

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

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

Official School Name Rufino Mendoza Elementary
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1412 Denver
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Fort Worth Texas 76106-9011
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (817) 740-5370 Fax (817) 740-5394

Website/URL fortworthisd.org Email elgon@ftworth.isd.tenet.edu

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 Dr. Thomas S. Tocco
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Fort Worth Independent School District Tel. (817) 871-2730

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 Ms. Lynn Manny
(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 I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct. [Include this page in the application as page 2.]

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12.
2. The school has been in existence for five full years.
3. 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.
4. The 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.
5. 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.
6. 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

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 78 Elementary schools
14 Middle schools
 Junior high schools
13 High schools
115 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 4,890
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. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4 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
PK	41	47	88	6			
K	56	49	105	7			
1	49	60	109	8			
2	57	53	110	9			
3	53	60	113	10			
4	49	43	92	11			
5	41	47	95	12			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							712

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>2.5</u> | % White |
| <u>-</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>96.9</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>.3</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>.3</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |

100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year 18.7 %

(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.	72
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	61
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	133
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	713
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.1870
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	18.70

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 56 %
399 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: 1
 Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 86.7 %

618 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.

10. Students receiving special education services: 4.2 %
32 Total Number of Students Served

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

<u> </u> Autism	<u> </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u> </u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>22</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>9</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>1</u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> </u> Multiple Disabilities	<u> </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness

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> </u>
Classroom teachers	<u>42</u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>7</u>	<u> </u>
Support staff	<u>17</u>	<u> </u>
Total number	<u>69</u>	<u> </u>

12. Student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 16.1

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	97.2%	96.9%	97.1%	97.2%	96.9%
Daily teacher attendance	96.38	96.17	94.88	95.09	96.57
Teacher turnover rate	7.1%	25%	24%	21%	24%
Student dropout rate	---	---	---	---	---
Student drop-off rate	---	---	---	---	---

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

Part III. Summary

Rufino Mendoza Elementary School is an 82 year old school serving some 700 Pre K -5th grade students in an urban, dominantly Hispanic neighborhood in Ft. Worth, Texas. The demographics of the neighborhood are mirrored in the school: 96.9% of the students are Hispanic; 2.5% are White, with fewer than 1% comprising other groups. The mobility rate of students is 18.7%; families often return to Mexico and then come back to Ft. Worth. The Limited English Speaking population is 56%, and 86.7% of the students are classified as economically disadvantaged. Mendoza has been a schoolwide Title I program school since 1995.

In fall 1998, a new principal, Ms. Irma Miller, was assigned to Mendoza. She found an unattractive building plagued by high teacher turnover, poor morale, low student expectations and achievement, no parent or community involvement, and little focus. The school had a mission statement – to increase student’s academic achievement and a positive self-concept by improving instructional delivery; fostering professional growth; improving student attendance and discipline, and encouraging greater school-community interaction – but it was being served by inertia rather than implementation. Not surprisingly, that year the school’s academic performance scores fell in four of nine designated areas as reported in the AEIS report; therefore, requiring an instructional intervention plan for the school.

At this point the principal conducted a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school situation and reassessed the school’s mission. She established a new, clear, non-negotiable vision for Mendoza that included 1) high expectations for all students; 2) improved leadership; 3) shared responsibility and collaboration; 4) improved communications within the school community; 5) focused curriculum, instruction, and assessments aligned with state standards and tests; 6) frequent, ongoing monitoring of learning and teaching; focused professional development; a positive, supportive, attractive learning environment with appropriate recognition/rewards for accomplishment, and high levels of parent and community involvement. The goal was set to move the school from low performing to exemplary status within 3-4 years. Staff report that the principal never wavered from this goal, and staff members who were reluctant to commit to this vision left the school, replaced by those who welcomed the challenge.

To implement this vision, the principal first established an administrative team composed of herself, the assistant principal, counselor, instructional specialist, and a newly created parent liaison who met formally every Monday before school to plan and to assess the school’s needs and problems. Problems were defined, specific duties were delegated, with a timeline, to individual members who were held accountable and feedback was provided. As the vision and revised mission of the school were shared with staff and parents, strong, committed grade level chairpersons were appointed to meet with the instructional specialist and principal while their students were with enrichment teachers. Those teachers, in turn, met with their grade level peers and brought ideas and/or issues for the chairpersons to discuss. Increasingly, the vision and plan reflected input and commitment from the entire faculty and staff.

To initiate community involvement, a leading city councilman and a respected area businessman were appointed to the site-based decision making team, which heretofore had no community members. The parent liaison and principal then set up a comprehensive parent involvement plan including home visits, adult education opportunities, a PTA, volunteer opportunities, training in parenting and teaching, and a wide variety of family learning and social activities.

In 2001 Mendoza Elementary was advanced to “recognized” status, and in 2002 it was raised to the coveted rank of “exemplary.”

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Part IV 2. How the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student performance.

Mendoza’s Systemic Approach to the Instructional Use of Assessment Data.

Mendoza uses a variety of assessment instruments, including the TAAS/TAKS criterion referenced test, TPRI primary reading inventory, RTPE reading test for bilingual, Stanford 9, Aprenda, district and campus benchmark tests, and teacher made mini-tests.

- **Data are used to develop the Campus Educational Improvement Plan.**
- **Data are used as an instructional resource for teachers.**

Teachers participated in District provided professional development at least once a year on how to use the data correctly. Staff were taught how to work with test vocabulary, analyze student answers, and implement problem-solving strategies appropriate for specific problems and students.
- **Data are used to determine campus curriculum strengths and weaknesses.**

The instructional staff used State Information on items and the AEISIT report to:

 - 1) Identify objectives some, most, and all students did not pass or barely passed.
 - 2) Examine responses to determine common wrong answers and signs of guessing.
 - 3) Gain an overall picture of curriculum problems, establish priorities, determine timelines, prepare direct instruction and tutorial materials, and implement the program.
 - 4) Prepare reports for the administrative team, SBDM, parents, and staff.
- **Data are used to monitor student progress and implementation of curriculum.**

Based on data analysis, the principal, instructional specialist, and Title I teacher assign students to tutoring groups, visit classes with high failure rates, teach model lessons for struggling teachers, and initiate peer coaching. Individual student folders, regularly reviewed by the specialist and Title I teacher, provide a more informal form of assessment.
- **Data are used to access educational resources and programs.**

Based on data analysis, district resources are accessed. This led to inclusion in grants and special programs, direct personnel assistance, and enriched resources.

Part IV 3. Communication of Student Performance to Parents, Students, and the Community

- Parent newsletters.
- Open House -- Student work is displayed. The principal presented the school's overall academic performance and grade level results.
- Grade level letters to parents and weekly planners.
- Newspaper prepared by students.
- Individual student conferences by teachers after benchmark results.
- Low performing students. The principal, as well as teachers and counselor, met with each child.
- Grade level assemblies. At the beginning of the year the principal informed students of her goals and what was expected of them.
- Monthly parent meetings. Parents can meet with teachers, discuss assessment results, and review their child's reading, writing, and math folders.
- RPTE. Bilingual education teachers conduct conferences with both students and with parents about the results and progress toward the advanced level for exiting the bilingual program.
- TPRI. Results for each administration is communicated as with other tests. Parents of students target for Reading Recovery come to school for a conference at least twice during the program.
- The parent liaison makes home visits to parents whose children are not coming to school.
- Student performance is a regular agenda item at SBDM meetings, which forms a conduit into the community.

Part IV 4. Sharing Successes with Other Schools

District

- FWISD has regular meetings of administrators at which promising interventions might be shared; these can lead to partnerships and mentoring.
- FWISD schools are organized into pyramids, and pyramid meetings of teachers, administrators, and offer an ideal format for collaboration and sharing.
- Mendoza will adopt an “open door” policy for educators who want to visit and observe programs in action. This, too, can lead to mentoring and collaboration, which will benefit Mendoza as well as the visiting schools.
- The Parent Liaison and Instructional Specialist will prepare a notebook sharing specific information about the parents morning program.
- The Title I Math Coordinator will offer assistance to coordinators in other schools who are conducting Family Math Night initiatives for the first time.
- Information on successful strategies and programs will be added to the FWISD website. The Internet also offers a powerful tool for individual sharing.

Regional Service Center

- The region service center system in Texas provides many opportunities for sharing through presentations, training of center personnel to transmit information, and one-to-one collaboration.

Conferences

- All members of the school community will pursue opportunities to make presentations at local, regional, state, and national conferences. The state Elementary School Principals’ Conference is an excellent starting point.

PART V-CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTIONS

Part V 1. School Curriculum – engaging students in significant content with high standards

Students in grades PreK – 5 are served in Mendoza Elementary School. The PreK program is organized into areas for language and mathematical development, culture, and physical development. The kindergarten – grade 5 program addresses essential learning areas of reading, writing, oral language, mathematics, science, social studies, technology, art, music, and physical education. Grade 5 includes thematic and cultural units which emphasize social studies and science objectives. Because over half the student population is limited English speaking, dual language instruction in English and Spanish is common. To support this, all teachers are certified in bilingual education or ESL, and to maintain high standards, all have G/T certification.

The school’s written curriculum, provided by the District, is aligned with state required standards and district expectations for students; academic achievement and developmental needs. The elementary program places great emphasis on language arts and mathematics. Each of these curriculum areas clearly articulates learning objectives, which support the expectations, and ensures that all students have sufficient opportunity to achieve. The district curriculum provides special programs and materials for students who are not on grade level and also includes materials for a 4-week extended year program offered in June to selected students.

More advanced students are provided with a challenging program with a special emphasis on science and health since the high school the students will attend features a special interest program in medical professions. A typical activity was a visit to the FW Museum of Science and History where Mendoza students joined with students from Texas Christian University to do exploration activities throughout the museum. Similarly, medical students from the North Texas College of Osteopathic Medicine visited Mendoza and spoke with students about medical profession opportunities and the training necessary for these careers. Further enrichment of the curriculum is provided by the after school Sports Academy for students who have successfully remediated any weaknesses. This includes one hour of academic enrichment and one hour of sports, activities in the arts, or special interest groups.

Daily technology support for students in grades 3-5 is provided by a CCC lab supporting content areas. Fourth graders have a mentoring program, conducted by computer, using computers, materials, and volunteers supplied by IBM. The Lightspan program uses Playstations to help with math and reading skills. The program provides students with playstations to use at home as well as a new CD each week, correlated with the curriculum being taught in the classroom.

The school’s library supports and is integrated into the school’s curriculum and instruction. Baskets of grade-level appropriate books are placed by benches in halls and in other “gathering points” to encourage reading by both children and parents. The Accelerated Reader program, supported by a variety of rewards and incentives, has proved a strong motivator for additional reading.

In all curriculum areas, teachers and administrators collaborate both horizontally and vertically to ensure that learning is cohesive and continuous. Weak areas are identified and changed or abandoned. Successful materials and programs are shared, and constant assessment ensures that students, and the school as a whole, meet their goals.

Part V 2. Reading curriculum

Bilingual Program. Students served in the K-3 full Bilingual program use the *Lectura* Scott Foresman to develop fluent readers able to comprehend and respond to a variety of reading text. This program is aligned with the reading program philosophy of FWISD, has a direct correlation with the reading program used in regular classrooms, and includes appropriate assessments of state standards to measure progress at regular intervals. It provides authentic literature in sequence from easiest to most difficult. Direct instruction in phonics, comprehension, and vocabulary development is supported with research projects, writing, and cross-curricular activities to extend and connect ideas.

The modified bilingual program, remedial program, and extended year program use Corrective Reading. This program is also a direct instruction model and emphasizes teaching decoding and comprehension skills at the level appropriate for each student. Corrective Reading was implemented in 1999 when assessment data indicated how far behind students were and the necessity to provide both a remedial and an on-grade-level curriculum. Its structure, repetition, and assessments have proved beneficial.

Open Court was chosen because it also is a research-based approach to teaching reading. The program focuses on direct instruction to the whole class, collaborative learning, small group, and individual instruction when needed with an emphasis on phonics and comprehension. Teachers like the assessments because they include observations, formal assessments, pre- and post-tests, unit tests, comprehension assessment, self-assessment, portfolio assessment, and family evaluation.

Advanced students use another Scott Foresman program, chosen because of the emphasis on higher level reading, varied text, and higher order questioning strategies, and correlated writing lessons in writing process and grammatical editing.

Part V 3. Other Curriculum Area: Mathematics

The math program at Mendoza Elementary School includes Silver Burdett, Ginn and Saxon Math; both supported by district curricula and offered to students depending on their placement in the regular, ESL, or bilingual programs. Highly successful at Mendoza has been the development of a mathematics vocabulary and a spiraling approach that includes review and reteaching of previously taught math concepts. Children feel successful because they are continually using strategies they know to master a variety of objectives within each lesson. The students at Mendoza Elementary learn to enjoy math because it is taught in a hands-on manner with manipulatives and active participation. The program also emphasizes extensive problem solving, communication, and connections/applications to “real world,” everyday math situations, such as time, money, and the calendar.

An important supplement to the basic curricula is Mountain Math, a math board program which is used daily in 15 minute “mini-lessons.” Each grade has a math/language board that focuses on that grade level’s concepts. Mountain Math was chosen because it is an aid in reviewing previously taught concepts, keeping concepts fresh in students’ minds, and helping them retain direct teaching from other programs. The mini-lesson format also enables teachers to provide students with a “think aloud” approach, an excellent learning method with good language practice for students with limited command of English. Teachers report that Mountain Math also serves as an effective assessment tool, allowing them to readily detect problem areas and adjust the teaching process in the ensuing class to help students better understand difficult concepts and processes.

Teachers have the option to supplement these basic programs with commercial materials, with district and campus-developed benchmark assessments and materials, with the family math program, and in the summer, with the extended year curriculum. All of these have proved successful.

Part V 4. Instructional Methods

Teachers use a variety of methods to meet students' different learning styles and backgrounds. These include direct teaching; discovery; hands-on learning with manipulatives and graphic organizers; drama and role-playing. Formats include whole class, small groups, peer pairs, and one-to-one. Field trips have been important at Mendoza both as incentives and because students have limited experiences.

Training parents to join in the teaching process has been successful and economical. Family math, reading, and writing nights are very popular, and many parents do go home and review or reteach the evenings concepts and skills.

Tutoring groups are kept as small as possible and are constituted and reconstituted repeatedly based on the results of benchmark or mini-tests. Tutoring is conducted by the Instructional Specialist, teachers, retired teachers, and volunteers, generally using District-prepared materials.

Technology is a great instructional aid for many students. As noted before, Mendoza uses the CCC lab, the Lightspan program, and classroom computer access to boost learning experiences.

Incentives and rewards have proved very important to motivating Mendoza students. These have included hot dog parties, honor rolls, Saturday field trips, and special opportunities for leadership. Perhaps the greatest incentive is meaningful praise and respect gained from teachers and parents.

Part V 5. Professional Development Program

Mendoza focused professional development on areas of high student need:

Reading: In years 1 & 2 of the grant, each teacher had 80+ hours of training, with 60-70 hours in years 3 & 4. This training occurred after school with food and stipends provided. The District reading department supported this with regular on-campus assistance.

Mathematics: Publishers provided training before school opened and District personnel trained during subsequent professional development days. Stipends were provided for Super Saturday Math workshops.

Writing: All 3rd and 4th grade teachers were trained in 6 writing modules. An ongoing e-mail sharing among teachers from different campuses has resulted.

Curriculum and Instruction: Pyramid staff development meetings provide both training and sharing. Areas of focus have included best practices, curriculum, lesson/unit development, analyzing assessments.

Diversity Training: Initial training was conducted at the District level, with follow-up on campus. Particular helpful was training in how to better communicate with students' parents.

Instructional Strategies: All teachers are certified in ESL or bilingual education and have 60 hours of G/T training. A guest speaker from the Rio Grande Valley trained teachers on improving the learning of LEP students.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 3rd Mathematics

Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Edition/publication year Updated yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficiency, and advanced cutpoints.

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced, and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1994 – 2002)
Grade 3 Mathematics – Tested in English**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	5/02	5/01	5/00	5/99	5/98
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	94%	82%	76%	42%	58%
Below Basic Level	5 st. -- 6%	12 st. – 18%	16 st. – 24%	40 st. – 58%	21 st. – 42%
Basic Level	53 st. – 69%	49 st. – 72%	29 st. – 43%	19 st. – 28%	19 st. – 38%
Proficient Level	17 st. – 22%	6 st. – 9%	14 st. – 21%	8 st. – 12%	5 st. – 10%
Advanced Level	2 st. – 3%	1 st. – 1%	8 st. – 12%	2 st. – 3%	5 st. – 10%
Number of students tested in English	77	68	67	69	50
Percent of total students tested	99%	100%	93%	95%	100%
Percent of students excluded¹	1%	-----	7%	5%	-----
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic -- number of students	75	66	65	66	47
Total Passing	95%	82%	75%	44	57%
Below Basic Level	4 st. – 5%	12 st. – 18%	16 st. – 25%	37 st. – 56%	20 st. – 43%
Basic Level	52 st. – 69%	48 st. – 73%	28 st. – 43%	19 st. – 29%	18 st. – 38%
Proficient Level	17 st. – 23%	5 st. – 8%	13 st. – 20%	8 st. – 12%	4 st. – 9%
Advanced Level	2 st. -3%	1 st. – 2%	8 st. – 12%	2 st. – 3%	5 st. – 11%
2. White -- number of students²	2	2	2	2	1
Total Passing	50%	100%	100%	0%	100%
Below Basic Level	1 st. – 50%	-----	-----	2 st. –100%	-----
Basic Level	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 50%	-----	-----
Proficient Level	-----	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 50%	-----	1 st. –100%
Advanced Level	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
3. Economic. Disadvantaged -- # students	61	61	50	54	40
Total Passing	92%	84	78%	41%	55%
Below Basic Level	5 st. – 6%	10 st. – 16%	11 st. – 22%	32 st. – 59%	18 st. – 45%
Basic Level	41 st. – 67%	44 st. – 72%	22 st. – 44%	15 st. – 28%	14 st. – 35%
Proficient Level	13 st. – 21%	6 st. – 10%	9 st. – 18%	6 st. – 11%	3 st. – 8%
Advanced Level	2 st. -- 3%	1 st. – 2%	8 st. – 16%	1 st. – 2%	5 st. – 13%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	87%	82%	92%	84%	78%
1. Hispanic Passing	83%	78%	89%	80%	71%
2. White Passing	93%	90%	96%	91%	86%
3. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	81%	75%	88%	76%	68%
Percent of students tested	97%	98%	90%	95%	90%

Note: When we queried Belinda Flores, Texas contact person for this program, we were told that Texas had neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (varies yearly)

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

1 Students may be excluded because of absence, because they are recent immigrants, because they are taking the test in Spanish (usually only in 3rd at Mendoza), because they are taking the Special Ed. Alternative test (SDAA), because their ARD committee considers testing inappropriate, because of illness after starting the test, etc.

2 Even though Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 students, we have included white students because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 3rd Reading

Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Edition/publication year Updated yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficiency, and advanced cutpoints.

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced, and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1994 – 2002)
Grade 3 Reading – Tested in English**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	5/02	5/01	5/00	5/99	5/98
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	86%	88%	89%	80%	66%
Below Basic Level	10 st. – 14%	8 st. – 12%	7 st. – 11%	14 st. – 20%	17 st. – 34%
Basic Level	22 st. – 30%	22 st. – 33%	22 st. – 33%	22 st. – 32%	13 st. – 26%
Proficient Level	30 st. – 41%	28 st. – 42%	24 st. – 36%	27 st. – 39%	16 st. – 32%
Advanced Level	12 st. – 16%	9 st. – 13%	13 st. – 20%	6 st. – 9%	4 st. – 8%
Number of students tested in English	74	67	66	69	50
Percent of total students tested	95%	99%	92%	95%	96%
Percent of students excluded³	5%	1%	8%	5%	4%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic -- number of students	72	65	64	67	47
Total Passing	88%	88%	89%	81%	64%
Below Basic Level	9 st. – 13%	8 st. – 12%	7 st. – 11%	13 st. – 19%	17 st. – 36%
Basic Level	22 st. – 31%	22 st. – 34%	22 st. – 34%	21 st. – 31%	11 st. – 23%
Proficient Level	29 st. – 41%	26 st. – 40%	23 st. – 36%	27 st. – 40%	15 st. – 32%
Advanced Level	12 st. -- 17%	9 st. – 14%	12 st. – 19%	6 st. – 9%	4 st. – 9%
2. White -- number of students⁴	2	2	2	2	1
Total Passing	50%	100%	100%	50%	100%
Below Basic Level	-----	-----	-----	1 st. – 50%	-----
Basic Level	-----	-----	-----	1 st. – 50%	-----
Proficient Level	1 st. – 50%	2 st. – 100%	1 st. – 50%	-----	1 st. -- 100%
Advanced Level	-----	-----	1 st. – 50%	-----	-----
3. Economic. Disadvantaged -- # students	62	60	49	54	40
Total Passing	88%	88%	88%	78%	65%
Below Basic Level	7 st. – 11%	7 st. – 12%	6 st. – 10%	12 st. – 22%	14 st. – 28%
Basic Level	20 st. – 32%	17 st. – 28%	16 st. – 33%	16 st. – 30%	11 st. – 28%
Proficient Level	24 st. – 39%	27 st. – 54%	18 st. – 37%	23 st. – 43%	12 st. – 30%
Advanced Level	9 st. – 14%	9 st. – 15%	9 st. – 18%	3 st. – 6%	3 st. – 8%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	87%	86%	87%	88%	83%
1. Hispanic Passing	83%	82%	83%	84%	81%
2. White Passing	94%	93%	93%	93%	92%
3. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	81%	80%	81%	81%	79%
Percent of students tested	97%	98%	92%	89%	90%

Note: When we queried Belinda Flores, Texas contact person for this program, we were told that Texas had neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:
Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (varies yearly)
Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent
Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

³ Students may be excluded because of absence, because they are recent immigrants, because they are taking the test in Spanish (usually only in 3rd at Mendoza), because they are taking the Special Ed. Alternative test (SDAA), because their ARD committee considers testing inappropriate, because of illness after starting the test, etc.

⁴ Even though Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 members, we have included white students because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 3rd Reading Spanish

Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Edition/publication year Updated yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficiency, and advanced cutpoints.

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced, and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1994 – 2002)
Grade 3 Reading – Tested in Spanish**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99	5 / 98
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	91%	95%	100%	75%	66%
Below Basic Level	3 st. -- 9%	1 st. – 5 %	-----	5 st. – 25%	17 st. – 34%
Basic Level	12 st. – 36%	9 st. – 45%	6 st. – 26%	8 st. – 16%	23 st. – 46%
Proficient Level	11 st. – 33%	4 st. – 20%	6 st. – %	4 st. – 8%	8 st. – 16%
Advanced Level	7 st. – 21%	6 st. – 30%	11 st. – 48%	3 st. – 6 %	2 st. – 4%
Number of students tested in Spanish	33	20	23	20	50
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of students excluded⁵	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	77%	76%	76%	74%	64%
Percent of students tested	94%	91%	90%	83%	92%

Note: When we queried Belinda Flores, Texas contact person for this program, we were told that Texas had neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (varies yearly)

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

Texas does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 3rd Math Spanish

Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Edition/publication year Updated yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficiency, and advanced cutpoints.

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced, and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1994 –2002)
Grade 3 Mathematics -Tested in Spanish**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99	5 / 98
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	97%	85%	83%	70%	52%
Below Basic Level	1 st. -- 3%	3 st. – 15%	4 st. – 17%	6 st. – 30%	24 st. – 48%
Basic Level	19 st. – 58%	11 st. – 55%	11 st. – 48%	8 st. – 40%	11 st. – 22%
Proficient Level	11 st. – 33%	5 st. – 25%	6 st. – 26%	4 st. – 20%	14 st. – 28%
Advanced Level	2 st. – 6%	1 st. – 5%	2 st. – 9%	2 st. – 10%	1 st. – 2%
Number of students tested in Spanish	33	20	23	20	50
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of students excluded⁶	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	87%	83%	75%	74%	65%
Percent of students tested	94%	91%	90%	83%	92%

Note: When we queried Belinda Flores, Texas contact person for this program, we were told that Texas had neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (varies yearly)

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

Texas does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

⁶ Students may be excluded because of absence, because they are recent immigrants, because they are taking the test in Spanish (usually only in 3rd at Mendoza), because they are taking the Special Ed. Alternative test (SDAA), because their ARD committee considers testing inappropriate, because of illness after starting the test, etc.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 4th Grade Mathematics

Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Edition/publication year Updated yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficiency, and advanced cutpoints.

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced, and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1994–2002)
Grade 4 Mathematics – Tested in English**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99	5 / 98
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	99%	95%	80%	60%	62%
Below Basic Level	1 st. -- 1 %	5 st. – 5 %	19 st. – 20%	34 st. – 40%	33 st. – 39%
Basic Level	44 st. – 54%	57 st. – 62%	31 st. – 33%	17 st. – 20%	28 st. – 33%
Proficient Level	27 st. – 33%	22 st. – 24%	25 st. – 27%	25 st. – 29%	21 st. – 25%
Advanced Level	9 st. – 11%	8 st. – 9%	18 st. – 19%	10 st. – 12%	2 st. – 2%
Number of students tested in English	81	92	93	86	84
Percent of total students tested	95%	97%	89%	84%	96%
Percent of students excluded⁷	5%	3%	11%	16%	4 %
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic -- number of students	79	89	90	84	81
Total Passing	99%	96%	80%	61%	60%
Below Basic Level	1 st. – 1 %	4 st. – 4 %	18 st. – 20%	33 st. – 39%	33 st. – 41%
Basic Level	43 st. – 54%	56 st. – 63%	29 st. – 32%	17 st. – 20%	27 st. – 33%
Proficient Level	26 st. – 33%	21 st. – 24%	25 st. – 28%	24 st. – 29%	19 st. – 58%
Advanced Level	9 st. – 11%	8 st. – 9%	18 st. – 20%	10 st. – 12%	2 st. – 2%
2. White -- number of students⁸	2	2	3	1	2
Total Passing	100%	50%	67%	100%	100%
Below Basic Level	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 33%	-----	-----
Basic Level	1 st. – 50%	-----	2 st. – 67%	-----	1 st. – 50%
Proficient Level	-----	1 st. – 50%	-----	1 st. – 100%	1 st. – 50%
Advanced Level	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
3. Economic. Disadvantaged -- # students	66	74	75	69	67
Total Passing	98%	95%	71%	57%	58%
Below Basic Level	1 st. – 2 %	4 st. – 5 %	17 st. – 23%	30 st. – 43%	29 st. – 43%
Basic Level	32 st. – 48%	45 st. – 61%	24 st. – 32%	13 st. – 19%	22 st. – 33%
Proficient Level	26 st. – 39%	16 st. – 22%	18 st. – 24%	19 st. – 28%	14 st. – 21%
Advanced Level	9 st. -- 14%	8 st. – 11%	16 st. – 21%	10 st. – 14%	2 st. – 3%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	94%	91%	87%	87%	82%
1. Hispanic Passing	92%	82%	83%	84%	77%
2. White Passing	97%	89%	93%	93%	88%
3. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	91%	87%	80%	81%	74%
Percent of students tested	96%	96%	89%	97%	89%

Note: When we queried Belinda Flores, Texas contact person for this program, we were told that Texas had neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (varies yearly)

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

⁷ Students may be excluded because of absence, because they are recent immigrants, because they are taking the test in Spanish (usually only in 3rd at Mendoza), because they are taking the Special Ed. Alternative test (SDAA), because their ARD committee considers testing inappropriate, because of illness after starting the test, etc.

⁸ Even though Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 students, we have included white students because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 4th Grade Reading

Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Edition/publication year Updated yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficiency, and advanced cutpoints.

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced, and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1994 – 2002)
Grade 4 Reading – Tested in English**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99	5 / 98
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	93%	91%	76%	56%	71%
Below Basic Level	6 st. -- 8%	8 st. – 9%	23 st. – 24%	38 st. – 44%	25 st. – 30%
Basic Level	23 st. – 29%	11 st. – 12%	20 st. – 21%	21 st. – 24%	32 st. – 39%
Proficient Level	22 st. – 28%	34 st. – 38%	28 st. – 30%	20 st. – 23%	18 st. – 22%
Advanced Level	29 st. – 36%	36 st. – 40%	23 st. – 24%	8 st. – 9%	8 st. – 10%
Number of students tested in English	80	89	94	87	83
Percent of total students teste d	96%	96%	93%	86%	96%
Percent of students excluded⁹	4%	4%	7%	14%	4%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic -- number of students	78	87	91	85	80
Total Passing	92%	92%	76%	56%	71%
Below Basic Level	6 st. – 8%	7 st. – 8%	22 st. – 24%	37 st. – 44%	24 st. – 30%
Basic Level	23 st. – 29%	11 st. – 13%	20 st. – 22%	21 st. – 25%	31 st. – 39%
Proficient Level	21 st. – 27%	34 st. – 39%	27 st. – 30%	19 st. – 22%	17 st. – 21%
Advanced Level	28 st. -- 36%	35 st. – 40%	22 st. – 24%	8 st. – 9%	8 st. – 10 %
2. White -- number of students¹⁰	2	2	3	1	2
Total Passing	100%	50%	67%	100%	50%
Below Basic Level	-----	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 33%	-----	1 st. – 50%
Basic Level	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Proficient Level	1 st. – 50%	-----	1 st. – 33%	1 st. – 100%	1 st. – 50%
Advanced Level	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 33%	-----	-----
3. Economic. Disadvantaged -- # students	65	71	76	69	67
Total Passing	92%	92%	72%	54%	68%
Below Basic Level	5 st. – 8%	6 st. – 8%	21 st. – 28%	32 st. – 46%	22 st. – 33%
Basic Level	17 st. – 26%	11 st. – 15%	16 st. – 21%	21 st. – 30%	26 st. – 39%
Proficient Level	19 st. – 29%	25 st. – 35%	21 st. – 28%	16 st. – 23%	12 st. – 18%
Advanced Level	24 st. -- 37%	29 st. – 41%	18 st. – 24%	7 st. – 10%	7 st. – 10%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	92%	90%	89%	88%	86%
1. Hispanic Passing	86%	87%	85%	84%	81%
2. White Passing	96%	95%	95%	94%	92%
3. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	88%	85%	84%	82%	79%
Percent of students tested	96%	96%	89%	87%	89%

Note: When we queried Belinda Flores, Texas contact person for this program, we were told that Texas had neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:
Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (varies yearly)
Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent
Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

9 Students may be excluded because of absence, because they are recent immigrants, because they are taking the test in Spanish (usually only in 3rd at Mendoza), because they are taking the Special Ed. Alternative test (SDAA), because their ARD committee considers testing inappropriate, because of illness after starting the test, etc.

10 Even though Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 members, we have included white students because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 5th Grade Mathematics

Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Edition/publication year Updated yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficiency, and advanced cutpoints.

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced, and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1994 – 2002)
Grade 5 Mathematics – Tested in English**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	5/02	5/01	5/00	5/99	5/98
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	97%	94%	89%	69%	74
Below Basic Level	3 st. -- 3%	5 st. – 6%	9 st. – 11%	29 st. – 31%	20 st. – 24%
Basic Level	24 st. – 28%	31 st. – 39%	23 st. – 28%	31 st. – 33%	24 st. – 29%
Proficient Level	46 st. – 53%	25 st. – 32%	23 st. – 28%	31 st. – 33%	30 st. – 37%
Advanced Level	14 st. – 16%	18 st. – 23%	28 st. – 34%	2 st. – 2%	8 st. – 10%
Number of students tested in English	87	79	83	93	82
Percent of total students tested	99%	98%	87%	85%	95%
Percent of students excluded¹¹	1%	2%	13%	15%	5%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic -- number of students	84	78	82	90	81
Total Passing	96%	95%	89%	64%	75%
Below Basic Level	3 st. – 4%	4 st. – 5%	9 st. – 11%	28 st. – 31%	20 st. – 25%
Basic Level	24 st. – 29%	31 st. – 40%	23 st. – 28%	30 st. – 33%	23 st. – 28%
Proficient Level	45 st. – 54%	25 st. – 32%	22 st. – 27%	30 st. – 33%	30 st. – 37%
Advanced Level	12 st. – 14%	18 st. – 23%	28 st. – 34%	2 st. – 2%	8 st. – 10%
2. White -- number of students¹²	3	0	1	2	1
Total Passing	100%	-----	100%	100%	100%
Below Basic Level	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Basic Level	-----	-----	-----	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 100%
Proficient Level	1 st. – 33%	-----	1 st. – 100%	1 st. – 50%	-----
Advanced Level	2 st. – 67%	-----	-----	-----	-----
3. Economic. Disadvantaged -- # students	70	64	70	70	72
Total Passing	96%	94%	91%	64%	76%
Below Basic Level	3 st. – 4%	4 st. – 6%	6 st. – 9%	25 st. – 36%	17 st. – 24%
Basic Level	17 st. – 24%	22 st. – 34%	23 st. – 33%	22 st. – 31%	23 st. – 32%
Proficient Level	38 st. – 45%	22 st. – 34%	22 st. – 31%	21 st. – 30%	30 st. – 42%
Advanced Level	12 st. – 14%	16 st. – 25%	24 st. – 34%	2 st. – 3%	8 st. – 11%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	96%	94%	92%	90%	85%
1. Hispanic Passing	95%	93%	89%	87%	82%
2. White Passing	98%	97%	96%	95%	91%
3. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	94%	91%	88%	84%	79%
Percent of students tested	97%	97%	90%	88%	90%

Note: When we queried Belinda Flores, Texas contact person for this program, we were told that Texas had neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:

Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (varies yearly)

Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent

Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

11 Students may be excluded because of absence, because they are recent immigrants, because they are taking the test in Spanish (usually only in 3rd at Mendoza), because they are taking the Special Ed. Alternative test (SDAA), because their ARD committee considers testing inappropriate, because of illness after starting the test, etc.

12 Even though Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 students, we have included white students because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

The Data Display Table is illustrated on the following page.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Complete a separate form for reading (language arts or English) and mathematics at each grade level.

Grade 5th Grade Reading

Test Texas Assessment of Academic Skills

Edition/publication year Updated yearly

Publisher Texas Education Agency

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Exempted students took an appropriate test in their native language (Spanish) or took an appropriate alternative test.

For the school and state, report scores as the percentage of students tested whose performance was scored at or above the cutpoint used by the state for 1) basic, 2) proficient, and 3) advanced, or similar categories as defined by the state. States will vary in their terminology and cutpoints. Note that the reported percentage of students scoring above the basic cutpoint should include students scoring above the proficiency, and advanced cutpoints.

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced, and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

**Vertical Record of State Criterion-Referenced Test
TAAS – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1994 – 2002)
Grade 5 Reading – Tested in English**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	5 / 02	5 / 01	5 / 00	5 / 99	5 / 98
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Passing	94%	89%	78%	57%	60%
Below Basic Level	5 st. -- 6 %	9 st. – 11%	18 st. – 23%	40 st. – 43%	33 st. – 40%
Basic Level	24 st. – 28%	15 st. – 19%	24 st. – 30%	21 st. – 23%	29 st. – 35%
Proficient Level	38 st. – 45%	31 st. – 39%	19 st. – 24%	25 st. – 27%	16 st. – 20%
Advanced Level	18 st. – 21%	24 st. – 30%	19 st. – 24%	6 st. – 7 %	4 st. – 5%
Number of students tested in English	85	79	80	92	82
Percent of total students tested	97%	98%	84%	84%	94%
Percent of students excluded¹³	3%	2%	16%	16%	6%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Hispanic -- number of students	82	78	80	90	81
Total Passing	94%	90%	78%	56%	60%
Below Basic Level	5 st. – 6 %	8 st. – 10%	18 st. – 23%	40 st. – 44%	32 st. – 41%
Basic Level	24 st. – 29%	15 st. – 19%	24 st. – 30%	20 st. – 22%	28 st. – 35%
Proficient Level	37 st. – 45%	31 st. – 40%	19 st. – 24%	24 st. – 27%	16 st. – 20%
Advanced Level	16 st. – 20%	24 st. – 31%	19 st. – 24%	6 st. – 7 %	4 st. – 5%
2. White -- number of students¹⁴	3	0	0	2	1
Total Passing	100%	-----	-----	100%	100%
Below Basic Level	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Basic Level	-----	-----	-----	1 st. – 50%	1 st. – 100%
Proficient Level	1 st. – 33%	-----	-----	1 st. – 50%	-----
Advanced Level	2 st. – 67%	-----	-----	-----	-----
3. Economic. Disadvantaged -- # students	69	64	69	70	72
Total Passing	93%	88%	77%	50%	62%
Below Basic Level	5 st. – 7 %	8 st. – 13%	16 st. – 23%	35 st. – 50%	28 st. – 38%
Basic Level	19 st. – 28%	11 st. – 17%	22 st. – 32%	16 st. – 23%	26 st. – 36%
Proficient Level	30 st. – 43%	24 st. – 38%	17 st. – 25%	11 st. – 16%	15 st. – 21%
Advanced Level	15 st. -- 22%	21 st. – 33%	14 st. – 20%	4 st. – 6%	3 st. – 4%
STATE SCORES					
Total Passing	92%	90%	87%	86%	85%
1. Hispanic Passing	90%	86%	82%	79%	79%
2. White Passing	96%	95%	94%	93%	91%
3. Econom. Disadvantaged Passing	88%	84%	81%	78%	77%
Percent of students tested	97%	97%	90%	88%	90%

Note: When we queried Belinda Flores, Texas contact person for this program, we were told that Texas had neither established categories like Basic, Proficient, and Advanced nor equated TAAS scores with a nationally normed test. To make these scores more comprehensible we have established these guidelines:
Basic: meeting the “cut” score for passing (varies yearly)
Proficient: a score of 85% or better (a solid “B” performance) – may round up or down one percent
Advanced: 95% or better (TAAS “Academic Achievement”) – may round up or down one percent

13 Students may be excluded because of absence, because they are recent immigrants, because they are taking the test in Spanish (usually only in 3rd at Mendoza), because they are taking the Special Ed. Alternative test (SDAA), because their ARD committee considers testing inappropriate, because of illness after starting the test, etc.

14 Even though Texas does not provide grade-level group scores for any population with fewer than 5 members, we have included white students because of the concern with ethnic gaps.

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 3rd Grade-Reading Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1992 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month				September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score		<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>	31	37
Number of students tested				88	51
Percent of total students tested				80%	44%
Number of students excluded				22	65
Percent of students excluded				20%	56%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)		<i>NCE</i>		39.4 (84 students)	42.9 (48 students)
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 3rd Grade-Math Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1992 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month				September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score		<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>	23	39
Number of students tested				89	51
Percent of total students tested				80%	44%
Number of students excluded				21	65
Percent of students excluded				20%	56%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)		<i>NCE</i>		34.5 (85 students)	44.9 (48 students)
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 4th Grade-Reading Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1992 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month				September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score		<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>	22	32
Number of students tested				103	64
Percent of total students tested				99%	60%
Number of students excluded				1	42
Percent of students excluded				1%	37%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)		<i>NCE</i>		34.0 (100 students)	40.9 (60 students)
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 4th Grade-Math Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1992 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month				September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score		<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>	29	44
Number of students tested				102	64
Percent of total students tested				98%	60%
Number of students excluded				2	42
Percent of students excluded				2%	37%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)		<i>NCE</i>		38.5 (99 students)	47.4 (60 students)
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 5th Grade-Reading Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1992 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month				September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score		<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>	29	36
Number of students tested				101	79
Percent of total students tested				96%	69%
Number of students excluded				5	35
Percent of students excluded				4%	31%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)		<i>NCE</i>		98.2 (97 students)	42.4 (77 students)
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 5th Grade-Math Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Version 7

Edition/publication year 1992 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education and LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month				September	September
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score		<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>	33	54
Number of students tested				91	79
Percent of total students tested				86%	69%
Number of students excluded				15	35
Percent of students excluded				14%	31%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)		<i>NCE</i>		40.8 (*87 students)	51.9 (77 students)
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 3rd Grade Reading Test Stanford 9; Form S

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education And LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	September	September	September		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	49	49	39	<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Number of students tested	73	70	76		
Percent of total students tested	65%	74%	78%		
Number of students excluded	40	25	22		
Percent of students excluded	35%	20%	22%		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	51.1	50.1	48.7 (61 students)	<i>NCE</i>	
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 3rd Grade Math Test Stanford 9; Form S

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education And LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	September	September	September		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	41	50	42	<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Number of students tested	77	69	76		
Percent of total students tested	68%	73%	78%		
Number of students excluded	36	26	22		
Percent of students excluded	32%	27%	22%		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	45.8	50.5	43.2 (66 students)	<i>NCE</i>	
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 4th Grade Reading Test Stanford 9; Form S

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education And LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	September	September	September		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	38	32	18	<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Number of students tested	83	89	104		
Percent of total students tested	90%	+5%	100%		
Number of students excluded	9	6	0		
Percent of students excluded	10%	6%	100%		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	43.4 (85 students)	39.5 (83 students)	30.5 (81 students)	<i>NCE</i>	
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 4th Grade Math Test Stanford 9; Form S

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education And LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	September	September	September		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	57	49	21	<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Number of students tested	85	93	105		
Percent of total students tested	93%	98%	100%		
Number of students excluded	7	2	0		
Percent of students excluded	7%	2%	0%		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	53.6 (85 students)	49.1 (83 students)	33.0 (87 students)	<i>NCE</i>	
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 5th Grade Reading Test Stanford 9; Form S

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? LEP students were eligible to be excluded by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles X

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	September	September	September		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	34	34	18	<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Number of students tested	87	57	77		
Percent of total students tested	92%	5%	84%		
Number of students excluded	8	33	15		
Percent of students excluded	8%	36%	16%		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	41.3 (87 students)	41.3 (57 students)	31.5 (62 students)	<i>NCE</i>	
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

*1 teacher did not administer both parts of the reading test.

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 5th Grade Math Test Stanford 9; Form S

Edition/publication year 1995 Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education And LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	September	September	September		
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	46	34	23	<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Ran)</i>
Number of students tested	89	81	90		
Percent of total students tested	94%	90%	98%		
Number of students excluded	6	9	2		
Percent of students excluded	6%	10%	2%		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	47.7 (89 students)	41.4 (81 students)	37.7 (70 students)	<i>NCE</i>	
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 3rd Grade Reading Test Aprندا 2

Edition/publication year _____ Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? Special Education And LEP students were eligible to be exempted by ARD and LPAC committees. Those students exempted were not assessed; no appropriate measurement instrument was available for use.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores Percentiles

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month	September	September	September		<i>Not Administered</i>
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score	81	82	85	74	<i>Percentile Rank</i>
Number of students tested	33	16	22	21	
Percent of total students tested	71%	17%	22%	19%	
Number of students excluded*	80	79	76	89	
Percent of students excluded*	71%	83%	78%	81%	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)	43.4	39.5	30.5 (81 students)		NCE
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					

* This number also includes students who took the English normal reference Stanford 9/Math 7 and not Aprندا.

DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate form for each test and grade level.

Grade 3rd Grade Math Test Aprenda 2

Edition/publication year _____ Publisher Harcourt Brace

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? _____

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores _____ Percentiles _____

***Fort Worth ISD does not administer Aprenda 2 Math to Grade 3 students enrolled in the Bilingual Education Program.**

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Testing month					
SCHOOL SCORES					
Total Score					
Number of students tested					
Percent of total students tested					
Number of students excluded					
Percent of students excluded					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. <u>Hispanic</u> (specify subgroup)					
2. _____ (specify subgroup)					
3. _____ (specify subgroup)					
4. _____ (specify subgroup)					
5. _____ (specify subgroup)					

Harcourt Brace does not prepare summary scores for populations with fewer than 5 students. Mendoza tested only third grade Spanish at this level. Because all students testing in Spanish were Hispanic and this population was overwhelmingly economically disadvantaged, there are no subgroups.

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national score (mean score) and standard deviation for the total test and each subtest.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
NATIONAL SCORES					
Total Score					
STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
Total Standard Deviation					