

2002-2003 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program Cover Sheet

Name of Principal Mr. Elbert L. White (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Robert Lee Frost Elementary School (As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 5650 Selinsky (If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Houston Texas 77048-1832 City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (713) 732-3490 Fax (713) 732-3498

Website/URL http://es.houstonisd.org/FrostES Email www.ewhite@houstonisd.org

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

(Principal's Signature) Date

Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

Name of Superintendent (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Tel. ()

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date

Name of School Board President/Chairperson (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: 211 Elementary schools
49 Middle schools
 Junior high schools
36 High schools
296 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 5,291
Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 4,929

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

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

4. 4 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	42	46	88	K			
1	46	52	98	1			
2	56	52	108	2			
3	58	61	119	3			
4	63	60	123	4			
5	55	58	113	5			
6	29	27	56	OtherPK			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							705

NCLB/BRS Application

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:

- 0.1 % White
- 93 % Black or African American
- 6.9 % Hispanic or Latino
- 0 % Asian/Pacific Islander

0 % American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 30.7 %

(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	157
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	164
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	321
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	697
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	46
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	44.5 %

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 4.1 %
29 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 1
Specify languages: **Spanish**

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 98.3 %
693 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method is not a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

NCLB/BRS Application

10. Students receiving special education services: 7.9 %
56 Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

- _____ Autism
- _____ Deafness
- _____ Deaf-Blindness
- _____ Hearing Impairment
- 12 Mental Retardation
- _____ Multiple Disabilities
- _____ Orthopedic Impairment
- 6 Other Health Impaired
- 32 Specific Learning Disability
- 17 Speech or Language Impairment
- _____ Traumatic Brain Injury
- _____ Visual Impairment Including Blindness

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

	Number of Staff	
	Full-time	Part-Time
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	_____
Classroom teachers	<u>31</u>	_____
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>4</u>	_____
Paraprofessionals	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>
Support staff	<u>14</u>	_____
Total number	<u>62</u>	_____

12. Student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 22.1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout and drop-off rates.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Daily student attendance	96.0	95.7	95.9	95.6	95.6
Daily teacher attendance	95.0	94.0	97.0	95.0	95.0
Teacher turnover rate	Data not available				
Student dropout rate					
Student drop-off rate					

NCLB/BRS Application

14. (**High Schools Only**) Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2002 are doing as of September 2002.

- 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 (travel, staying home, etc.) _____%
- Unknown _____% **Total**
- 100 %

Part III - Summary

Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 475 words). Include at least a summary of the school's mission or vision in the statement and begin the first sentence with the school's name, city, and state.

Robert Lee Frost Elementary School in Houston, Texas has made a commitment to the students and the community. We are proud to acknowledge that each and every student will be successful. We are sincere in our desire to provide the best and the finest educational opportunities possible for all of our students. The mission of Robert Lee Frost Elementary School is to educate all students in an environment that is conducive to learning. Our setting does include innovative technical skills, which promote academic improvements, parental involvement, the development of each child's potential, and enhance the desire to become productive and functioning citizens of the twenty-first century. Our motto at Frost Elementary School is "Failure is Not An Option." We welcome you to Frost Elementary School. Frost is a pre-kindergarten through fifth grade elementary school within the South District of the Houston Independent School District. Currently, 98.3% of our 705 students participate in the federal free-reduced breakfast/lunch program. One hundred percent of our students are considered economically disadvantaged by Texas Education Agency (TEA) guidelines which qualifies Frost as a Title I school. Ninety-three percent of our students are African-Americans, one-tenth percent are white, and six and nine tenths percent are Hispanics and are Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Eight percent of our student body receives special education services. Our special education program is comprised of a generic self-contained class, a behavior services class, a speech program and a learning disabled resource program. These multi-level classes serve the primary and intermediate grades.

Our student/classroom teacher ratio is 22:1. Our gender population is approximately 50 percent male and 50 percent female. Forty-five percent of the students are academically at-risk according to TEA guidelines. These students are served through Title I and Community in Schools of Houston (C.I.S.H) programs.

Forty-six percent of our teachers have eleven or more years of teaching experience, eight percent are between five and eleven years and forty-six percent have five years or less. Twenty-six percent of our instructional staff have a master's degree. The following information service to define our professional team: female teachers 87%, male teachers 13%, African American teachers 85% and Caucasian teachers 15%. We have twelve instructional aides that assist the teachers in the classrooms.

The majority of families served in our learning community are of low socioeconomic status. They are resident apartment dwellers receiving government assistance and are predominantly single mothers as head of households. Students from Frost Elementary also come to us from homes which include traditional families, single parents, foster parents, families of unemployed parents, as well as families with two working parents. There are some residential homes in our area that are headed by grandparents who have assumed the responsibility of raising their grandchildren. In spite of the economic variations of Frost, our learning community remains committed to educating all students. A strong sense of devotion for our children is exhibit by staff members, parents, and community members.

Frost places a strong focus on student academic achievements and exhibited the creation of a safe and nurturing learning environment. We continually seek avenues for close analysis of programs in order to improve and expand upon learning environments which nurture the development of the full potential of each child. High expectations for student behavior and learning have been manifested in mandatory tutorials after-school, daily homework and parents' support of school uniforms.

Further support for Frost's community has been achieved through grants from the Mayor's After-School Achievement Program, and Spark Park-Playground Development. These grants are funded by the city of Houston. The grant goals are to help create a safer neighborhood that fosters involvement on all levels. These partnerships are helping Frost to provide a wealth of support and enrichment opportunities for our students, parents and the community at large. Thanks to this sort of dedication by parents, community and staff, Frost is continually elevating students' achievement and moving toward its vision of creating learning environments that empower all students to reach their full potential.

Part IV - Indicators of Academic Success

1. The school must show assessment results in reading and mathematics for at least the last three years using the criteria determined by the CSSO for the state accountability system.

Houston Independent School District (H.I.S.D.) 2002-2003 accountability system results identified Robert Lee Frost Elementary as being an exemplary school. The HISD progress rating, when compared to the 2001 Spring TAAS test, indicated that Frost made exemplary progress. Frost Elementary School also received the same "Exemplary" accreditation rating from the Texas Education Agency based on our student attendance rate of (95.8%) and the following TAAS scores: 93% of all student groups passed reading, 97% of all student groups in fourth grade passed math, and 96% of all student groups passed writing. Implementation of school improvement plan strategies contributed to student achievement on TAAS.

The TAAS test was administered in the Spring of 2000, 2001 and 2002. The number of students tested were 114 third graders in reading and 114 third graders in math; 112 fourth graders in reading and 111 fourth graders in math; 91 fifth graders students in reading and 97 fifth graders in math.

The following is an overview of the results. All grade levels greatly improved in reading and math from 2000 results. The third graders had some difficulty in the following area: Reading objective 3 - Summarization up to 85%. Overall there was remarkable improvement in reading objective 1 - word meaning 97%, objective 12 - supporting ideas 91%, objective 4 - relationships and outcomes 89%, objective 5 - inferences and generalization 95%, objective 6 - point of view, propaganda, and fact and opinion 88%. Seventy-three percents of the third grade students mastered all objectives in reading, ninety four percent of the third grader students met the minimum expectations. (c-3)

On the TAAS math subtest, the third grade students results indicated that objectives 10 and 13 were the most difficult; estimation and reasonableness 53%, and objective 11 problem solving using solution strategies. (c11). Overall there was great improvement in the objectives 1-6 and objective 12. Twenty four percent of the third grade students mastered all objectives in math. Ninety two percent met minimum expectations.

The fourth grade students also improved in reading and math. The fourth grade students results indicated that objective 3 and 6 were difficult; summarization 50%; and objective 6 point of view, progranda, and fact and opinion 81%. (c4) Thirty six percent of the entire fourth grade students mastered all objectives. Ninety eight percent of the students met minimum expectation in reading.

On the TAAS math subtest the major difficulty was in estimation 27 % solution strategies, and 64% in objective 12 using mathematical representation. (c15) Five percent of the fourth grade students mastered all objectives in math. Ninety five percent of the fourth grades class met minimum expectations in math. On the written communication narrative, 63% receive a score of 2 and 33% receive a score of three. Twenty eight percent mastered all objectives and 96% met minimum expectations.

The fifth grade students results indicated that objective 3 was the most difficult; summarization 82%. The other five subtest objectives 1 89%, objective 2 supporting ideas 96%, objective 4 relationships and outcomes 89%, objective 5 inferences and generalizations 97% and point of view, propaganda, and fact and opinion 95%. Fifty nine percent of the fifth grade students mastered all objectives. (c5) One hundred percent of the students met minimum expectations.

In math the fifth grade students had their greatest difficulty 57% in objective 13, evaluation of the reasonableness of a solution 77% in objective 10, problem solving using estimation 75%, in objective 11 problem solving using solution strategies, 77% in objective 12, problem solving using mathematical representation. Twenty three percent mastered all objectives and 99% met minimum expectations. (c17)

Stanford 9 Reading: Frost's Kindergarten students had an increase in grade equivalent (G.E.) score, moving from G.E. K.8 to G.E. 1.2. Eighty-four kindergarten students were at or above the 50th national/percentile rank (N/PR). First grade students remained about the same with a G.E. of 2.0, but there was an increase in the number of students at or above on the 50th N/PR, from 72 students to 80 students. (c24) Second grade students met the minimum goal of G.E. 1.6, which was a decrease of 3 months from the year 2001. Thirty-two students were at or above the 50th N/PR, which was a decrease of 15 students, form the previous year. (c25) Third grade students earned a G.E. of 3.6, which was an increase of 6 months. Fifty-one students were at or above the 50th N/PR. (c26) Fourth grade students had

an increase of G.E. 3.8 to 4.2. (c27) Thirty-nine students were at or above the N/PR. (c27) Fifth grade students had an increase of G.E. scores moving from 4.3 to 4.5 but decrease by one student on or at the N/PR 23 students to 22. (c28)

Stanford 9 Math: Frost's Kindergarten students improved from G.E., K1 to 1.0 month, which was an increase of .9 months. Sixth-five students were at or above the N/PR for 2002. First grade students improved from G.E. 1.6 to 1.9 months which was an increase of 3 month. Sixty-nine students were at or above the N/PR for 2002. (c24) Second grade students decreased from G.E. 2.2 to 1.8 month. The number of students at or about the N/PR remained the same (26). (c25) Third grade students improved from 3.0 to 4.2 which was an increase of 1.2. Seventy students were at or above the N/PR for 2002. (c26) Fourth grade students improved from 4.5 to 4.7 which was an increase of .2 month. Sixty-one students were at or above the N/PR for 2002. (c30) Fifth grade students improved from 5.6 to 6.3 which was an increase of .7 month. Seventy-two students were at or above the N/PR for 2002. (c28)

1a. Disaggregate the data for any ethnic/racial or socioeconomic groups that comprise sufficient numbers.

Robert Frost currently has 705 students that participate in the federal free reduce breakfast / lunch program. One hundred percent of our students are considered economically disadvantaged by Texas Education Agency which qualifies Frost as a Title I school. Ninety-three percent of our students are African-Americans. There are three subgroups that comprise sufficient numbers to be statistically significant; African American students, free and reduced breakfast / lunch program and economically disadvantages. Within each subgroup all groups made statistically significant gain total students over a three-year time span. There is little or no dispantry between each sub groups since the population is primary the same students.

1b. Specify which groups, if any, are excluded from a test, the reasons for the exclusions, as well as the number and percentage of students excluded. Describe how these students are assessed.

Frost administered the TAAS and Stanford 9 in three consecutive years. An important factor to note is the small percentage of students on average were exempted from TAAS and Stanford 9 testing in those three years. Only 38 students, 12% of the 323 students were not tested in reading. This number includes students in the generic self-contained classes, generic behavior service class and the resource classes at Frost. Only 33 students, about 10% of the 322 students were exempted from TAAS math. Likewise, 6%, of the 105 fourth graders at Frost Elementary School were exempted from the writing portion of TAAS. Students who were exempted from TAAS/Stanford 9 at Frost were either absent from school, learning disabled, mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed. Our special education students are administered the SDAA tests which is determined by the students Individualize Education Program (I.E.P.) and the ARD process.

2. How Frost uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance?

Assessment results are used systematically in making decisions about the effectiveness of educational programs and for identifying performance gaps through specific instructional strategies. Frost uses multiple assessment data for every student. Performance assessments in the core areas ensure that all stakeholders have quantifiable evidence of what students at Frost know and are able to do, as measured against the Texas Standards.

The school also uses the Stanford 9, Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) and Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI). These test results are shared with our teachers to show how their students compare to state and national norms. This data helps our teachers to analyze various performance patterns in reading, mathematics and language. In faculty meetings, workshops and staff development activities teachers analyze student performance for school-wide strengths and areas in need of improvement. This school-wide analysis helps our teachers to view their classroom results in a wider perspective and to articulate instruction.

In collaborative planning meetings, teachers at each grade level analyze their data in depth. The in-depth analysis of the test data showed that a major focus was needed in the area of problem solving. Teachers attended a series of math workshops on instructional strategies to improve and identify skills critical to problem solving. As a result of data-based decisions, which focused on instructional strategies

and specify targets, fourth grade students exceeded the state and national norm in mathematics for the first time in three years.

3. Describe how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community?

TAKS, TPRI, Stanford 9 and TEKS (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills) are communicated to parents in a variety of ways: quarterly report cards, mid-quarter progress reports, fall and spring parent conferences and the year-end school report card provided by the State of Texas. With the assistance of the district's research and assessment department, the state "report card" visually displays school results in charts that are explained in non-technical language. Clear, consistent and timely information allows parents and community members to understand how the school and district goals are aligned with the Texas standards and how students are progressing towards mastery.

During parent conferences, teachers explain the state and district standards (all parents are given with a copy of the standards) and their relationship to curriculum and assessment. In the course of the conference, teachers clarify and answer questions parents may have regarding their child's progress and discuss ways that both parent and teacher can work together to provide support. Our principal's regular home communications include information about our school-wide plans for elevating student achievement and suggestions for home involvement. In Parent and monthly P.T.O. meetings, our principal and staff members make pertinent presentations that clarify assessment results and highlight school intervention plans. District newsletters further complement our school efforts, deepening the commitment of Frost's parents and community to challenging standards, assessments and high expectations for students learning.

4. Describe how the school will share its successes with other schools

Frost shares its successes with other schools in a variety of ways. Our team is made up of five elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. This concept of vertical team focuses students moving from within their community from elementary to high school. We meet monthly to share data and discuss various strategies. During this sharing systematic review process within the vertical team, a curriculum committee was formed which included vertical team teachers, administrators and parents. Our staff members consistently serve on curriculum committees to represent our schools and to articulate our successes with best practices.

In May of each year, Frost's vertical team and district supervisors review the state standards and districts curriculum guides. Cross-grade level teams from each school compare and align critical learning between grades. With the assistance of our district supervisors and lead teachers from each school, the results of the Stanford 9/ TAAS test and other district assessment are analyzed to identify strengths and needed improvement. Student learning is assessed through the use of criterion references tests, teacher impact. The district supervisors, vertical team leaders, and lead teachers support the sharing of best practices by providing inservices that familiarize all teachers within our vertical team with new materials, teaching approaches and the research upon which these paradigm shifts are based.

Our staff uses this opportunity to dialogue within and across team levels to facilitate a clear understanding of the impact and implications teaching methods and different strategies may have on instruction.

Part V - Curriculum and Instruction

1. Describe the school's curriculum and show how all students are engaged with significant content, based on high standards.

Frost staff realizes that our students need to feel safe and have teachers in their lives who will love, respect and encourage them. Validation and praise for student achievements and having high expectations are apparent within our school structure and embedded in our school's philosophy. Our vision is for all Frost students to have a firm foundation in basic skills, English language proficiency, technology, exposure to the arts and an appreciation for the richness of our multicultural setting.

Uniting to meet student diversity is the driving force behind Frost's teaching philosophy and instructional efforts. State and district standards, Frost's School Improvement Plan guides our staff in focusing on what students shared and be able to do. Students' needs are identified and addressed in ongoing processes which require constant analysis and monitoring of pertinent information. The principal, with the assistance of the Instructional Coordinator, devotes a great deal of time and effort in the collection and sharing of pertinent data. The principal monitors instruction through formal and informal observations and monthly lesson plan review.

Analysis of student data guides the decision making process at Frost's staff and team meetings to ensure that emphasis on issues which impact student learning are addressed. At the end of each academic year in May, the staff participates in workshops and ongoing staff meetings. At these meetings, the staff analyzes the latest academic and affective data and share professional insights as we plan for the next school year. Long and short-term goals for student achievement and professional development opportunities are set. Total staff planning, blended with grade level and cross grade level articulation, assures that curriculum alignment and teacher expectations are synchronized.

Each school year starts with the staff focused on goals and objectives for student learning previously identified at the May meetings. Improvement of reading achievement has been a primary focus for three years. Frost's updated reading and math labs have been a unique and vital force behind the elevation of reading achievement at our school. The reading lab is staffed by a Title I reading specialist teacher and a Title I instructional aide. Each year, teachers conduct school-wide reading pre-tests (post-test information is retrieved in May) which provide valuable information for addressing student needs. The test results are used to assist teachers in making instructional decisions and to form flexible instruction groups for the reading lab. New students' reading abilities are assessed by the teaching staff when they enter our school, providing vital information to classroom teachers and facilitating appropriate programming.

The multi-disciplinary team consists of the principal, assistant principal, instructional coordinator, grade-level chairpersons, classroom/special education teachers, and nurse. The team meets a minimum of once weekly to assist teachers and parents in reviewing profiles of students with learning difficulties. Team consultations result in suggestions for intervention strategies, further testing or program placement to meet student needs.

Our LEP population requires dual instruction in Spanish and English. Those students in need of bilingual services are identified using a Home Language Survey completed by the parent. Students are biannually assessed using the Language Assessment Scales (LAS). These test results guide classroom teachers in providing instruction in the child's primary language and subsequent testing assists teachers in making decisions about transitioning students into English instruction. LEP classrooms at each grade level have instructional assistants to support them in meeting the diverse needs within their teaching environment. School and classroom communications are sent home in both English and Spanish so that parent understanding and involvement are facilitated.

Frost's staff committee structure provides our school with a wide variety of activities to meet our students' needs. Our highly dedicated staff members belong to at least one committee and often are on two or more committees. These are structured into four overarching committees that deal with curriculum, extra-curricular activities, discipline, and public relations. The extra time and effort that staff members contribute to our school is exemplary and results in diverse opportunities for students.

2. Describe the school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.

The focus of our reading/language arts curriculum program is the development of effective verbal and non-verbal communication skills. Our curriculum emphasizes the personal, functional and social aspects of language. Class experiences engage students in an integrated language art/reading program which fosters communication and develops decision-making skills across the curriculum. Our language arts/reading curriculum is enriched by a literate learning climate in which all students are active and equal members of the learning community. The district language arts/reading curriculum outlines the scope and sequence and essential skills necessary to meet state standards TEKS. Each school can select a reading

program that best meets the academic needs of its students. At Frost, we selected the reading program offered through the R.I.T.E. (Rodeo Institute for Teacher Excellence) program. This involves grades Pre K – 2 the program is called Reading Mastery.

Reading Mastery is a direct instruction model. Reading is taught two hours a day. Our focus in the lower grades PK-2 is to teach students "How to learn to read." Ability grouping is established through testing each student. Therefore, we have different groupings to meet the needs of all of our students. A paraprofessional (teacher's aide) is placed with the lower functioning classes to assist with instruction.

The *Reading Mastery* program is a complete basal reading program. Reading is treated as an interactive process, establishing a decoding foundation from "bottom up" and extending the ability to comprehend from the "top down." *Reading Master* uses an explicit phonics approach that features step by step instruction for all decoding strategies. Phonics instruction stresses letter-sound relationships, a blending technique, and acquiring as many high utility sight words as possible. Accuracy and fluency are stressed in the *Reading Mastery* program through word attack strategies and individual reading checkouts. Comprehension is practiced by answering written and oral questions about pictures and story content. Following directions are emphasized. The program is scripted for the teacher to ensure high quality and consistency of instruction and to help develop the students' language of instruction. On-site trainers work with teachers on a weekly basis. We estimate that each of our teachers will receive from 35 to 40 hours of one-to-one coaching this year. With this coaching we see teachers become proficient in only one year with a program that normally takes three years to master.

Teachers receive written feedback from their trainer with a monthly formal observation. Additionally there are many informal conferences during the day and during weekly scheduled classroom visits. We have found the teachers are extremely receptive to this model and more than willing to work with their trainer. A rapport has developed between trainer and teacher that allow the two to work in tandem.

3. Describe one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

Mathematics is a creative dynamic process and Frost's educators are constantly looking for teaching strategies to enhance the key subject area. Clear (District's Curriculum) is very different from the passive mastery of concepts and procedures. The goals of our mathematics instruction are to develop mathematical self-confidence and competence in students toward problem-solving, the use of mathematical reasoning, math facts and the skills transfer mathematical learning to real life situations.

Our staff uses a multi-modality approach aligned with state and district standards. Through projects, district supervisors and lead teachers have trained personnel in after-school inservices and have provided model lessons within individual classrooms. Teachers use performance based assessments in conjunction with classroom lessons to make "real life" connections to measure and ensure high levels of achievement. We stand by our motto "Failure is not an option." We focus on each students' strengths and weaknesses teaching through different modalities to ensure success. We have two site technology-techs who provide individualized and group training. The lab personnel also provide training for our math students and teachers on computer applications with programs such as Leaf Frog Math, Earning by Learning, and Lightspan. Each program is aligned specifically with our Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills' (TEKS) goals and objectives. The school is fully networked providing local and wide area access to the entire school. Each student goes to the computer lab twice weekly to work on and enhance their knowledge of math concepts taught in the classroom.

4. Describe the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

All faculty and staff members of Robert Lee Frost Elementary School focus on the same goals and objectives, and use a variety of instructional methods to improve and increase student achievement. All students are provided with opportunities to learn. Students work individually and collaborate to think critically and creatively, incorporate problem solving strategies, practice literacy skills, and make connections to the world around them. To accommodate differing student academic needs, staff members work collaboratively to analyze student data to provide our students with the appropriate instruction. Our

teachers use a variety of everyday manipulative to model and to convey different strategies for our students. Videos of new teacher's presentation in the classroom have helped to analyze their strengths and weakness. The Individual Education Program (I.E.P.) has played a vital role in identifying each student deficient. The teachers modify their strategies and teach through different modalities to help our students become successful. Frost's fine arts programs and ancillary classes had been integrated into our curriculum to help support our academic curriculum.

Students are given opportunities in the classroom to work in cooperative learning groups with their peers in a variety of academic settings. This model promotes individual accountability and positive peer interaction through consensus building. It also gives the learning environment a sense of a Child Centered Classroom. Student grouping for instruction remains flexible and adjustments are made as students show progress. The Title I Schoolwide Program provides services to 100% of the students at Frost with after school tutorials for At-Risk students and those needing extra help. This program also provides field lessons and staff development activities for teachers which enhances student achievement.

Frost's Technology Plan supports the school goals for enhancing student achievement in Math and Reading. Students attend the primary and intermediate lab where they learn computer literacy skills and utilize different computer programs. Our on site computer technologist provides individual and group sessions during and after school for those students needing extra assistance. *Frost's Faculty and Staff are always striving to go beyond being an Effective 21st Century Quality School.*

5. Describe the school's professional development program and its impact on improving achievement.

Frost professional development community is lead by our principal. One hundred percent of the *Frost instructional* staff is consistently involved in ongoing learning component, which address the needs of our population. Our professional development program focuses on creating a learning environment which support student learning and develop collegial opportunities to try new ideas, solve problems, seek information and reflect upon student outcomes and needs.

New teachers attend workshops prior to the start of school and attend a series of professional development workshops throughout the school year. New hires are also assigned a mentor teacher and receive frequent visits from an instructional supervisor who give added support to them. Throughout the school year, team leaders and mentors assist new teachers with lesson planning, effective classroom management techniques, teaching strategies, student assessments, and parental involvement. Teachers are given opportunities to engage in different leadership roles; such as team leaders, committee chairpersons, co-chairpersons, and representatives for district meetings. The entire staff engages in professional development workshops and seminars to remain abreast of the current trends and issues related to the *21st Century of Education.*

Our approach to professional development has expanded teaching expertise, and positively impacted student achievement by tailoring training to build upon and extend instructional delivery. Frost has significantly enhanced its learning community. Our teachers are given feedback related to student achievement on their individual teaching performance through an administrative evaluation instrument prepared after a formal classroom observation. It's the principal's responsibility to prepare a formal evaluation document and review it with the teacher at a specified time. This document shows a teacher's strengths and extends itself for collaboration in areas identified as next steps. Teachers in need of assistance are provided the extra support; such as being assigned to master teachers to gain professional insight and ideas.

Teachers with outstanding performances are awarded with certificates, plaques, and nominated by their peers for special awards. Many of our teachers have been recognized as master teachers and are called upon to share innovative strategies at the building and district level. The Houston Independent School District implements a Campus Incentive Pay Plan those schools who have received an outstanding academic rating. At Frost Elementary School, it is the teachers who make the difference.

Charts

C1	TAAS Results% Passing Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002
C2	Stanford 9 Results % Passing, Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002
C3	3 rd Grade TAAS Reading Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002
C4	4 th Grade TAAS Reading Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002
C5	5 th Grade TAAS Reading Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002
C6	TAAS Reading – Cross Grade Level Comparison
C7	SDAA Reading
C8	TAAS Reading Pass Rates by Objectives 2000, 2001 and 2002
C9	3 rd Grade TAAS Math 2000
C10	3 rd Grade TAAS Math 2001
C11	3 rd Grade TAAS Math 2002
C12	4 th Grade TAAS Math 2000
C13	4 th Grade TAAS Math 2001
C14	4 th Grade TAAS Math 2002
C15	5 th Grade TAAS Math 2000
C16	5 th Grade TAAS Math 2001
C17	5 th Grade TAAS Math 2002
C18	TAAS Math – Cross Grade Level Comparison
C19	SDAA Math
C20	TAAS Math Pass Rates by Objectives Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002
C21	4 th Grade TAAS Writing
C22	SDAA Writing
C23	TAAS Writing Pass Rates by Objectives Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002
C24	1 st Grade Stanford 9 (2000, 2001 and 2002)
C25	2 nd Grade Stanford 9 (2000, 2001 and 2002)
C26	3 rd Grade Stanford 9 (2000, 2001 and 2002)
C27	4 th Grade Stanford 9 (2000, 2001 and 2002)
C28	5 th Grade Stanford 9 (2000, 2001 and 2002)

Robert L. Frost Elementary School
English or Spanish TAAS Results % Passing, Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002.

C1.

TAAS	READING			MATH			WRITING		
	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2001	2001	2002
3 RD GRADE	67%	63%	94%	66%	69%	92%			
4 TH GRADE	84%	83%	98%	69%	86%	95%	94%	94%	96%
5 TH GRADE	49%	87%	100%	49%	93%	99%			
Averages	67%	77%	97.3%	62%	83%	95.3%	94%	94%	96%

Robert L. Frost Elementary School
English or Spanish Stanford 9 Results % Passing, Spring 2000, 2001 and 2002.

C2.

Grade	Reading						Math					
	2000		2001		2002		2000		2001		2002	
Kinder.	29	K.1	35	K.8	84	1.2	34	K.1	44	K.1	65	1.0
1 st	49	1.6	72	2.0	81	2.0	56	1.6	60	1.6	70	1.9
2 nd	08	2.1	47	2.4	32	2.1	10	1.9	26	2.2	26	1.8
3 rd	29	3.2	16	3.0	51	3.6	14	3.3	37	3.0	70	4.2
4 th	11	3.9	21	3.8	38	4.2	27	4.6	46	4.5	60	4.7
5 th	7	3.9	16	4.3	22	4.5	13	4.8	33	5.6	72	6.3

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Reading
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
3rd Grade

C3.

2000	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	66	3	99	----	99	47	56	---	3		36

Test Performance (2000)
Objectives

Mastering

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	72	70
Supporting Idea	77	75
Summarization	53	51
Relationships and Outcomes	83	81
Inferences and Generalizations	65	63
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	53	51

2001	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	64	8	96	----	102	53	51	---	6	7	5

Test Performance (2001)
Objectives

Mastering

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	73	70
Supporting Idea	62	60
Summarization	39	38
Relationships and Outcomes	74	71
Inferences and Generalizations	55	53
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	63	61

2002	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	94	14	103	----	116	53	54	---	8		40

Test Performance (2002)
Objectives

Mastering

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	113	97
Supporting Idea	107	91
Summarization	99	85
Relationships and Outcomes	104	89
Inferences and Generalizations	111	95
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	103	88

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Reading
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
4th Grade

C4.

2000	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	84	4	69	----	70	25	48	---	---	---	29

Test Performance (2000)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	51	70
Supporting Idea	51	70
Summarization	27	37
Relationships and Outcomes	49	67
Inferences and Generalizations	44	60
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	49	67

2001	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	84	4	86	----	90	42	48	---	2	2	1

Test Performance (2001)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	82	86
Supporting Idea	81	85
Summarization	52	55
Relationships and Outcomes	62	65
Inferences and Generalizations	67	71
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	61	64

2002	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	98	6	105	1	109	57	55	---	3	---	2

Test Performance (2002)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	105	94
Supporting Idea	106	95
Summarization	56	50
Relationships and Outcomes	98	88
Inferences and Generalizations	95	85
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	91	81

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Reading
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
5th Grade

C5.

2000	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	49	6	71	----	76	33	44	---	2	1	30

Test Performance (2000)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	24	31
Supporting Idea	31	40
Summarization	24	31
Relationships and Outcomes	43	56
Inferences and Generalizations	33	43
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	31	40

2001	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	87	2	66	----	65	24	44	---	---	2	10

Test Performance (2001)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	42	62
Supporting Idea	50	74
Summarization	32	47
Relationships and Outcomes	55	81
Inferences and Generalizations	53	78
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	40	59

2002	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	100	5	86	---	90	37	54	---	4	---	45

Test Performance (2002)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Word Meaning	77	89
Supporting Idea	84	97
Summarization	71	82
Relationships and Outcomes	77	89
Inferences and Generalizations	84	97
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	82	94

**English TAAS Reading – Cross Grade Level Comparison
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)**

C6.

Grade and Year	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
Gr 4 – 02	98	6	105	1	109	57	55	0	3	0	2
Gr 3 – 01	64	6	91	0	95	49	48	0	5	0	4
Gr 5 – 02	100	5	86	0	90	37	54	0	4	0	45
Gr 4 – 01	84	4	86	0	90	42	48	0	2	0	1
Gr 3 – 00	66	3	99	0	99	47	56	0	3	0	36
Gr 6 – 02											
Gr 5 – 01	87	2	66	0	65	24	44	0	0	0	10
Gr 4 – 00	84	4	69	0	70	25	48	0	0	0	29
Gr 3 – 99	33	2	84	0	79	40	47	1	0	3	7

English SDAA Reading (Students with disabilities exempt from TAAS)

C7.

Grade	Total % Met ARD Expectation	Hispanic	African American	White	Male	Female	Econ Disadv	LEP	At Risk
GR. 3	N/A								
Gr. 4	80%	0	5	0	3	2	5	0	2
Gr. 5	87%	1	14	0	8	7	15	0	7
Gr. 6									

**2000, 2001 and 2002 TAAS English Reading Pass Rates by Objectives
All Students – regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed**

C8.	Third Grade			Fourth Grade			Fifth Grade		
	00	01	02	00	01	02	00	01	02
Word Meaning	70	70	97	70	88	94	31	62	89
Supporting Idea	75	60	91	70	87	95	40	74	96
Summarization	51	38	85	37	57	50	31	47	80
Relationships and Outcomes	81	71	89	67	68	88	56	81	89
Inferences and Generalizations	63	53	95	60	72	85	43	78	97
Point of View, Propaganda, and Fact and Opinion	51	61	88	67	66	81	40	59	95
Met Minimum Expectations	67%	64%	95%	85%	84%	99%	53%	88%	100%

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
3rd Grade

C9.

2000	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	48	4	114	----	115	57	62	---	3	0	51

Test Performance (2000)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Objectives	# of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	89	75
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	80	67
Geometric Properties and Relationships	83	70
Measurement Concepts	55	46
Probability and Statistics	76	64
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	91	76
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	69	58
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	80	67
Use of Division to Solve Problems		
Problem Solving Using Estimation	43	36
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	37	31
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	59	50
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution		

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
3rd Grade

C10.

2001	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	48	4	114	----	115	57	62	---	3	0	51

Test Performance (2001)
Objectives

Mastering
of Students

% of Students Passing

Test Performance (2001) Objectives	Mastering # of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	86	83
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	51	50
Geometric Properties and Relationships	67	65
Measurement Concepts	54	52
Probability and Statistics	59	57
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	70	68
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	56	54
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	64	62
Use of Division to Solve Problems		
Problem Solving Using Estimation	7	7
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	19	18
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	46	45
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution		

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
3rd Grade

C11.

2002	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	48	4	114	----	115	57	62	---	3	0	51

Test Performance (2002)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Objectives	# of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	112	98
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	108	95
Geometric Properties and Relationships	99	87
Measurement Concepts	107	94
Probability and Statistics	104	91
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	103	90
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	90	79
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	95	83
Use of Division to Solve Problems		
Problem Solving Using Estimation	60	53
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	74	65
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	92	81
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution		

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
4th Grade

C12.

2000	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	69	4	71	----	72	27	48	0	0	0	30

Test Performance (2000)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Objectives	# of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	66	88
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	67	89
Geometric Properties and Relationships	63	84
Measurement Concepts	66	88
Probability and Statistics	50	67
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	68	91
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	58	77
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	56	75
Use of Division to Solve Problems	61	81
Problem Solving Using Estimation	31	41
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	46	61
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	51	68
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution		

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
4th Grade

C13.

2001	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	86	5	92	----	97	46	52	---	---	7	7

Test Performance (2001)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Objectives	# of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	81	83
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	64	65
Geometric Properties and Relationships	86	88
Measurement Concepts	66	67
Probability and Statistics	63	64
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	86	88
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	59	60
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	75	77
Use of Division to Solve Problems	71	72
Problem Solving Using Estimation	17	17
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	39	40
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	60	61
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution		

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
4th Grade

C14.

2002	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	95	6	104	1	108	56	55	---	3	---	3

Test Performance (2002)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Objectives	# of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	105	95
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	99	89
Geometric Properties and Relationships	103	93
Measurement Concepts	102	92
Probability and Statistics	93	84
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	101	91
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	89	80
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	102	92
Use of Division to Solve Problems	91	82
Problem Solving Using Estimation	30	27
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	30	27
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	75	64
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution		84

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
5th Grade

C15.

2000	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	53	5	51	----	69	30	40	---	1	---	31

Test Performance (2000)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Objectives	# of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	37	43
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	67	78
Geometric Properties and Relationships	42	49
Measurement Concepts	78	91
Probability and Statistics	56	65
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	67	78
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	37	43
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	44	51
Use of Division to Solve Problems	40	47
Problem Solving Using Estimation	45	52
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	33	38
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	42	49
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution	28	33

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
5th Grade

C16.

2001	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	93	1	67	----	66	25	43	---	1	---	10

Test Performance (2001)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Objectives	# of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	50	74
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	45	66
Geometric Properties and Relationships	64	94
Measurement Concepts	53	78
Probability and Statistics	33	49
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	63	93
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	57	84
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	57	84
Use of Division to Solve Problems	55	81
Problem Solving Using Estimation	37	54
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	23	34
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	38	56
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution	22	32

Robert Lee Frost Elementary
Student Achievement
English TAAS Math
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
5th Grade

C17.

2002	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
	99	5	91	----	95	56	40	---	4	---	48

Test Performance (2002)

Mastering

Objectives

of Students

% of Students Passing

Objectives	# of Students	% of Students Passing
Number Concepts	85	98
Algebraic/Mathematical Relations and Functions	86	99
Geometric Properties and Relationships	85	98
Measurement Concepts	83	95
Probability and Statistics	82	94
Use of Addition to Solve Problems	85	98
Use of Subtraction to Solve Problems	84	97
Use of Multiplication to Solve Problems	82	94
Use of Division to Solve Problems	85	98
Problem Solving Using Estimation	68	78
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	66	76
Problem Solving Using Mathematical Representation	69	79
Evaluation on the Reasonableness of a Solution	50	57

**English TAAS Math – Cross Grade Level Comparison
(All Students –regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)**

C18.

Grade and Year	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
Gr 4 – 02	95	6	104	1	108	56	55	0	3	0	3
Gr 3 – 01	69	6	90	0	94	48	48	0	5	0	4
Gr 5 – 02	99	5	91	0	95	40	56	0	4	0	48
Gr 4 – 01	88	4	86	0	90	42	49	0	2	0	1
Gr 3 – 00	48	4	114	0	115	57	62	0	3	0	51
Gr 6 – 02											
Gr 5 – 01	93	1	67	0	66	25	43	0	0	0	10
Gr 4 – 00	69	4	71	0	72	27	48	0	0	0	30
Gr 3 – 99	33	2	84	0	79	40	47	1	0	4	7

English SDAA Math (Students with disabilities exempt from TAAS)

C19.

Grade	Total % Met ARD Expectation	Hispanic	African American	White	Male	Female	Econ Disadv	LEP	At Risk
GR. 3	N/A								
Gr. 4	100%	0	6	0	4	2	6	0	3
Gr. 5	91%	1	10	0	6	5	11	0	4
Gr. 6									

**2000, 2001 and 2002 TAAS English Math Pass Rates by Objectives
All Students – regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed**

C20.	Third Grade			Fourth Grade			Fifth Grade		
	00	01	02	00	01	02	00	01	02
Number Concepts	75	82	98	88	84	95	43	74	97
Alg/Math Relationship & Functions	67	51	95	89	66	89	78	66	98
Geometric Properties and Relationships	70	64	87	84	88	93	49	94	97
Measurement Concepts	46	51	94	88	68	92	91	78	95
Probability and Statistics	64	59	91	67	66	84	65	49	91
Addition to Solve Problems	76	67	90	91	90	91	78	93	96
Subtraction to Solve Problems	58	55	79	77	62	80	43	84	94
Multiply/Division to Solve Problem	67		83						
Multiply to Solve Problem		63		75	80	92	51	84	93
Division to Solve Problems				81	76	82	47	81	95
Problem Solving Using Estimation	36	5	53	41	19	27	52	54	77
Problem Solving Using Solution Strategies	31	18	65	61	41	27	38	34	75
Problem Solving Using Math Representation	50	46	81	68	62	68	49	56	77
Eval. of the Reasonableness of a Solution							33	32	56
Met minimum expectation	48%	69%	92%	69%	69%	86%	53%	93%	99%

**English TAAS Writing
(regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed)
4th Grade**

C21.

Year	% Passing	Hispanic	African American	White	Econ Disadv	Male	Female	G/T	LEP	SpEd	At Risk
02	96	6	99	----	102	55	50	---	3	---	0
01	94	4	85	---	89	39	50	---	2	1	1
00	92	3	71	---	71	26	48	---	0	---	29

English SDAA Writing (Students with disabilities exempt from TAAS)

C22.

Grade 4	Total % Met ARD Expectation	Hispanic	African American	White	Male	Female	Econ Disadv	LEP	At Risk
02	33	0	12	0	12	6	6	0	9

**2000, 2001 and 2002 TAAS English Writing Pass Rates by Objectives
All Students – regular, LEP, non-exempt Special Ed
4th Grade**

C23.

	00	01	02
0 in Writing Composition	1	0	0
1 in Writing Composition	0	0	1
2 in Writing Composition	54	73	66
3 in Writing Composition	43	27	33
4 in Writing Composition	1	0	0
Sentence Construction	82	70	87
English Usage	77	93	92
Use of Spelling, Capitalization & Punctuation	74	72	81
Percentage Passing	92%	94%	96%

**STANFORD 9
FIRST GRADE**

C24. 2000

	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	140	141	141	140	140	140	141
Number Tested	140						
Number Raw Score	62.3	22.2	15.0	24.8	41.1	26.8	14.3
Mean Scaled Score	519	536	491	521	623	537	499
National PR-S	50-5	49-5	40-5	57-5	48-5	46-5	50-5
Mean National NCE	49.8	49.6	44.6	54.0	49.0	47.7	50.1
At/Above Number	50	50	45	60	54	50	50
Percent	49	49	44	59	53	49	49

2001

	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	106	36	30	40	69	44	25
Number Tested							
Number Raw Score	109	109	109	115	114	115	114
Mean Scaled Score	69.6	23.7	18.9	26.4	41.1	26.4	14.6
National PR-S	59-5	54-4	56-5	64-6	46-5	41-5	54-5
Mean National NCE	54.9	52.2	53.4	57.8	48.0	45.4	52.1
At/Above Number	72	66	69	75	60	57	54
Percent	66	61	63	65	53	50	47

2002

	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	106	36	30	40	69	44	25
Number Tested							
Number Raw Score	101	101	101	101	101	101	101
Mean Scaled Score	81.6	27.3	22.8	31.5	48.7	30.9	17.8
National PR-S	69-6	62-6	70-6	77-7	61-6	54-5	68-6
Mean National NCE	60.5	56.3	61.1	65.3	55.7	52.1	59.9
At/Above Number	81	74	74	87	70	64	77
Percent	80	73	73	86	69	63	76

**STANFORD 9
SECOND GRADE**

C25. 2000

	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	111	111	111	111	111	111	111
Number Tested							
Number Raw Score		27.0	13.1	14.0	36.2	21.5	14.6
Mean Scaled Score	549	551	534	552	536	545	522
National PR-S	26-4	33-4	23-4	26-4	21-3	20-3	28-4
Mean National NCE	36.8	40.6	34.6	36.8	32.9	32.1	37.5
At/Above Number	30	40	27	30	27	27	35
Percent	29	39	26	29	26	26	34

2001

	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	118	48	30	40	74	46	28
Number Tested	128	128	128	128	127	127	127
Number Raw Score	65.9	31.1	15.9	18.9	41.1	25.9	15.2
Mean Scaled Score	566.1	571.3	546.6	573.8	547.4	561.3	526.3
National PR-S	40-5	47-5	32-4	43-5	30-4	33-4	31-4
Mean National NCE	44.7	48.4	40.2	46.5	39.3	40.8	39.6
At/Above Number	47	51	38	52	26	33	31
Percent	37	40	30	41	20	26	24

2002

	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	118	48	30	40	74	46	28
Number Tested	99	100	100	99	99	99	99
Number Raw Score	66.2	30.6	16.9	18.7	40.7	25.2	15.6
Mean Scaled Score	567.5	569.9	555.1	572.5	546.7	558.7	529.7
National PR-S	34-4	38-4	33-4	34-4	23-4	25-4	30-4
Mean National NCE	41.5	43.5	40.6	41.6	34.8	35.6	38.8
At/Above Number	32	35	32	36	26	28	27
Percent	32	35	32	36	26	28	27

**STANFORD 9
THIRD GRADE**

C26 . 2000

	Total Reading	Vocabulary	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible							
Number Tested	116	116	NA	116	116	116	116
Number Raw Score	45.8	17.2	NA	28.6	44.4	27.2	17.2
Mean Scaled Score	592	583	NA	598	586	592	577
National PR-S	34-4	31-4	NA	37-4	40-5	38-4	46.5
Mean National NCE	41.3	39.8	NA	42.8	44.9	43.7	48.0
At/Above Number Percent	29 25	20 20	NA	18 18	35 34	37 35	45 46

2001

	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	84	NA	30	54	76	46	30
Number Tested	102	NA	102	102	102	102	102
Number Raw Score	42.3	NA	16.2	26.1	43.4	27.1	16.3
Mean Scaled Score	584.9	NA	577.6	589.1	583.9	592.5	570.7
National PR-S	28-4	NA	28-4	30-4	39-4	38-4	41-5
Mean National NCE	37.8	NA	37.5	38.9	43.9	43.4	45.2
At/Above Number Percent	16 16	NA	19 19	13 13	37 36	34 33	46 45

2002

	Total Reading	Word Study Skills	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	84	NA	30	54	76	46	30
Number Tested	109	NA	109	109	109	109	109
Number Raw Score	56.3	NA	20.3	36.0	54.9	33.0	21.9
Mean Scaled Score	620.8	NA	608.7	629.6	616.9	621.6	613.9
National PR-S	54-5	NA	48-5	57-5	61-6	56-5	69-6
Mean National NCE	52.3	NA	48.9	53.8	56.1	53.0	60.4
At/Above Number	56	NA	54	60	76	64	77
Percent	51		50	55	70	59	71

**STANFORD 9
FOURTH GRADE**

C 27. 2000

	Total Reading	Vocabulary	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible			NA				
Number Tested	68	68	NA	68	68	68	68
Number Raw Score	49.0	21.4	NA	27.6	49.7	31.0	18.3
Mean Scaled Score	616	363	NA	609	625	625	626
National PR-S	31-4	47-5	NA	28-4	54-5	53-5	56-5
Mean National NCE	39.8	48.6	NA	37.6	51.9	51.5	53.0
At/Above Number	22 23	19 20	NA	30 31	46 47	43 44	46 47
Percent							

2001

	Total Reading	Vocabulary	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	84	30	NA	54	78	48	30
Number Tested	97	97	NA	97	97	97	97
Number Raw Score	44.6	16.2	NA	28.3	47.7	30.3	17.4
Mean Scaled Score	614.6	605.2	NA	618.6	321.4	615.0	626
National PR-S	31-4	47-5	NA	28-4	54-5	53-5	56-5
Mean National NCE	39.8	48.6	NA	37.6	51.9	51.5	53.0
At/Above Number Percent	21 22	18 19	NA	30 31	46 47	44 45	45 46

2002

	Total Reading	Vocabulary	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	84	NA	30	54	78	48	30
Number Tested	103	103	NA	103	102	102	103
Number Raw Score	51.9	20.2	NA	31.7	53.2	33.4	19.8
Mean Scaled Score	630.5	632.0	NA	630.8	632.1	634.7	630.9
National PR-S	43-5	45-5	NA	44-5	56-5	54-5	59-5
Mean National NCE	46.3	47.4	NA	46.9	53.3	52.3	54.9
At/Above Number Percent	39 38	49 48	NA	42 41	61 60	56 55	68 66

**STANFORD 9
FIFTH GRADE**

C 28. 2000

	Total Reading	Vocabulary	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible							
Number Tested	76	76	NA	76	76	76	76
Number Raw Score	40.4	16.1	NA	24.3	40.6	26.1	14.4
Mean Scaled Score	621	621	NA	620	626	626	625
National PR-S	21-3	20-3	NA	24-4	30-4	34-4	29-4
Mean National NCE	33.0	32.6	NA	34.9	39.1	41.1	58.4
At/Above Number Percent	24 26	21 23	NA	26 28	55 61	58 63	67 73

2001

	Total Reading	Vocabulary	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	84	30	NA	54	78	48	30
Number Tested	69	69	NA	68	68	68	68
Number Raw Score	44.6	17.8	NA	26.7	47.9	29.9	18.0
Mean Scaled Score	631.8	638.9	NA	628.6	640.8	638.6	645.5
National PR-S	30-4	34-4	NA	30-4	46-5	47-5	46-5
Mean National NCE	38.8	41.6	NA	39.2	47.9	48.5	48.1
At/Above Number Percent	16 23	19 28	NA	17 25	33 49	29 43	32 47

2002

	Total Reading	Vocabulary	Word Reading	Reading Comp	Total Math	Problem Solving	Procedures
Number Possible	84	30	NA	54	78	48	30
Number Tested	92	92	NA	92	92	92	92
Number Raw Score	47.0	18.3	NA	28.6	55.2	34.3	20.9
Mean Scaled Score	636.3	641.0	NA	634.1	659.0	657.1	663.5
National PR-S	32-4	34-4	NA	61-6	61-6	61-6	59-5
Mean National NCE	40.2	41.4	NA	41.3	56.1	55.8	55.0
At/Above Number	20	21	NA	20	66	58	67
Percent	22	23		22	72	63	73