

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

11PV64

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

11PV64

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT

Questions 1 and 2 are for Public Schools only.

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

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

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	0	0	0		6	0	0	0
K	21	16	37		7	0	0	0
1	17	24	41		8	0	0	0
2	21	18	39		9	0	0	0
3	18	19	37		10	0	0	0
4	28	21	49		11	0	0	0
5	35	23	58		12	0	0	0
Total in Applying School:								261

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
6 % Asian
2 % Black or African American
5 % Hispanic or Latino
1 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
83 % 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: 3%
 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.	4
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.	5
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	9
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2009	264
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.03
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	3

8. Percent limited English proficient students in the school: 0%
 Total number of limited English proficient students in the school: 0
 Number of languages represented, not including English: 0
 Specify languages:

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 1%
 Total number of students who qualify: 2

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.

As a private school, we do not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program. We extracted this data from our financial aid recipients.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 6%
 Total number of students served: 16

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

<u>1</u> Autism	<u>1</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>0</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>15</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>2</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>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>14</u>	<u>2</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Support staff	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>37</u>	<u>2</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: 17:1

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	97%	95%	96%	95%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	4%	8%	8%	4%	8%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

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:	_____
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____ %
Enrolled in a community college	_____ %
Enrolled in vocational training	_____ %
Found employment	_____ %
Military service	_____ %
Other	_____ %
Total	_____ 0%

For more than three decades, Santa Fe Christian Schools has enjoyed tremendous success. From our humble beginnings as a campus that emerged from a renovated hotel, Santa Fe Christian Schools has continued to grow, refine, and improve over the past 33 years. Many institutions, like Santa Fe Christian Schools, have struggled with the idea that Christian schools must either focus on the pursuit of Christ or on the pursuit of academics in order to be competitive in the world. We not only believe that it is possible to raise young men and women who are both strong in their faith and excel academically, we believe the two are mutually reinforcing. Families that choose to attend Santa Fe Christian Schools do not have to concede strong academic training in order to receive a superb Christian school experience. Although it has not always been easy, the constant quest of excellence has helped forge and shape Santa Fe Christian Schools into a remarkable organization with a strong Christian community and a distinct mission: The mission of Santa Fe Christian Schools is to partner with Christian parents within a Bible-based community in order to disciple students to embrace biblical truth, strive for academic excellence, and model Christ-like leadership to influence their homes, churches, and communities for Christ.

Santa Fe Christian Schools is made up of four schools on two different campuses. Each school has its own administrator, but all four have one board and one Head of School's oversight. The distinctive goal of Santa Fe Christian Lower School is to use the curriculum as a means to help students grow in their expression and understanding of a Christian worldview and in their knowledge of God. Our desire is to train the whole child – academically, emotionally, socially, physically, and spiritually- so that he will become a Godly example in his community. We expect each student to achieve beyond their perceived potential by applying academic and spiritual discipline and training.

The main campus sits on 17.5 acres of land in Solana Beach, California, overlooking the Pacific Ocean. Starting out as a resort-style hotel, the property later transitioned into a military academy; then, although slated to be a housing development, it was purchased by a man who envisioned a school that could serve Christian families in north San Diego County. Christian Unified Schools of San Diego (CUSSD) established Santa Fe Christian Schools in 1977. In 1985, SFCS became a separate entity from CUSSD and has operated independently ever since.

One of the unique strengths of Santa Fe Christian is that we are an “independent” Christian school. Unlike most Christian schools in our region that are tied to one specific church, Santa Fe Christian brings together more than 70 Christian churches from throughout San Diego County, all sharing a common set of core beliefs, to form a united body of believers. The result is an incredibly rich and well rounded community that is dedicated to raising godly young men and women to serve our Lord Jesus Christ. Santa Fe Christian is not the church, but rather a school focused on providing students the very best Christian education by partnering with families and churches. Santa Fe Christian, or SFC, represents a dynamic partnership between the School, Family, and Church – each charged with a unique and very specific responsibility. As a community, we have strong and established relationships with churches and pastors that reach out into nearly every corner of San Diego County. Through these relationships, Santa Fe Christian is able to provide our students and families with an unequaled richness and depth of opportunities.

A true strength of SFC Lower School is the talented and dedicated faculty and staff. Our highly qualified teachers and staff work seamlessly to ensure that we are all working toward achieving our mission. Our many active parent volunteers are another essential ingredient in our success. As our mission statement reads, we truly “partner with Christian parents” to help raise Christian leaders of tomorrow.

1. Assessment Results:

Stanford Achievement Test 10th Edition is one of the data points used as the school's measure of academic success. Over the past five years, the students at SFC Lower School have made consistent progress, performing well above the national norm. Our average K-5 national percentile ranking in reading has climbed steadily, from 82 percentile in 2006 to 86 percentile in 2010. Likewise, our math scores have improved incrementally as well, from K-5 national percentile average of 86 to the 89th percentile average in 2010. The significance of this data is the fact that the school has also undergone tremendous changes in the past five years, both in leadership and in structure. It was imperative that the school maintain its high standards for student performance, uphold all admissions criteria during a recession, and continue as an exceptional school in a highly competitive private school community.

One issue the school has wrestled with for many years was how to help our students with diagnosed learning differences. In 2006, Santa Fe Christian Middle and Upper School added to their course offerings, an Academic Support Program. This class, led by a teacher with a special education degree and credential, is designed to help our students with specific learning disabilities. In 2007, the Board of Directors approved the Lower School to start the Academic Support Program. With the team working quickly, researching and identifying our needs and how to meet these needs, the program quickly filled up during the 2008-2009 school year, and by 2009-2010, we were ready to disaggregate the scores of students who are clinically identified as having a learning difference and who receive accommodations in their school work, including being tested in a different setting. Of the 51 fourth graders tested in the spring of 2010, eight scores were disaggregated. Of the 58 fifth graders, seven were disaggregated. Because we had fewer than ten students per grade level disaggregated, these scores are not reported.

In addition to the SAT-10, we also use DRA (Scholastic's Developmental Reading Assessment) scores to monitor students' reading progress, as well as fluency assessments. These assessments are conducted four times a year. The first one is done during the first few weeks of school to obtain a benchmark score for each student. The following three sets of assessments are taken prior to the trimester reporting date. Based on these scores, K-2 students are placed in one of four guided reading groups. Working collaboratively with the literacy specialist, the classroom teachers conduct small group instructions to meet the needs of the varied learners in their classrooms. Our final trimester report for 2009-2010 school year, indicate that 100% of our students in grades K-2 met the grade level DRA benchmark, and 90% (103 out of 113 students) of our students scored above grade level (based on Fountas and Pinnell DRA benchmark scores).

For students in grades one (starting in trimester 2) through five, a reading fluency assessment is also conducted. These assessments are conducted manually using *Read Naturally's* material. Parent volunteers are trained at each grade level. The same volunteer assesses all the students in the same grade level. No volunteer may assess students in the same grade as their own child. At the end of trimester one of the 2010-2011 school year, 73 percent of our students were at or above the 75th percentile mark (based on the scores provided by Hasbrouck-Tindal table).

2. Using Assessment Results:

The SAT-10, DRA, and fluency scores are used in various ways to improve and direct our instruction for individual students as well as grade level and whole school. The SAT-10 provides us with the yearly progress report of how we are meeting our goals. Our steady growth in the past five years proves that our curricular changes are meeting the needs of our students. It is noticed that regardless of personnel changes and improved teaching practices, our scores in the third grade, especially in reading, are not as strong as those of other grades. Though our third grade still exceeds the mean scale score at the 85th percentile of National School norms, as well as the student percentile equivalent for the 85th school percentile, when

compared with our other grades, third grade falls short year after year. The same students then pick up their scores the following school year. Prior to the 2009-2010 school year, we had three third grade classes. Due to the recession, we consolidated and only offered two sections of third grade. During this time, faculty changes also occurred. Regardless of these changes, the scores remained consistent- lower than other grade levels. (It should be noted that during the 2008-2009 school year, we consolidated our fourth and fifth grade classes from four to three sections of each grade level. The scores, however, remained consistent during this year.) We began our plan of action to help remedy this issue. The Lower School Curriculum Council (made up of 7 faculty members to represent seven curricular strands) decided that we shift our resources to provide the third grade classroom teachers with additional support in order to conduct guided reading groups as in K-2 grades. Due to limited resources for these reading levels, our teachers used creative means - purchasing books from EBay, using book club points, downloading resources from the internet – to acquire the materials necessary to conduct leveled groups in this grade level. With the Board of Director’s approval, we will be purchasing a new third grade reading series for the next school year. With the added personnel support and the new designated material, as well as faculty training, our hope is to increase our reading scores in the third grade.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

There are several assessment scores that are communicated to the parent body. The DRA and fluency assessment scores are sent home three times a year with the trimester report cards. Since we conduct two parent-teacher conferences a year, these scores are also shared with the parents as we make individual goals for our students during these conferences. When reporting DRA scores to our families, we do not assess our students above one grade level. As most of our students score above their given grade level in primary reading, we are cautious about how we report these scores. Though our scores are strong, we are also highly cognizant of the dangers in pushing students too fast. We firmly believe these early years in education are critical for providing students with a solid phonics education, as well as developing fundamental reading comprehension skills. When pushed too fast, students can often have holes in their learning. For this reason, we do not test beyond one grade level for our students. We encourage parents to choose “just right books” for their student, considering both appropriate skill level and content interest.

Typically, we receive our SAT-10 scores before the last week of school in May. Once we receive our scores, the principal provides a summary letter for the parent community, which is included in the mail with the individual student’s score sheet. The parents are encouraged to contact the principal to review the individual student’s scores, if desired. If the scores are in before the end-of-the-year Town Hall meeting, then the Lower School principal includes the summary results of the test scores in her presentation to the whole school community.

The teachers review individual student’s scores as well as their class report. If the scores have not significantly changed for the whole, we continue with the pursuit of meeting our set learning objectives. If, however, a significant change has occurred or an improvement is necessary, the team meets with the principal to design curriculum and teaching practices to meet these identified needs, as in the example of third grade reading.

4. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Though the SAT-10 scores did not prompt us to review our math program, as a school community we identified this as an area of needed improvement. When our test scores proved to show steady improvements in math, and word quickly got out around our community that Santa Fe Christian Schools is using Singapore Math curriculum, the school began receiving phone calls from other schools wanting to know more about this program. Every school who inquired about our progress was provided with a personal phone call or face-to-face meeting to answer any question they had regarding our new math curriculum. During our teacher training, local schools were invited to join us for the in-service to help with the cost. One school responded, a Christian school in San Diego County. Teachers of this school were invited to join our training at no cost to them. They reciprocated this gesture by inviting us to their future in-services. Our teachers have emailed occasionally to share with them and they have helped us, in

return, to answer questions about ways to implement the Singapore math program in SFC's Middle School.

Our literacy program is another successful program that is often inquired about by other ACSI schools. Teachers from various schools have come on campus to observe our program. We have also provided these schools the information necessary for them to start their own literacy program, acting as their consultant. During San Diego County's most recent ACSI regional district meeting, the Lower School principal had the opportunity to share with other administrators about how our literacy program is set up, how to train the many parent volunteers, and how to obtain needed materials with a constraint budget.

1. Curriculum:

Quality instruction at Santa Fe Christian Schools starts with a well defined curriculum that is structured and appropriately sequenced. This provides students in the Lower School with the strong foundation necessary for success in the curriculum at our Middle and Upper Schools. All K-5 students are instructed in Bible, language arts, math, science, social studies, technology, PE, visual and performing arts, and Spanish. Bible is a core curriculum at SFCS. As students in the primary grades learn the basic stories of the Bible, the older students are taught to apply these biblical principles to their daily lives. In 4th grade, *The Young Peacemakers* program is taught to help students with conflict resolutions.

Open Court is the main curriculum used in the primary grades, along with guided reading materials (see # 2.) Writing is taught through the various genres as students meet the necessary benchmark standards. Every student in grades K-5 builds and compiles a writing portfolio, a collection of their work.

Our philosophy in mathematics education is that students enter school with a great deal of informal and intuitive knowledge to help build their understanding of formal mathematics concepts. When students are encouraged to think of additional strategies to solve problems, they are able to solidify their understanding of mathematical concepts. *Singapore Math* series is used in grades K-5. This program offers students multiple strategies to solving problems, not just the one “formula.” Students are often asked to solve a word problem before doing a series of computation problems. The problem type is altered for those students needing additional challenges as well as remediation.

The primary textbook used in the lower school for social studies instruction is the Scott Foresman series. Because this is a secular textbook, teachers supplement their instruction with various other resources to include the Christian worldview. In the primary grades, as students begin to broaden their sense of “place,” our social studies curriculum gives them insights into their communities and helps them make connections to the larger world. Various lesson formats allow students to explore the geographic, social and economic aspects of their world. Younger students are introduced to real families and events in other times and places through integrated literature selections and testimonies of famous Christians. As children reach the upper grades, they are introduced to more complicated concepts, such as why wars were necessary, and deepen their study of American history from the first appearance of the Native Indians to the Revolutionary War, Westward Expansion, and the Civil War.

Our science program is enhanced with the science lab specifically designed to meet the needs of the lower school students (see #4.) Harcourt Science series is used in all grades, 1-5, as well as supplemental materials. Instructional design is carefully mapped out to meet the needs of the visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and other learners in the classroom. Students are often paired or clustered to work out a given problem.

Visual and Performing Arts is a year-long program for all the students in grades K-5. The students have opportunities to analyze different styles of music, read and play basic notation and rhythmic patterns, and explore the similarities and differences in various cultural works. Most importantly, music is valued and presented as a wonderful tool in the expression of worship and praise. SFC Lower School’s studio art program is a recently added program, currently in its third year. The program has flourished as students are taught an array of art media. At the conclusion of the school year, we celebrate with our students entering over 100 pieces of art work at the local fair, as well as holding our own culminating art show for the Santa Fe community.

Every student takes PE 2-3 times a week, depending on the grade level. Our curriculum teaches by skill themes. Kindergarten through second grades’ physical education is based on a developmental program that emphasizes locomotor, non-locomotor, body management, manipulative, and rhythmic movement

skills. Basic skills are practiced and are used in game-like activities. PE in third through fifth grades develops life-long skills incorporating fitness, health, and safety. Lead-up activities are used to learn the skills necessary for team sports. In second grade, nutrition is added to the curriculum as students learn about the various food groups as well as the habits of healthy living. These topics are revisited in science during our “Human Body” unit in grade five.

In the school year 2010-2011, the Lower School added Spanish to our already comprehensive program for students in grades K-5. The goal of the SFC Lower School Spanish curriculum is two-fold: language and cultural appreciation and basic language skills acquisition.

2. Reading/English:

The reading and language arts curriculum begins in kindergarten. Open Court reading series is used in the primary grades and is supplemented by guided reading materials. The Open Court series was chosen for its strong phonics program. In the intermediate grades, novel studies are primarily used with full literary circles in fifth grade. Shared reading and guided reading activities provide students with an opportunity to understand story elements, follow the sequence of a story, and develop a sight vocabulary. As early as kindergarten, students are taught reading strategies to develop their ability to problem solve and connect to the text for meaning. Book Talks – Reciprocal Teaching is taught in order for students to take ownership of their reading and to become “thinking readers”. They meaningfully engage in independent book discussions, following the process of predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing both fiction and non-fiction materials. Students also peer-edit as their reading and writing abilities strengthens.

In kindergarten, the “Letter of the Week” curriculum introduces students to a new letter each week, providing ample opportunities to grasp the formation of the letter as well as the sound it makes within the context of a word. Open Court series is used in kindergarten, as phonics instruction is an imperative part of the reading program. The literacy specialist works with every student in kindergarten, assessing them and grouping the students in their leveled reading groups.

In first and second grades, the Open Court series becomes an even more integral part of the reading and language arts program. Students continue to experience shared and guided reading, developing an even greater understanding of story elements and story sequence. Reading groups continue based on the DRA scores.

In grades 3-5, the reading program provides students with a balanced and well-rounded exposure to age appropriate literature, rich language experiences, and sequential skill instruction in reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. The novels are leveled for the wide range of reading abilities. The curriculum evolves from a phonetic base and slowly develops from the essential areas of decoding to progressively more complex levels of comprehension and critical thinking.

3. Mathematics:

During our 2007 accreditation/self-study process with WASC and ACSI, Santa Fe Christian Lower School identified its math program as an area needing improvement. Though our test scores did not indicate the need to overhaul our program, as a faculty we felt the need to change the way we taught math. We gained greater understanding through a two-year professional development training, dealing with the cognitive development of children in the elementary age range. The CGI (Cognitively Guided Instruction) is a methodology course. It’s not a curriculum, but helps guide the teachers to properly assess the cognitive level of each student’s understanding of the various concepts in math. Each year, our training consisted of 3 full days and 5 half days of training dispersed throughout the school year. The strength of our faculty can be illustrated by the very fact that teachers were not compensated for these training days, yet they voluntarily attended the weekend workshops.

Once we were trained through the CGI method, we needed to change our curriculum. Without this change, it made it too easy for everyone to revert to their “old ways.” Dr. Tom Bennett, our Head of

Schools, recommended the Singapore Math program. He had been part of the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), an international comparative study on 60 nations and how these nations perform in math and science in grades four and eight. As a tenured full professor of mathematics at California State University, San Marcos, as well as having served as the Vice-President of CSUSM, Dr. Bennett provided us the needed training, as well as the research background. Singapore Math was adopted by the Lower School and we began our instruction, K-5, 2008-2009 school year. Currently in our third year of this new curriculum, and our fourth year of implementing CGI methodology in teaching mathematics, we are reaping the fruits of these changes as our test scores indicate a gradual growth.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

During the summer of 2008, the Lower School received an unexpected “face-lift” of our buildings by the parent community. In just 45 days, the LS buildings were stripped down to studs and refinished, fully equipped with the necessary technology to bring us current. During this remodel, we gained a designated Lower School science lab. The lab is taught by a part-time teacher, who, with the support of a consultant and colleagues, created this program from scratch. The lab teacher and the classroom teachers work closely together to ensure that they are synced. Classroom teachers teach content and provide the necessary information for the students. Once they come to the lab, students are provided the hands-on experiments to see science come alive. Every student, K-5, visits the lab every other week. The labs are designed to not only meet the state standards for science, but to provide our students experiences that are above and beyond what one can do in the classroom. Every student at every grade level is exposed to a dissection lab as well as is taught the scientific process through the bi-monthly lab experiments.

We strive to train critical thinkers who investigate beyond the obvious, who are quality contributors, and who use biblical discernment and standards in all areas of inquiry and achievement. The lessons learned in the science lab truly exemplify who we are as a school. During the lab, students are required to utilize new knowledge to problem solve and think critically, to differentiate between fact and opinion, and are expected to analyze, integrate, and synthesize this newly gained knowledge. They are also expected to discern and extract biblical truth in the study of science.

5. Instructional Methods:

The only identified subgroup we have at SFC Lower School is the Academic Support Program. Though every teacher differentiates his/her instruction to meet the varied needs of his/her students, in order to receive more significant accommodations, such as getting extended time on tests or use technology for all written assignments, the student must be enrolled in this fee-based program called Academic Support Program. In order to participate in the program, a full-battery academic psychological assessment must be administered, either by a private child psychologist or through the IEP process with the local public school. Once the assessment results are in, the teaching team, with the parents, meets to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses and write out the accommodation plans. These plans are monitored by the Academic Support Specialist and are updated and communicated to parents about the updates on a trimester basis.

Depending on the grade level and the needs of the individual students, students are either pulled out for a one-on-one session or are pulled as a group, usually 2-3 students. Students either receive the same lesson presented in the classroom, in a smaller setting and in smaller increments, or they are specifically working on a skill, such as skills to strengthen auditory processing. Students with reading related disabilities, such as dyslexia, are provided not only extended time, but are, at times, provided opportunities to take oral tests. In the 5th grade, we have an academic probation policy in place. Students who earn two grades below a C- are placed on Academic Probation and must bring these grades up by the following reporting period in order to be invited back to the school. If a student with a diagnosed learning need is placed on Academic Probation, it is after they have received all the accommodations necessary to be successful.

Differentiated instruction is also provided for the rest of our students, daily. All of our students in grades K-2 are assessed three times a year, using the DRA measure of reading, to properly place them in their leveled reading groups. Reading instruction is taught through the use of these fluid groupings to meet the reading skill needs of our students. For mathematics instruction, we do not use a specific curriculum to provide differentiation for these students, but rather challenge them by changing the problem types to increase the level of difficulty for students ready for deeper understanding. Recognizing that students go through various stages of cognition when learning new concepts, our teachers are trained to identify these stages in order to meet the needs of their students.

6. Professional Development:

The SFC Lower School has had several exemplary and focused professional development opportunities. As described in question three, the CGI methods course was the catalyst for how we designed future professional developments. Instead of the one-time trainings where experts are invited to speak on a given topic, and once they leave everyone goes back to their old ways of thinking and teaching, we invested in a series of trainings, spaced out, with opportunities for teachers to team plan. The teachers also received model lessons by our PD presenter. She taught several lessons in various classrooms and teachers were released to observe the trainer teach their own students. The trainer assigned “homework” for the teachers and we shared our experiences with one another on a regular basis. The greatest change happened in the classrooms. Students began taking risks, especially with word problems in math. After two years, our current second graders, who had only this style of teaching, are competent problem solvers.

With the success of the math training, we used this method for our writing training sessions. The training was dispersed throughout the school year to provide teachers the opportunity to practice what they were just taught. Planning sessions were also incorporated at the end of the school year to summarize and document our learning. With the consistent trainer, the continuity was a definite benefit. With the writing curriculum, we had many struggles. Using a rubric to score writing was a definite benefit to students, teachers, and parents alike, provided that the rubric was well created. Converting the rubric into a letter grade was not as easy. An opportunity for the various grade levels to iron out grade specific concerns were provided and with the consultants there to answer our questions, the faculty created a cohesive program that met the unique needs of our students and community.

7. School Leadership:

The leadership (Cabinet) of Santa Fe Christian Schools consists of the Head of Schools, four division principals (preschool, Lower School, Middle School, Upper School), the CEO, and the Directors of Admissions, Development, Athletics, Facilities and Technology. The eleven-member board of directors is responsible for overseeing school policy, operations, finances, development, and growth. Each division principals are heads of their own schools as they have oversight of curriculum, faculty and instruction, as well as maintain and manage the department’s budget.

In the Lower School, the principal created a Curriculum Council, made up of seven Lower School faculty members and the principal. These council members represent all the grade levels in the Lower School as well as oversee specific subject matters. In following the shared leadership model of the cabinet structure, the Lower School Curriculum Council advises and recommends curricular decisions as well as provides a forum for open discussions about any concerns or even innovation ideas to the principal. This model ensures transparency in all decision making process.

In the spring of 2009, the Board of Directors set a clear vision for the direction of the school and officially charged the Head of Schools to lead Santa Fe Christian through a comprehensive strategic planning effort. A Strategic Planning Task Force, consisting of representation from all stakeholders of the school, was created to oversee the planning process and to help represent and engage the various constituencies of the campus community. After months of small group discussions and research, as well as conducting surveys, the task force identified seven pillars and goals for the school. In the fall of 2009 the Board of Directors

approved the seven pillar and goal statements: Spiritual Development, Academic Excellence, Christ-Like Leadership, Student Engagement, Stewardship, Godly Relationships, and Governance.

Led by the Lower School principal and Curriculum Council, the Lower School developed our own objective statements and specific action items to help us achieve the identified goals under each pillars. The Board of Directors officially approved our strategic plan and priorities for funding in October of 2010. Each action items proposed are linked with measurable goals with timeline. With this plan, we have already been approved to improve our current music program, an area we identified needing better articulation as well as innovation. In the fall of 2011, we will be implementing the Yamaha Music in Education program, a technology based keyboarding program, for all the students in the Lower School. This program is well aligned, philosophically as well as technically, with our current music program in the Middle and Upper School as most of our students matriculate on to our Middle and Upper School.

PART VI - PRIVATE SCHOOL ADDENDUM

11PV64

1. Private school association: Other Christian

2. Does the school have nonprofit, tax-exempt (501(c)(3) status? Yes

3. What are the 2009-2010 tuition rates, by grade? (Do not include room, board, or fees.)

<u>\$10982</u>	<u>\$10982</u>	<u>\$10982</u>	<u>\$10982</u>	<u>\$10982</u>	<u>\$10982</u>
K	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>
6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th
<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>				
12th	Other				

4. What is the educational cost per student? (School budget divided by enrollment) \$10488

5. What is the average financial aid per student? \$4485

6. What percentage of the annual budget is devoted to scholarship assistance and/or tuition reduction?
12%

7. What percentage of the student body receives scholarship assistance, including tuition reduction? 29%

Bottom of Form

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 1 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
 Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	600	577	571	568	569
Number of students tested	38	40	41	53	51
Percent of total students tested	95	100	98	96	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 1 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	617	606	595	605	588
Number of students tested	38	39	40	53	49
Percent of total students tested	95	98	95	96	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 2 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	643	632	619	621	622
Number of students tested	36	40	53	42	54
Percent of total students tested	100	95	100	89	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 2 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	642	640	652	635	637
Number of students tested	36	40	53	42	54
Percent of total students tested	100	95	100	89	96
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	650	655	638	638	648
Number of students tested	39	48	46	59	58
Percent of total students tested	91	98	94	98	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	9	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	651	651	647	649	655
Number of students tested	39	48	46	57	58
Percent of total students tested	91	98	94	95	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	9	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	679	666	662	662	661
Number of students tested	42	57	61	67	65
Percent of total students tested	82	92	95	98	94
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	15	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	683	669	673	677	675
Number of students tested	43	58	61	66	64
Percent of total students tested	84	100	95	97	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	15	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	679	684	676	680	682
Number of students tested	51	59	79	71	63
Percent of total students tested	88	97	99	99	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	7	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	12	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: Stanford Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: Tenth Publisher: Pearson Scores reported as: Scaled scores

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Average Score	684	685	679	684	680
Number of students tested	50	59	80	70	63
Percent of total students tested	86	97	100	97	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	7	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	12	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
2. African American Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
6.					
Average Score					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11PV64