

2004-2005 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Cover Sheet

Type of School: Elementary Middle High K-12

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

Official School Name Charles Helmers Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 27300 Grandview Drive
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Valencia California 91354-1800
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)
Los Angeles School Code Number* 19 64998 6106876

Telephone (661) 286-4399 Fax (661) 286-4391

Website/URL www.saugus.k12.us.ca E-mail btorhan@saugus.k12.us.ca

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 February 1, 2005

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

District Name Saugus Union School District Tel. (661) 294-5300

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 February 1, 2005

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mr. Gary Murr
(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 February 1, 2005

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

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

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.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2004-2005 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1999 and has not received the 2003 or 2004 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. 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 the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. 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.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 14 Elementary schools
 Middle schools
 Junior high schools
 High schools
 Other
- 14 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$5,893
- Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,542

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 as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK				7			
K	54	62	116	8			
1	62	64	126	9			
2	82	69	151	10			
3	78	77	155	11			
4	97	80	177	12			
5	86	86	172	Other			
6	86	73	159				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							1,056

[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| 74 | % White |
| 3 | % Black or African American |
| 12 | % Hispanic or Latino |
| 11 | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| 0 | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% Total | |

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 4%

(This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	26
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	23
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	49
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	1,056
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.04
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	4%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 1%
10 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 19

Specify languages: Arabic, Armenian, Assyrian, Bengali, Cantonese, English, Farsi, Filipino, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Russian, Spanish, Thai, Vietnamese. (These are the language groups our students speak at home; most are Fully English Proficient - FEP.)

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 2 %

Total number students who qualify: 22

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the 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: $\frac{10}{106}$ % 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>7</u> Autism	<u>2</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u>4</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>54</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>3</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>33</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> </u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> </u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>1</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>2</u> Emotionally Disturbed	

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>44</u>	<u>4</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u> </u>	<u>29</u>
Support staff	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>
Total number	<u>55</u>	<u>39</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: Gr. K-3 = 20:1 Gr. 4-6 = 30:1; average 25:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. 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 rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Daily student attendance	97 %	97 %	97 %	97 %	97 %
Daily teacher attendance	93 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	95 %
Teacher turnover rate	8 %	12 %	8 %	9 %	16 %
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate (high school)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

PART III – SUMMARY

The learning community of Charles Helmers Elementary School is dedicated to our school mission: the development of a strong community of life-long learners, decision makers and persons of character, one student at a time. Emphasizing scholarliness, we urge students to ponder, to consider multiple perspectives, to take risks in exercising intellectual curiosity. But most of all, our students and staff exercise academic humility by realizing they will always have more to learn. Character development goes hand-in-hand with academic excellence. Students have multiple opportunities to make their own decisions—beginning with classroom and playground rules. Peace Patrol, Student Council, class meetings, service learning projects, cooperative learning, and classroom government systems all offer a rich environment which promote autonomous and cooperative decision making, while fostering moral intelligence. We nurture our sense of community through activities that bond students and families to our school. After-school PTA– sponsored enrichment classes, childcare, scout meetings, as well as academic intervention classes vie for space each afternoon. PTA functions—including popular Family Quest nights, Site Council, parent education meetings, university classes for teachers, and reading clinics for students crowd the evenings. On Sundays, a small church holds services in our multipurpose room.

A strong home/school partnership fosters success for all. Last year, dedicated volunteers provided 20,000 hours of assistance. Our award-winning PTA sponsors field trips, technology purchases, family involvement evenings, parent education, multi-cultural assemblies, artist-in-residence music workshops, and books fairs. PTA supports our Disaster Preparedness Program with financial and organizational assistance. PTA membership is over 200 %. Our Site Council is another full partner, not only providing valuable input to our single site plan, but also leading the campaign for a recently passed local school bond. Parents actively support our commitment to Character Education. The Six Pillars of Character are integrated into our curriculum, class meetings and discipline policies, and home activities.

Our elevated test scores and Academic Performance Index of 903 (API is California’s measurement of how well a school is doing academically) reflect the efforts and quality of our staff. Each of our 52 dedicated teachers is fully credentialed, and most have master’s degrees. Teachers collaborate continually to develop and refine assessment methods and plan curriculum. The qualifications of our instructional aides exceed the requirements of NCLB. All students benefit, as is evidenced by strong performance in each of our subgroups. Our desire for continual improvement is strong. Staff development has included Standards Based Instruction, differentiation for Gifted and Talented Education (GATE), intervention training, and advanced technology training. This year, in response to assessment results, our focus is on honing writing instruction. Classroom and Special Education teachers work together to coordinate workshop time to address the special needs of all students. Leadership is broad based. In addition to an administrative open-door policy and weekly staff meetings, a 7-member leadership team meets each Monday to enhance communication among staff.

Multi-media technology strengthens the fabric of the Helmers community. E-mail, newsletters, and websites foster broad communication. Web-based research, Power Point presentations, digital photography, and videography enhance curriculum at all grade levels. Our library-media center is a model for our district and uses electronic cataloging and circulation systems. The library collection is current and well balanced to meet the needs of students, staff, and parents.

A recent visitor remarked, “Helmers feels good inside and outside.” This is no accident. We work to implement the tenets of the *Fish!*TM Philosophy: to play, to choose our attitude, to make someone’s day and to be there for others. These goals, along with an exemplary commitment to excellence, empower our staff to fulfill our mission.

PART 1V – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Meaning of School Assessment Results

California's public school children in grades 2 through 11 are assessed for academic progress in reading and math as part of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. STAR assessment tools currently include the nationally norm-referenced California Achievement Test (CAT 6) and the California Standards Test (CST), a criterion referenced test aligned with State academic standards. The results of these assessments are combined to establish an Academic Performance Index (API) score ranking schools from a low of 200 to a high of 1000. An API score above 800 is the benchmark for high achieving schools. Helmers Elementary School's API is 903, placing us in the top ten percent of high performing schools statewide, and first in our district. Since 2000 our API has increased 30 points. We have met and exceeded our No child Left Behind (NCLB) Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) goals through all phases.

SAT 9 (3 years of norm-referenced data / full battery test)

From 2000 to 2002 the state used the **SAT 9**. In 2002, at least 82 % of all Helmers students scored at or above the 50th percentile in reading and at least 88% in math, placing the vast majority of Helmers students in the top half of students nationally. Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, or 2002.

CAT 6 (two years of norm-referenced data/ survey test)

Beginning in 2003 the state chose the CAT 6 as our new norm referenced test. At least 69% of students in all tested grades scored above the 50th percentile in reading and at least 80% in math in 2004. Sub groups also did well. Grade level percentages of Latino students above the 50th percentile ranged from 59% to 73% in reading and 65% - 93% in math. Grade level percentages for Special Education students meeting standards ranged from 25% - 67% in reading and 42%-83% in math. This is impressive, considering our Learning Disabled students receive services based on their specific learning disabilities. In order to qualify for the resource specialist program students are required to show a discrepancy between their ability and their achievement.

California Standards Test (CSTs)

Students scoring Proficient or above on CSTs meet California's high standards. Grade level percentages of all students meeting standards have moved from a median of 69% to 75% in English language arts and from 77% to 79% in math over the last three years. In 2004 median grade level percentages for Latino students meeting standards was 60% in English Language Arts and 76% in math. The most recent data for Asian students was from 2003 and showed median grade level results of 89% in English language arts and 87% in math. Our lowest performing (and largest) subgroup, Special Education, has moved from a tested-grade level median of 24% of students meeting standards in English language arts to 28% and from 34% to 42 % in math during the same period. This validates recent changes in our special education program and gives impetus to further refinement.

Additional Measures

Our district also uses a multiple measurements matrix to monitor individual student progress. Assessments include the state testing, writing samples, report card grades, performance-based assessments, and district math computation and application tests. This helps us identify intervention needs and form balanced classes. Additionally, classroom instruction in math and language arts is based on formative assessment data that guides teachers as they plan instruction. The website where information on California's state testing may be found is www.cde.ca.gov.

2. School's Use of Assessment Data

All of our teachers are involved in the use of assessment data. Our district uses a multiple measurement matrix that allows us to look at state test scores (CAT 6, previously SAT 9, and California Standards Tests), along with writing samples, math scores, and report card grades. These are all put on-line in "iSchool," a district-based software program. This gives teachers an overall look at their students so they can plan instruction, provide intervention or enrichment as needed, and develop lessons that meet individual needs.

Early in the school year, teachers meet with parents to set goals for their students. Part of this meeting is to go over the assessments given the students, which also include reading and math placement tests. In October, teachers meet with the site administrators to develop professional goals that help them meet the district and state standards. They review assessment data and student placement in groups for reading and math. They also include a curriculum map charting what standards they will be covering in each of the academic subjects.

Throughout the year teachers use formal and informal benchmark assessments to mark progress, as well as publisher developed chapter and unit tests, and quizzes. They work together in grade levels for at least 900 minutes of collegial planning each year. They analyze curriculum and assessment data, planning how to meet each student's unique needs, while developing strategies to help him/her meet the standards. At teachers' meetings we discuss grading and using data to make instructional decisions.

3. Communication of Student Performance

Helmets Elementary School communicates student performance to parents, students and the community on a regular basis. We believe that this communication is vital to ensure student success. We share information with the community through our Site Council, Parent Teacher Association (PTA) meetings, the annual School Accountability Report Card, our weekly newsletter, *Helmets Happenings*, the PTA's monthly newsletter, *The Scoop*, teacher newsletters and websites, local newspapers, and the district's web site.

Throughout the year we share individual student performance with parents and students. Parents attend Back to School Night shortly after the school year begins. At this time parents are given information about the state standards and the district/school/classroom expectations. Five weeks into the school year Goal Setting Conferences are conducted with the parents. Upper grade teachers often include students in this conference. Parents learn about their child's accomplishments thus far in the school year, including performance data on diagnostic testing and state assessments. The parents and teacher discuss how the child is doing overall and develop mutually agreed upon goals for the student that are revisited during the year. If a student is having difficulties, an Academic Intervention Plan is developed. Other plans, for example GATE or English Language Learners (ELL), are developed if needed. In the spring we have another formal parent-teacher conference in which parents learn of their child's progress toward meeting the standards. Report Cards go home three times a year, with informal progress reports sent home more frequently. Parents of special education students meet annually with our school team to review their child's individual education plan (IEP) and develop new goals, as well as during parent-teacher conferences to review progress toward those goals.

Teachers at Helmets communicate student achievement continuously. Every teacher has an e-mail account and a telephone in his or her classroom. At dismissal time it is common to see parents and teachers chatting, often with the student involved. Students are able to assess their own learning through informal conferences with their teachers, using rubrics, portfolios, class work grades, and testing.

4. Sharing School Success

Helmets Elementary School is always proud to share our success with other schools. Our teachers sit on all the district's committees, such as Staff Development and Curriculum Council. They are regular presenters at staff development workshops throughout the district, and they are involved in their own learning as they participate in trainings such as writing instruction, GATE techniques, and teaching reading. Contractually, teachers have 900 minutes of collegial planning each year in which they meet by grade levels to discuss issues pertinent to them such as curriculum planning, but they voluntarily exceed these minutes as they meet informally.

Several of our teachers are Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Support Providers who help guide new teachers through their first two years in a well-planned program. The local universities and colleges regularly send their student teachers to us for training, because our Master Teachers are considered outstanding.

Our school often appears in the local newspapers celebrating our successes. One such instance is the PTA-sponsored CHORDS (Culture-Helmets-Origin-Rhythm-Discover-Sing) program, a performer in residence program brought to us by the Los Angeles Music Center. Our Disaster Plan is considered a model by the district and the City of Santa Clarita. We have been asked to share it with other schools through committees such as the district Parent Advisory Committee.

We share information about our school activities at PTA meetings, Site Council Meetings, the District Parent Advisory Committee, and at School Board meetings. The district website includes our API scores and the School Accountability Report Card. Parent-friendly web sites, such as schoolwisepress.com and ed-data.com, contain valuable information about Helmets. People moving into the area often call to get more specific data and to arrange tours. Many families decide on Helmets as the school for their children and then search for a home to buy in our attendance area.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Implementation of School Curriculum Based on High Standards

Helmets' rich curriculum challenges all students to meet and exceed state standards and is guided by continuous assessment to monitor progress. Teachers design curriculum collaboratively based on standards, frameworks, and knowledge of research-based best practices. Software and online resources are an integral component of curricular support. Initially proposed for GATE students, a differentiated curriculum within each classroom promotes increased opportunities for depth and complexity for all students at their own level. All core subjects are taught using standards-based textbooks that have been evaluated at the district and site level, and piloted by teachers from our site. In-school, after-school and summer school intervention classes support all of our at-risk students. Popular after school enrichment classes are offered to all students, including chess, critical thinking, flute, geology, video production, and musical theatre.

The Houghton Mifflin series serves as a resource for instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, word attack, fluency and comprehension skills. Grade Academic Intervention Teams (GRAIT) training prepares teachers to provide systematic, research-based instruction for students needing reading intervention. Daily half-hour workshops provide time in and out of class for targeted, flexible, small group instruction. Teachers enthusiastically apply their training in *6 +1 Writing Traits*—a six trait model of writing instruction and assessment. Writing skills spiral and build through the grades while students explore a variety of writing genres—personal narrative, memoir, informative, and persuasive. Listening and speaking strategies are explicitly taught and assessed using a district-developed rubric. Daily classroom opportunities and our Junior Toastmasters program provide students a context in which to

apply these skills.

All math strands and key standards are addressed in the Harcourt Brace mathematics series, along with resources for enrichment and intervention. Students acquire essential skills, concepts, and the critical thinking and problem solving strategies necessary to apply them as, for example, they “shop” with set amounts of money, calculate costs, discounts, and taxes. Helmers students consistently shine in our District’s Math Field Day.

The Harcourt Brace, and (in sixth grade) Holt science series fosters understanding of the scientific method and key concepts in physical, life, and earth science through investigation and experimentation. Upper grade students use the scientific method to create projects for our annual Helmers Science Fair. Sixth graders take a floating lab marine biology field trip to supplement their study of ecology.

Harcourt Brace social studies provides a standards-based foundation to prepare students to develop social intelligence, demonstrate responsible citizenship, and understand global interrelationships. Field trips support the curriculum and include visits to a working farm, the local newspaper, the San Fernando Mission, and an overnight trip to Fort Tejon to learn about California history.

Visual arts and performing arts are explicitly taught and integrated throughout the curriculum. For example, a music program, CHORDS (Culture-Helmers-Origin-Rhythm-Discover-Sing), integrates social studies, art, dance, and music and provides opportunities for cross-cultural understanding, through artists-in-residence, student performances, and multi-cultural assemblies. Physical Education specialists provide a comprehensive foundation for skills and fitness using San Diego State University’s Sports, Play and Active Recreation for Kids (SPARK) program. Character Education curriculum is incorporated using Character Counts and the research-based California Department of Education approved prevention curriculum, A Caring School Community. Service Learning opportunities range from replanting worn grass to sponsoring needy families, the Ronald McDonald House, Jump Rope for Heart, and UNICEF. A school-to-career curriculum is also provided through Junior Achievement and Career Days.

2a.The School’s Reading Curriculum

All students at Helmers Elementary School are taught reading through a comprehensive, balanced program. The state of California approved two reading series for adoption by districts across the state. The Saugus Union School District adopted the Houghton-Mifflin Language Arts program because of its strong research base that is aligned to the state standards. This series provides explicit, systematic reading instruction to our students and covers the four language arts domains – listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Skills and strategies taught include phonemic awareness, letter recognition, phonics, blending skills, high frequency vocabulary recognition, spelling, grammar, writing, and comprehension. Students are taught reading in whole group, small flexible groups, and through individualized instruction as needed. The focus is on early reading fluency and comprehension skills. The Houghton-Mifflin series supports differentiated instruction for all learners through a wide variety of resources specifically aimed at the instructional needs of students with special needs, English language learners, accelerated students, as well as the general population. There is a re-teaching component in the program. Multiple assessment resources are available for teachers to monitor their students’ progress, aided by online lesson planning software.

In addition to the Houghton-Mifflin program, our teachers make use of the Mountain Language curriculum on a daily basis so students can frequently review skills they have learned. We do sustained silent reading on a daily basis, and our students participate in both the Pizza Hut and Magic Mountain reading incentive programs. Our district adopted the writing program *6 + 1 Writing Traits* this year for students in grades 1 through 6, and all teachers are being trained in its use. Teachers make use of 4-Square and other graphic organizers to assist their students in writing. Our Kindergarten teachers are working with Janine Batzle, a nationally recognized writing expert.

3. Our Math Curriculum and how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

Saugus Union School District adopted the Harcourt-Brace Math series beginning with the 2001-2002 school year. This textbook series is based on the California state standards in math and is designed to support student mastery in mathematical reasoning; number sense; probability and data analysis; statistics; measurement and geometry; and algebra and functions. Our teachers work hard to ensure that all students have the necessary computational and problem solving skills. They do this through direct instruction, modeling, reteaching, and checking to see if the students understand the concepts being taught. This is done in both large and small group settings, with individualized instruction provided as needed. As a result, mathematics is an area of strength for our school, as shown by test scores over the years.

Teachers use ongoing assessments - diagnostic, formative, and summative - in order to determine whether additional assistance or enrichment is needed. For students who have special needs and have an IEP with math goals, our Resource Specialist teachers and assistants provide the support needed. This program includes challenge and enrichment components embedded in the program as part of every lesson for our GATE and high achieving students. Teachers also use Mountain Math and Math For Today activities on a daily basis to support the math curriculum through review of previously learned skills.

Every spring our upper grade students (4th through 6th) are invited to participate in a district-wide Math Field Day experience. These students work after school with teachers, reviewing all the concepts that will be tested. Our sixth graders also annually participate in a district Math Honors test. Our students do very well on all these challenges.

High student achievement at Helmers is the direct result of our staff's exemplary commitment to excellence. This empowers us to dedicate ourselves to the school's mission: Helmers Elementary School is committed to the development of a strong community of life-long learners, decision makers, and persons of character, one student at a time.

4. Different instructional methods Helmers uses to improve student learning

In order to meet the needs of all Helmers students, teachers use a variety of instructional strategies in their classrooms. Beginning with diagnostic assessments, teachers determine the placement of students into flexible groups for instruction. Emphasis is on active, differentiated learning strategies that include both depth and complexity. Lessons are taught whole group, small group, or individually as needed. Students work independently, collaboratively, or in cooperative groups. Teachers carefully monitor students' progress through assessments and observations. Some classes are team-taught, and two grade levels group their students homogeneously for math instruction. Our class size in the primary grades (K-3) is reduced to 20:1, while the upper grades have approximately 30 students in each room. Regardless of class size, teachers find ways to group students for instruction so that all are challenged to meet the state standards.

Helmers is fortunate to have an extraordinary Special Education Team. These teachers work closely with the classroom teachers to meet students' needs. All 3rd through 6th grade teachers have been trained in GATE techniques so that they can meet the needs of high achieving students. Our English Language Learner (ELL) students are placed with specially trained and credentialed Cross Cultural Language Acquisition Development (CLAD) teachers so they learn English quickly while meeting the standards.

When students are having difficulty achieving the standards, we have interventions ready. Teachers, parents, and students collaborate to write an Academic Intervention Plan (AIP) that puts accommodations in place. If a student continues to struggle, he is referred to a Student Study/Success Team (SST) that includes an administrator, teachers, parents, and support personnel. They work together to discuss the student's strengths, performance, and address concerns. Further accommodations, modifications and

interventions are implemented; then these students may qualify for direct intervention classes as well as summer school.

Instructional aides in the primary classrooms, as well as parent volunteers throughout the school assist teachers and students with lessons. The teachers make use of peer tutors and cross age “buddies” to make sure each student is learning to the optimum.

5. Our professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

Ongoing professional growth is a necessary component at any school. At Helmers, as well as throughout the Saugus Union School District, many opportunities are offered for teachers to increase their expertise and hone their craft. Just this year district-wide opportunities include all teachers in grades 1-6 being trained in the *6+1 Writing Traits*, and our Kindergarten teachers in non-fiction writing. We have Reading Academies going on, as well as GRAIT – (Grade Academic Intervention Teams) for teachers in grades 1-4. As part of the adoption of our reading series teachers are going to a specially developed reading training to learn strategies and techniques in reading instruction. All teachers in grades 3 through 6 have been trained in GATE (Gifted and Talented Education) so they can meet the unique, differentiated learning needs of all their students. We have had training on special needs students, and ELL (English Language Learner) strategies. Teachers who are new to primary grades go through training on class size reduction (CSR) strategies because to reap its benefits, they need to rethink their teaching strategies. Through the California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP) program we have learned how to use video streaming in teaching, and other multimedia projects. Several of our teachers are presenters at various workshops and conferences, such as Kindergarten Math Assessments, Character Education, and Special Needs Students.

New teachers are required to go through either the Beginning Teachers Support Assistance Program (BTSA) or the Peer Assistance and Review Program (PAR), depending on their credentials. All teachers meet with their administrator early in the school year to plan professional goals for the year. Teachers go through a formal evaluation process to improve instructional techniques. This is aligned to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Over the last two years, experienced, highly successful teachers have been allowed to do alternative evaluation projects in place of the formal observation and evaluation process. Examples include family education evenings on Santa Clarita Valley History, and a 3rd through 6th grade Readers’ Theatre Project, *Free to Be... You and Me*. Our school and district have reaped enormous resources from these.

Our principal and assistant principal are active in the local administrators group, The Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), and attend forums, workshops, and conferences on educational issues regularly. They share their knowledge with the staff on a regular basis. All of us at Helmers continuously seek ways to grow professionally.

PART VII – ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **READING** Grade **2** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	40%	43%	52%	49%	52%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	77%	78%	83%	84%	83%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	91%	92%	95%	96%	96%
Number of students tested	154	172	176	163	180
Percent of total students tested	99%	100%	99%	97%	99%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	17%	13%	23%	14%	18%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	25%	53%	23%	43%	55%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	50%	60%	62%	71%	91%
Number of students tested	12	15	13	14	11
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	20%	47%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	73%	76%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	93%	88%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	15	17			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	50%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	93%	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	14			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **READING** Grade **3** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	38%	33%	58%	63%	60%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	71%	68%	86%	86%	83%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	89%	91%	96%	98%	97%
Number of students tested	178	171	167	170	157
Percent of total students tested	99%	100%	98%	98%	99%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	11%	18%	28%	27%	*
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	37%	36%	50%	45%	*
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	67%	68%	67%	73%	*
Number of students tested	27	22	18	11	8
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	44%	19%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	67%	63%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	83%	75%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	18	16			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	35%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	76%	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	17			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **READING** Grade **4** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	35%	39%	67%	63%	52%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	72%	70%	85%	83%	83%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	88%	91%	95%	96%	95%
Number of students tested	173	158	150	145	142
Percent of total students tested	99%	100%	92%	97%	97%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	11%	6%	*	*	*
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	42%	25%	*	*	*
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	74%	56%	*	*	*
Number of students tested	18	16	7	8	10
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	41%	29%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	59%	57%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	82%	71%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	17	14			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	64%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	93%	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	14			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **READING** Grade **5** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	40%	53%	54%	51%	44%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	69%	77%	85%	79%	78%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	92%	94%	96%	94%	91%
Number of students tested	158	143	142	136	140
Percent of total students tested	100%	99%	97%	99%	95%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	40%	35%	*	*	*
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	67%	59%	*	*	*
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	87%	94%	*	*	*
Number of students tested	15	17	10	9	10
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	44%	19%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	67%	63%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	83%	75%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	18	16			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	*	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	*	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	*	**	**	**
Number of students tested	7	10			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **READING** Grade **6** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	50%	54%	53%	57%	55%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	80%	84%	82%	84%	87%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	94%	95%	96%	96%	98%
Number of students tested	157	140	135	131	111
Percent of total students tested	99%	99%	98%	98%	99%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	13%	*	8%	*	*
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	40%	*	33%	*	*
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	73%	*	58%	*	*
Number of students tested	14	10	12	8	6
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	37%	55%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	68%	82%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	89%	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	19	11			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	64%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	91%	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	7	11			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **MATH** Grade **2** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing.

	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
Test Given	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	66%	68%	64%	68%	69%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	85%	87%	88%	85%	89%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	97%	96%	99%	96%	96%
Number of students tested	154	172	176	168	180
Percent of total students tested	99%	100%	99%	100%	99%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	25%	33%	31%	7%	27%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	83%	60%	77%	33%	64%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	92%	80%	100%	73%	100%
Number of students tested	12	15	13	15	11
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	53%	59%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	87%	82%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	93%	94%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	15	17			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	86%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	14			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **MATH** Grade **3** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles **X**
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	65%	58%	70%	66%	67%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	83%	80%	93%	89%	89%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	94%	95%	98%	98%	99%
Number of students tested	179	171	167	170	158
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	98%	98%	99%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	22%	23%	33%	27%	*
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	44%	41%	56%	55%	*
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	74%	77%	86%	82%	*
Number of students tested	21	22	18	11	9
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	61%	44%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	89%	69%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	94%	81%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	18	16			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	59%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	76%	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	94%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	17			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **MATH** Grade **4** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	59%	59%	71%	70%	62%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	80%	84%	90%	89%	83%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	94%	97%	97%	97%	94%
Number of students tested	173	158	153	147	143
Percent of total students tested	99%	100%	94%	99%	98%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	42%	19%	*	*	36%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	42%	50%	*	*	36%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	89%	94%	*	*	45%
Number of students tested	18	16	8	8	11
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	53%	57%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	65%	79%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	88%	93%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	17	14			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	79%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	14			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **MATH** Grade **5** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles **X**
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	58%	63%	70%	65%	58%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	91%	89%	91%	88%	86%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	97%	98%	97%	98%	91%
Number of students tested	157	143	142	133	140
Percent of total students tested	99%	99%	97%	96%	95%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	32%	15%	*	*	*
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	58%	54%	*	*	*
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	89%	92%	*	*	*
Number of students tested	19	13	10	7	10
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	47%	41%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	93%	82%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	100%	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	15	17			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	*	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	*	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	*	**	**	**
Number of students tested	7	10			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

Subject **MATH** Grade **6** Test SAT 9 Stanford Achievement Test (2000, 2001, 2002)
 Test CAT 6 California Achievement Survey Test (2003, 2004)
 Edition/Publication Year 9th Edition 2000, 2001, 2002 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement
 Edition/Publication Year 6th Edition 2003, 2004 Publisher CTB McGraw-Hill
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing.

Test Given	Survey Tests		Total Battery of Tests		
	CAT 6	CAT 6	SAT 9	SAT 9	SAT 9
Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	71%	69%	84%	83%	84%
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	89%	89%	95%	92%	96%
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	97%	96%	98%	97%	97%
Number of students tested	157	140	134	131	110
Percent of total students tested	99%	99%	97%	98%	98%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	27%	*	45%	*	*
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	47%	*	45%	*	*
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	73%	*	82%	*	*
Number of students tested	14	10	11	8	6
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	63%	45%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	74%	82%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 25 th NPR	95%	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	19	11			
<i>Asian</i>					
% Scoring At or Above 75 th NPR	*	73%	**	**	**
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	*	82%	**	**	**
% Scoring at or Above 25 th NPR	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	7	11			

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Please note that the 2000, 2001, and 2002 Norm Referenced Tests were changed from SAT 9 (full battery) Test to the CAT 6 (survey) Test in 2003 and 2004.

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS** Grade **2** Test California Standards Test Scores
 Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs _____ Scaled scores _____ Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	91%	93%	88%	91%	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	73%	71%	64%	71%	N/A
% At Advanced	32%	31%	15%	27%	N/A
Number of students tested	155	172	176	163	180
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	99%	97%	99%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	75%	60%	54%	50%	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	33%	40%	23%	29%	N/A
% At Advanced	33%	13%	8%	0%	N/A
Number of students tested	12	15	13	14	11
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	53%	76%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	15	17	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	93%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	14	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS** Grade **3** Test California Standards Test Scores

Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California

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

No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	91%	93%	94%	94%	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	71%	74%	72%	72%	N/A
% At Advanced	27%	32%	31%	31%	N/A
Number of students tested	178	171	169	170	157
Percent of total students tested	99%	100%	99%	98%	99%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	56%	68%	70%	45%	*
% At or Above Proficient	19%	41%	25%	27%	*
% At Advanced	7%	14%	5%	0%	*
Number of students tested	27	22	20	11	10
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	67%	69%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	18	16	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	71%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	17	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS** Grade **4** Test California Standards Test Scores

Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California

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

No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	96%	97%	94%	97%	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	78%	75%	75%	76%	N/A
% At Advanced	41%	42%	50%	40%	N/A
Number of students tested	174	158	157	146	143
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	96%	98%	98%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	89%	82%	64%	*	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	39%	19%	35%	*	N/A
% At Advanced	16%	13%	14%	*	N/A
Number of students tested	18	16	14	9	11
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	65%	64%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	17	14	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	14	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS** Grade **5** Test California Standards Test Scores
 Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs _____ Scaled scores _____ Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	98%	98%	96%	95%	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	76%	79%	67%	65%	N/A
% At Advanced	42%	40%	34%	21%	N/A
Number of students tested	158	144	146	136	140
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	99%	99%	95%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	89%	84%	62%	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	21%	46%	31%	*	*
% At Advanced	0%	0%	23%	*	*
Number of students tested	19	13	13	9	10
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	47%	65%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	15	17	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	*	**	**	**
Number of students tested	7	10	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS** Grade **6** Test California Standards Test Scores

Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California

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

No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	99%	98%	95%	97%	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	78%	87%	69%	75%	N/A
% At Advanced	46%	45%	34%	26%	N/A
Number of students tested	158	141	136	132	110
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	99%	99%	98%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	94%	63%	62%	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	29%	18%	8%	*	*
% At Advanced	6%	18%	0%	*	*
Number of students tested	14	11	13	9	6
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	68%	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	19	11	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	91%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	7	11	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **MATH** Grade **2** Test California Standards Test Scores
 Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs _____ Scaled scores _____ Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	96%	96%	95%	N/A	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	82%	86%	77%	N/A	N/A
% At Advanced	47%	53%	30%	N/A	N/A
Number of students tested	155	172	176	168	180
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	92%	80%	96%	N/A	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	67%	47%	46%	N/A	N/A
% At Advanced	25%	40%	8%	N/A	N/A
Number of students tested	12	15	13	15	11
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	73%	88%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	15	17	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	14	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 and 2001 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **MATH** Grade **3** Test California Standards Test Scores

Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California

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

No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May**	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	92%	93%	96%	N/A	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	85%	81%	81%	N/A	N/A
% At Advanced	48%	45%	37%	N/A	N/A
Number of students tested	179	171	169	170	159
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	99%	98%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	70%	77%	70%	N/A	*
% At or Above Proficient	38%	63%	50%	N/A	*
% At Advanced	19%	27%	25%	N/A	*
Number of students tested	21	22	20	11	10
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	94%	69%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	18	16	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	76%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	17	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 and 2001 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **MATH** Grade **4** Test California Standards Test Scores
 Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs _____ Scaled scores _____ Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	94%	99%	93%	N/A	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	77%	83%	79%	N/A	N/A
% At Advanced	44%	44%	36%	N/A	N/A
Number of students tested	174	158	160	148	143
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	98%	99%	98%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	79%	95%	60%	*	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	44%	51%	27%	*	N/A
% At Advanced	21%	13%	7%	*	N/A
Number of students tested	18	16	15	9	11
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	65%	79%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	17	14	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	100%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	8	14	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 and 2001 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **MATH** Grade **5** Test California Standards Test Scores

Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California

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

No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	96%	92%	92%	N/A	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	74%	77%	68%	N/A	N/A
% At Advanced	30%	39%	21%	N/A	N/A
Number of students tested	155	144	146	136	140
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	99%	99%	95%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	79%	69%	54%	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	26%	15%	31%	*	*
% At Advanced	5%	0%	8%	*	*
Number of students tested	19	13	13	9	10
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	67%	65%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	15	17	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	*	**	**	**
Number of students tested	7	10	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2002, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 and 2001 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS
CALIFORNIA STANDARDS TEST SCORES

Subject **MATH** Grade **6** Test California Standards Test Scores
 Publication Year 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 Publisher State of California
 Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs _____ Scaled scores _____ Percentiles X
 No groups were excluded from testing

Year	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or Above Basic	93%	98%	95%	N/A	N/A
% At or Above Proficient	77%	86%	79%	N/A	N/A
% At Advanced	43%	43%	44%	N/A	N/A
Number of students tested	158	141	136	132	110
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	99%	99%	98%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
Special Education					
% At or Above Basic	63%	72%	61%	*	*
% At or Above Proficient	36%	36%	15%	*	*
% At Advanced	6%	18%	0%	*	*
Number of students tested	14	11	13	9	6
Ethnicity					
<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>					
% Proficient or Above	74%	82%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	19	11	**	**	**
<i>Asian</i>					
% Proficient or Above	*	73%	**	**	**
Number of students tested	7	11	**	**	**

* 10 or less scores

** Scores were not disaggregated by ethnicity in 2000, 2001, and 2002

Note: In 2000 and 2001 the scores were reported as Number Enrolled, Number Tested, Average Number Correct/ Number Possible