, much of our school's professional development was provided by an outside consulting firm. A representative was assigned to our school and taught professional development largely based on Marzano strategies. Engagement was lukewarm.

Three years ago, we began to create a more in-house form of professional development. In this model the experience and wisdom of the teachers are utilized to teach each other and learn together. Grade levels were organized into instructional data analysis teams. Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) leaders were selected. Our Professional Learning Community (PLC) was born.

PSUSD provided data analysis and protocol training for our ILT leaders. These leaders came back to the school and trained the staff. As with any growth spurt, there were growing pains, but PSUSD and our principal provided support with specific, high expectations for our success. The staff transcended the pain and found the growth.

Our PLC accomplishments have included collaborating to select 18 Essential Standards at each grade level; to create common assessments; to identify areas of strength and obstacles to success. We created a spirit of action-orientation and experimentation in our search for ways to overcome the identified obstacles. Using the SMART goal protocol created collaboratively by ILTs from all schools in the PSUSD, we are oriented for results and continually striving for mastery of Essential Standards.

Our Instructional Leadership Team guides our professional development system. For example, this year as we looked to determine the most effective manner to meet at least 80% of student needs within the Tier I intervention, professional development was organized around effective strategies for organizing Universal Access. Some of the other in-house and on-site trainings have included Applied Behavioral Analysis by our school psychologist and technology training for Envision Math and United Streaming by two of our tech-savvy teachers.

PSUSD has supported our PLC's drive for excellence in math and language arts. They have provided two math experts for content-deepening lessons, daily math routines and game-based strategy trainings. Additionally, English Language Professional Development (ELPD) was offered for eight consecutive Saturdays. Recently, the district has lent us an expert on creating and using Language Objectives in every subject to aid language acquisition for our ELL population.

7. School Leadership:

As a Professional Learning Community, school leadership at Katherine Finchy is a shared responsibility. Parents, students, school staff members, and district personnel have a voice in the specific goals and programs focused on improving student achievement.

Each grade level team (GLT) has an Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) representative. These representatives meet biweekly with the principal to report on successes and challenges faced by their respective grade levels. The principal often asks them to return to their GLTs and survey opinions on policies that affect the entire school. The ILT writes reports of their findings to the principal. By using this system, he gets the feedback he needs from the staff to make important decisions, and valuable time in staff and professional development meetings is not sacrificed, but used to focus on student achievement. The ILT representatives also receive training on data analysis and teaching strategies. Then, the ILT rep is responsible to propagate the training within his GLT.

Parents are also encouraged to take on leadership roles such as serving as members of our School Site Council (SSC), English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC), or the Parent-Teacher Organization

(KFPTO). The SSC works collaboratively to create and revise the Single Plan for Student Achievement which allocates resources based on improving student achievement.

Our principal holds high academic and behavioral expectations for all 650 students. He is able to articulate his belief that providing a safe and orderly scholastic environment is an essential foundation for exceptional student achievement. His vision is that the Katherine Finchy Falcons are a learning team; all stakeholders in the system including administration, staff, parents and students contribute to the school climate and spirit of cohesion that are so essential to positive student outcomes. He promotes a spirit of cohesion through clear expectations for staff and students, effective communication, and continuous monitoring. Our principal maintains high visibility at the school. Before and after school, he greets students and parents in the parking lot. At lunch, recess, and other transition times, he is constantly monitoring. Teachers appreciate his high level of visibility and frequent feedback, both in the common areas of the school and in their classrooms.

The Professional Learning Community at Katherine Finchy is effective because all members of the community are proud to share the same goals of building a positive school environment and improving school achievement.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	79	74	64	47	62
Advanced	51	42	39	19	28
Number of students tested	102	114	100	113	94
Percent of total students tested	96	100	99	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	0	1	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	4	0	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	74	66	57	34	46
Advanced	42	31	30	10	12
Number of students tested	71	74	70	59	50
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced		67		14	
Advanced		40		7	
Number of students tested		15		14	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	68	70	53	42	50
Advanced	37	29	25	8	14
Number of students tested	51	56	57	50	44
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced				0	
Advanced				18	
Number of students tested				11	
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	63	65	53	30	47
Advanced	37	30	24	12	6
Number of students tested	35	46	45	34	34
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	89	80	76	66	76
Advanced	66	57	72	34	47
Number of students tested	35	35	25	41	38
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 2 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	67	56	54	40	44
Advanced	34	26	20	11	22
Number of students tested	102	114	100	113	95
Percent of total students tested	96	100	99	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	0	1	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	4	0	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	59	52	46	27	26
Advanced	27	22	13	3	8
Number of students tested	71	74	70	59	50
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced		54		28	
Advanced		27		7	
Number of students tested		15		14	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	53	41	35	30	31
Advanced	20	11	9	2	11
Number of students tested	51	56	57	50	45
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced				27	
Advanced				9	
Number of students tested				11	
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	48	46	36	35	24
Advanced	17	13	7	3	6
Number of students tested	35	46	45	34	34
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	86	75	80	54	63
Advanced	49	46	44	22	37
Number of students tested	35	35	25	41	38
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	78	73	59	50	60
Advanced	41	47	32	26	30
Number of students tested	128	89	109	96	106
Percent of total students tested	100	97	96	97	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	3	4	3	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	3	4	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	71	71	53	34	43
Advanced	31	38	24	18	13
Number of students tested	86	61	63	49	47
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	60		40		
Advanced	40		33		
Number of students tested	15		15		
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	74	61	55	41	49
Advanced	30	35	15	18	14
Number of students tested	61	46	47	44	43
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	0			10	
Advanced	0			0	
Number of students tested	0			10	
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	69	46	50	31	38
Advanced	16	15	5	14	13
Number of students tested	38	26	22	29	24
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	85	91	75	58	73
Advanced	52	78	50	35	45
Number of students tested	42	23	37	40	47
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	43	45	41	33	53
Advanced	23	17	14	11	13
Number of students tested	127	90	108	96	106
Percent of total students tested	99	98	96	97	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	2	5	3	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	2	4	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	32	38	32	14	38
Advanced	16	10	5	4	4
Number of students tested	85	61	63	49	47
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	33		26		
Advanced	20		13		
Number of students tested	15		15		
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	24	28	23	23	44
Advanced	12	4	2	7	9
Number of students tested	60	46	47	44	43
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced				10	
Advanced				0	
Number of students tested				10	
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	11	8	14	10	25
Advanced	0	0	0	10	4
Number of students tested	37	26	22	29	24
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	67	75	67	45	62
Advanced	36	33	28	15	17
Number of students tested	42	24	36	40	47
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	80	65	55	49	45
Advanced	58	39	26	23	20
Number of students tested	85	106	98	103	118
Percent of total students tested	97	93	91	94	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	6	10	7	2
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	5	9	6	2
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	76	60	34	25	30
Advanced	47	34	15	11	10
Number of students tested	58	68	53	44	60
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced		38	30		42
Advanced		38	0		17
Number of students tested		13	10		12
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	75	64	46	36	32
Advanced	47	29	20	16	11
Number of students tested	43	48	46	44	47
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced				10	23
Advanced				0	8
Number of students tested				10	13
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	62	40	29	31	24
Advanced	29	27	5	12	6
Number of students tested	21	15	21	26	34
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	91	73	69	60	58
Advanced	74	49	37	27	29
Number of students tested	23	37	38	45	52
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	67	65	47	48	52
Advanced	42	28	27	26	25
Number of students tested	85	102	97	103	121
Percent of total students tested	97	90	90	94	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	10	11	7	2
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	9	10	6	2
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	58	58	24	18	33
Advanced	32	22	11	7	8
Number of students tested	57	67	54	44	61
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced		46	10		23
Advanced		23	0		8
Number of students tested		13	10		13
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	52	51	35	34	31
Advanced	26	13	20	16	10
Number of students tested	42	47	46	44	49
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced				0	15
Advanced				0	0
Number of students tested				10	13
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	29	27	14	16	23
Advanced	5	0	5	4	3
Number of students tested	21	15	22	26	36
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	92	86	71	63	73
Advanced	67	46	41	36	40
Number of students tested	24	35	37	45	52
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	72	69	64	46	39
Advanced	50	35	26	17	23
Number of students tested	106	96	100	118	109
Percent of total students tested	96	91	95	98	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	9	5	3	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	4	9	5	2	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	64	60	54	32	29
Advanced	45	25	18	5	8
Number of students tested	73	51	50	63	52
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	53	67		21	18
Advanced	40	17		0	9
Number of students tested	15	12		14	11
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	64	67	59	31	24
Advanced	38	30	20	13	7
Number of students tested	53	43	46	45	42
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced				35	0
Advanced				14	0
Number of students tested				14	10
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	46	71	55	22	24
Advanced	33	12	11	6	4
Number of students tested	15	17	18	32	25
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	89	70	78	65	49
Advanced	68	46	27	24	40
Number of students tested	34	37	37	51	43
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: California Standards Test

Edition/Publication Year: Updated Publisher: Educational Testing Services

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	70	51	49	43	45
Advanced	24	20	16	12	14
Number of students tested	102	93	100	118	109
Percent of total students tested	93	89	95	98	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	12	5	3	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	7	11	5	2	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	64	32	38	22	24
Advanced	18	10	10	5	2
Number of students tested	72	51	50	63	52
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	60	8		14	36
Advanced	27	0		0	0
Number of students tested	15	12		14	11
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	62	46	39	25	17
Advanced	10	12	13	7	2
Number of students tested	52	41	46	45	42
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced				14	10
Advanced				0	0
Number of students tested				14	10
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	27	13	17	16	4
Advanced	0	0	0	3	0
Number of students tested	15	16	18	32	25
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	85	72	59	65	60
Advanced	41	33	16	18	23
Number of students tested	32	36	37	51	43
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 0

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	77	70	60	48	51
Advanced	49	41	31	21	25
Number of students tested	421	405	406	430	427
Percent of total students tested	97	95	95	97	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	12	18	20	13	3
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	4	5	3	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	71	65	50	32	36
Advanced	41	32	23	11	11
Number of students tested	288	255	236	215	209
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	65	63	39	23	33
Advanced	42	33	17	9	13
Number of students tested	48	49	41	43	39
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	70	66	53	38	39
Advanced	37	31	20	14	11
Number of students tested	208	193	196	183	176
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	77	58	29	20	21
Advanced	36	26	10	9	11
Number of students tested	22	19	21	45	38
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	62	58	48	28	33
Advanced	28	23	14	11	7
Number of students tested	109	104	106	121	117
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	88	77	74	62	63
Advanced	63	55	44	29	39
Number of students tested	134	132	137	177	180
NOTES:					

11CA22

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 0

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient plus Advanced	60	55	47	41	49
Advanced	30	23	19	15	19
Number of students tested	416	399	405	430	431
Percent of total students tested	96	94	95	97	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	17	24	22	13	3
Percent of students alternatively assessed	4	6	5	3	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	52	46	35	21	30
Advanced	23	17	10	5	6
Number of students tested	285	254	237	215	210
2. African American Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	50	39	32	21	28
Advanced	29	16	5	5	5
Number of students tested	48	49	41	43	40
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	46	42	33	28	31
Advanced	16	10	11	8	9
Number of students tested	205	190	196	183	179
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	41	31	11	13	18
Advanced	18	15	0	2	5
Number of students tested	17	13	18	45	39
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient plus Advanced	29	28	23	20	20
Advanced	7	6	4	5	4
Number of students tested	108	103	107	121	119
6. White					
Proficient plus Advanced	81	77	68	57	65
Advanced	46	40	31	23	29
Number of students tested	133	130	135	177	180
NOTES:					

11CA22