

REVISED 4-11-2005

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 Mr. Frank Gomez

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

Official School Name Santa Margarita Elementary

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address One Carnes Road

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

County San Diego

School Code Number* 37-73569-6038913

Oceanside

CA

92054-6660

City

State

Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (760) 430-7110

Fax (760) 430-1415

Website/URL http://www.oside.k12.ca.us

E-mail fgomez@oside.k12.ca.us

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.

Date February 1, 2005

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Mr. Kenneth Noonan

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

District Name Oceanside Unified School District

Tel. (760) 757-2560

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.

Date February 1, 2005

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Mr. Roy Youngblood

(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.

Date February 1, 2005

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

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

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.

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 2003-2004 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 1998.
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

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 17 Elementary schools
 03 Middle schools
 00 Junior high schools
 04 High schools
 _____ Other (Briefly explain)
- 24 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,903
- Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6,881

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. 8 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
- _____ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	43	47	90	7	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	42	39	81	8	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	40	31	71	9	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	35	26	61	10	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	34	21	55	11	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	19	20	39	12	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	*PS SDC	17	9	26
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							423

* PS SDC includes our Preschool Special Day Classes for 3-5 year old special education students

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>54</u> | % White |
| <u>14</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>23</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>8</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>1</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% Total | |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 76%

(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.	95
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	235
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	330
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	434
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.76
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	76%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 0.9%
4 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 2
Specify languages: Spanish, Japanese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 40%

170 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method does not produce 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: 17%
72 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>6</u> Autism	<u>4</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>6</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>10</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>41</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>2</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>1</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>2</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>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>21</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>
Support staff	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total number	<u>32</u>	<u>7</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 20
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.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	97%	95%	98%	98%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	13%	14%	6%	10%	14%
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

PART III - SUMMARY

Santa Margarita Elementary has become a “home away from home” for many of our students with the deployment of military fathers and mothers to the war in Iraq. The staff members realized that our goal was to comfort, care and educate the students. We fulfilled our goal over the years as noted in the increased Academic Performance Index (A.P.I.) from 637 in 1999 to 819 in 2003. The tremendous gain of 182 point in our A.P.I. has resulted from a clear communicated vision, instructional practices based on standards and research, professional development on an ongoing basis, weekly teacher collaboration meetings, and a plan for student growth that incorporates regular review by our school community. In 2000, we received the National Title I Achieving School Award Honorable Mention and in 2004, we received California Distinguished School Award.

Every year since the inception of the STAR assessment program, Santa Margarita Elementary has continued student achievement levels. The academic growth has continued to increase even though our student mobility levels the last three years reflect figures of 64%, 72%, and 76% due to the school being located on the Camp Pendleton Marine Base. We have had over 300 students with a parent deployed due to Operation Iraqi Freedom during the last two years. Even with the trauma of having a parent going off to war, all students continue to show overall gains as shown in our A.P.I. of 819, the second highest of 23 schools in the school district.

The school delivers a feeling of community that affords students with a sense of belonging. Students, in this time of emotional fragileness, did not care about how much we knew until they knew about how much we cared. Staff members met to brainstorm strategies to keep students focused for learning and ways to meet their emotional concerns. We decided to maintain high academic standards and routines to keep students on task and provide emotional support. Some students brought a stuffed animal to school, others needed an additional hugs and increased dialog with staff.

Our Marine Corps Community Services supported Santa Margarita over the last two years by sending us trained counselors who developed deployment groups over six-week cycles. Students maintained communication with their deployed parents through emails and a letter writing campaign by our Parent Teacher Organization. We also provided on-site Internet access for our families to use to keep in contact with their military members in Iraq. Many local and national news agencies including NBC Nightly News with Tom Brokaw, CNN, National Public Radio and newspapers reported the support interventions that our school had in place.

The instructional program we designed is built on the vision “All students will succeed” and “All adults will succeed”. The school community is a cohesive team where we feel responsible for the educational and emotional well being of our students, parents and colleagues. We adopted core values of respecting and supporting individual differences and viewpoints; being honest and taking responsibility for our actions; accepting and working with change; being supportive of individual growth; and willingness to accept, ask for and offer help to colleagues. The framework for our professional development and ongoing collaboration within grade levels for certificated and classified personnel has been a cohesive one. Buddy teachers and grade level mentors provide new teachers with support to help them adjust to procedures and instructional practices at our school.

Our military families come from all over the world to the small corner of the land called “Santa Margarita Elementary”. Testimony from our new parents arriving to our campus reflects a sense of coming home. The parents who have left write us from the four corners of the world stating, “We miss the people at Santa Margarita because you made us feel like family”.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Assessment Results: All students in the state of California in grades 2-5 were given the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth edition (SAT/9) in reading, language arts and mathematics in 1998-2003. The California State Testing and Reporting (STAR) program included the California Achievement Test, Sixth Edition (CAT/6) and the California Standards Test (CST) beginning in 2003. The SAT/9 and the CAT/6 are norm referenced standardized tests. Students are tested on reading, language arts, mathematics, and

spelling. The scores from these tests are reported in the enclosed charts in percentile rankings. Test data is analyzed each year by our school staff and our school community. The CST is aligned to the California Content Standards. All students in grades 2-5 are assessed in reading, language arts, and mathematics. Reading and language arts scores began in 2001 and the scores for mathematics started in 2002. Data is reported in a cumulative percent of students who perform in the categories defined by the State of California as Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic and Far Below Basic. All significant subgroups, those students that number 100 in one group or 15% of the population, are reported as the percent of students at or above Proficient level.

The Academic Performance Index (API) each year in California is based on the combination of the SAT9/CAT6 and the CST scores. The state establishes goals for each school and each subgroup is expected to make annual progress. An API score of 800 is the expectation established for all schools. The API is also used to determine if a school has met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements. The information for the assessment data can be found on the website at <http://www.star.cde.ca.gov>.

We believe our growth, as evidenced in our Academic Performance Index score 637 to 821 in five years is due to the delivery of a cohesive, well-articulated school plan that reflects the cultural and economic diversity of our student body. We are able to achieve continuous student academic growth despite our mobility rate of 64% in one year and 80% over two years. Our API growth for subgroups since 1999 is as follows: All students: 188 points, Hispanic students: 128 points, White students: 186 points, African-American students: 228 points and Economically disadvantaged students: 188 points. Our current API for each of these subgroups is as follows: All students: 818, Hispanic students: 803, White students: 816, African-American students: 800 and Economically disadvantaged students: 807. The API is the best measure of overall achievement because it includes both the CST and the SAT9/CAT6 results. All of our subgroups are meeting the state standard of an API score of 800 or higher in order to be considered successful. These scores prove the success of our vision that Santa Margarita Elementary is a place where all students succeed. A review of the enclosed data of the CST results for the last three years in reading/language arts and mathematics reveals that students at Santa Margarita Elementary score a higher percentage at or above the proficiency levels than the same results of all students in the state in these two subject areas. In Reading/Language Arts, the percent of students at or above the proficient level in grades 2-5 ranges from 40% to 61%. In mathematics, the percent of students at or above the proficient level in grades 2-5 ranges from 45% to 72%.

Assessment Analysis and Program Improvement: Our staff is dedicated to the achievement of grade level standards for all students. We participate in an ongoing student review process to assure that grade level standards are being addressed in daily instruction. Teachers become a critical member of the decision making process for renewal and monitoring for standards based instruction and district adopted core materials by reviewing the data from student assessment and school community surveys each fall and spring Teachers worked collaboratively each week to support the instruction and assessment of closely aligned grade level standards. The district supports the monitoring of the implementation of these standards by providing centralized assessment tools, trimester benchmarks in reading and math, and writing prompts in the grade level required genres. In addition, the district has provided site teachers with the training to use unit tests from state adopted materials. Other subject areas included in district standards implemented at our school are the science and history/social science standards imbedded in our core areas of instruction of reading, writing, and mathematics. Our vision of having all students succeed drives the teacher monthly meetings to problem solve the educational needs of student academic weaknesses and challenges to sustain the overall program effectiveness. For example, teachers review student classroom data and student work to target instructional strategies on Teacher Learning Logs to support SMART goals. The district director of assessment and evaluation supports our school community review of local and state assessment results by disaggregating the data using student characteristics of ethnicity, gender, Title I identification, special education, and primary language. Each teacher receives a class listing of this disaggregated data for students from last years' enrollment, as well as their present students. Teacher collaboration occurs throughout the grade levels. The support of the district to establish common standards in order to align curriculum occurred through the implementation of a new standards based language arts program. The district coordinates grade level

teacher discussions on best practices in instruction and assessment during monthly share meetings. In support of the language arts program, the district has trained teacher representatives, called Lead Learners, to support school sites. They assist in lesson implementation and the monitoring of student progress.

Communicating Results: Our families and school community routinely receive information about grade level standards and assessment results through a variety of means throughout the school year. These forms of communication share with families what is expected of their child for grade level proficiency based on district and state standard levels. The communication begins with the teacher presentations of grade level proficiency at Back-to-School Night where parents receive a district pamphlet highlighting state exit standards for reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and history/social science. This meeting gives opportunities for teachers to help interpret for families the significance of the student assessment results. Similar meetings to support parent understanding of assessment results occurs in parent meetings such as the Title I and GATE, P.T.O., S.S.C. parenting workshops, math/literature family nights and monthly Citizen of the Month assemblies. We have a communication folder that is specific to the proficiency standards of each grade level. This folder goes home each week and reminds parents and students of grade level exit criteria. Parents are able to note the same information on the standards based report card given to families each trimester. The report card provides families and students with assessment results tied to proficiency standards that have clear descriptors, rich in detail, such as in the area of reading, proficiency levels reflected include decoding and word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension of narrative/informational text and literary response and analysis. The report card is useful for teachers, students, and parents to develop together learning goals. There are district support personnel and materials available to help families receive parent information in their primary language of Spanish.

At Santa Margarita Elementary, the students know of the high expectations in the core academic areas. We start the school year by reviewing our Mustang Motto. One of the areas of our motto speaks to students doing their best. An assignment given to ALL students at our school was to show off what was considered their best work. In doing so, the students had to know the reasons as to the work being their best in matching proficient levels for their grade. The principal conducted visitations to all classrooms to randomly ask students to explain why a piece of student work was their best. This practice of questioning students continues through principal visitations, teacher-student conferences and student-student conferences. As a result of these opportunities for reflection, students have become aware of their strengths and weaknesses. Teachers hold individual conferences with students in order to develop learning goals, which take into consideration their social, emotional and physical development. Students use grade level criteria in the form of anchor papers and student work samples that reflect grade level proficiency. Student writing is displayed for students and parents to observe in the office, the library and in classrooms. Teachers have established trimester proficient levels for editing in writing such as the use of focus topic sentences, descriptive words and paragraph organization. Students know their levels of proficiency through daily opportunities for reflection with the teacher and their peers. The district standards based report card is based upon trimester achievement levels of grade level proficiency. These proficiency levels are tracked each trimester by the principal and teachers. The data is used for individual teacher-student-parent conferences and weekly teacher planning meetings.

Sharing Our Story: Santa Margarita Elementary has had many opportunities to share its successes with teachers and administrators. Our district has ongoing leadership meeting with all administrators in which we are able to discuss successful practices that lead to increased students achievement. We also have monthly meetings that focus on important instructional and curriculum issues. These meetings are attended by our directors of assessment, instruction and staff development in addition to all of the district elementary level principals. We have many opportunities to work with other administrators in which we are able to network and share successful strategies. The level of sharing is also discovered among teachers with the informal meetings called by the district. Our teachers share at district workshops and play an active role in critical district groups such as the Curriculum Advisory Committee. We have also shared our success through the Instructional Television Channel via the San Diego County Office of Education.

The principal has been involved as a group facilitator at the Principal's Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles sponsored by the Association of California School Administrators. It is in

this venue that the principal, as a group facilitator, has shared successful school level strategies to over 880 principals from throughout the state of California that have attended the institute in the summer over the last twelve years. The principal has also presented workshops to district administrative groups, district school faculties and to administrative teams from other area districts.

As a staff, we are always willing to share our success stories with other area educators through district presentations, newspaper highlights, and the networking capabilities of the San Diego County Office of Education.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Curriculum and Instruction: The academic excellence in the curricular and instructional practices start with our school plan which is based on the state and district standards and our knowledge of best educational strategies. Key administrative personnel met with district specialists from assessment and instruction to review and revise components of the plan. It was through the insight of the director of assessment and evaluation that we gained valuable information in the alignment of our goals and noted instructional practices in the school plan to research based strategies. Classroom instruction is articulated across the grade levels through planning meetings that help to maintain consistent methodology observed across grade level classes. Best practices identified through teacher discussions for classroom use include flex grouping, hands-on activities that appeal to multiple modalities, differentiating curriculum through scaffolding techniques, cooperative work groups, and classroom technology resources to extend learning opportunities.

Our alignment to state academic standards is reflected in all of our core subject areas. Our teachers use the state content standards to ensure that all students receive a comprehensive balanced educational program. The district curriculum in literacy and mathematics has been aligned to the state standards. This curriculum promotes higher-level critical thinking and the application of the basic skills needed for student success. Our reading program is a balance between the skills and practice to enhance reading in our students and understanding different genres of literacy so that we build a foundation for personal writing and reading. We emphasize essential reading skills of decoding, background knowledge, vocabulary, and comprehension with fiction and nonfiction text.

The language arts program at Santa Margarita Elementary includes phoneme awareness, explicit phonics, and instruction in identified reading comprehension strategies and skills. Our teachers have developed a spelling program based on research. The emphasis is on spelling within the context of writing. The program reflects the use of identified grade level high frequency words, common spelling rules and “no excuse” words for spelling accuracy. Students are held accountable to transfer these spelling skills into their everyday writing. Our state adopted mathematics curriculum integrates conceptual activities to ensure a deep understanding of the required state standards. Hands-on activities combined with real life situations help to master the problem solving skills needed to meet the mathematics standards. Our science and social studies content standards are taught using state adopted instructional materials. Our teachers take a thematic approach in order to present lessons that cross various subject areas such as writing and mathematics. Students receive weekly instruction in the visual and performing arts from classroom teachers, through after-school enrichment programs with community docents and our music specialist. Our physical education teacher provides weekly activities to students in grades first through fifth. Our library and computer lab reflect instructional software and activities that meet key language arts and mathematics standards.

Every student has writing, reading and math portfolios that are passed from teacher to teacher as the child progresses through the grades. Teachers meet every week on a Friday afternoon or Wednesday morning during the student instructional day to share student achievement information through teacher made tests, state adopted material unit assessments, or student work. In a month’s calendar, teachers meet as grade levels on the first and third Wednesdays of the month to plan for articulated standards based instruction. The first Wednesday of the month is also dedicated for a multigrade leadership team meeting for two hours with the principal and School Based Resource Teacher (S.B.R.T.) to share issues and concerns regarding students learning across the grades. The kindergarten staff meets with the community

preschool center on an annual basis to review readiness skills in order to be successful in mastering the kindergarten academic standards. Teachers worked together each week to support the instruction and assessment of closely aligned grade level standards. The district supports the monitoring of the implementation of these state adopted materials by providing centralized assessment tools, trimester benchmarks in reading and math, and writing prompts in the grade level required genres. In addition, the district has provided site teachers with the training to use unit tests from state adopted materials.

The teaching staff supports classroom educational programming at Santa Margarita Elementary by diligently seeking a variety of methods to meet the diverse instructional needs of all our students. Our staff bridges the balance between independent activities, collaborative student work, teacher directed work and student centered work and matching instructional practices to student needs. Homework practices at our school are aligned with instructional expectations. Teachers collaborate as a grade level to assign weekly homework packets that support Teacher Learning Log instructional goals. Grade levels collaborate to present common activities for homework expectations. The community based YMCA Branch Services Division operates an Operation Hero, after school homework lab program that implements a class four days a week in which that our at-risk students have priority enrollment. Our RSP teacher and an assigned aide supervise a lunchtime daily homework program five days a week for any student in grades 2-5. Our at-risk learners are provided extension activities that reflect extra time and support in this lab for assigned work that is challenging to complete such as writing activities through the use of computers and tutoring in reading comprehension assignments.

Reading: We have designated a two-hour block of instructional time for language arts and the implementation of the new *Houghton-Mifflin* program. During this time, emphasis on listening and oral language skills is built into the lesson plans of teachers. Other instructional methods in this reading block include shared reading, guided reading, pair-share reciprocal reading, and the editing process in writing. All of our students are given equal access to a print rich environment including, but is not limited to, word walls in the primary grades, *Accelerated Reading* programs, daily oral language, readers theater, reading logs, read aloud, and buddy reading. In reading, teacher teams created best practices in the area of comprehension such as the use of *Bloom's Taxonomy* of questions in order to extend learning beyond the text. Teacher workshops in reciprocal reading along with articles shared from educational researchers have helped the teachers analyze data and incorporate changes in daily instruction such as addressing the weakness of story comprehension through story "picture-walks" for all grades. Reading is taught using guided reading, modeled reading, independent reading, and phonics in English-language arts. The materials used for instruction are a state-adopted, standards based program of *Houghton-Mifflin*. The new language arts program has a wealth of standards based literature that teachers tie into daily instruction when there is a connection to a service learning activity. For example, last year when the Parent-Teacher Organization sponsored the letter writing campaign to the military personnel stationed overseas in Iraq, second grade teachers tied this activity to the writing standard of writing a friendly letter. A fourth/fifth grade class participated in the community activity of cleaning the San Luis Rey Riverbed and learned about habitats and natural environments. In support of the language arts program, the district has trained teacher representatives, called Lead Learners, to support school sites. They assist in lesson implementation and the monitoring of student progress with this new adoption. These Lead Learners received formal training with Marilyn Tabor on effective coaching strategies through the district to enhance grade level collaboration.

Writing: A student friendly rubric scoring process is completed four times a year to address specific student weaknesses in the areas of writing applications, organization, and convention. All of our students are given access to a print rich environment which includes, but is not limited, to interactive peer/teacher writing journals, letter writing of newspaper editorials and student published storybooks. Teacher planning discussions at the grade level and as a whole staff led to interventions that are agreed upon. Individual grade levels provide consistency of interventions such as emphasis of writing conventions, applications, or organization based on student data. Students use grade level criteria in the form of anchor papers and student work samples that reflect grade level proficiency. Student writing is displayed for students and parents to observe in the office, the library and in classrooms. Teachers have established

trimester proficient levels for editing in writing such as the use of focus topic sentences, descriptive words and paragraph organization. These levels are reflected in SMART goals and student work. Students know their levels of proficiency through daily opportunities for reflection with the teacher and their peers.

Research Based Instructional Practice: Our district strategic plan assures that all students will be provided with standards based instructional programs that are research based. In order to make sure that this happens, the district-adopted materials must be carefully scrutinized to reflect best practices noted in educational research. Committees of staff, parents and community members reviewed the state adopted materials and recommended that *Houghton-Mifflin* Language Arts program and *Harcourt Brace* in math be adopted in all elementary schools. The development of a quality curriculum and the selection of instructional materials is a process coordinated and closely monitored by district support staff, principal, S.B.R.T., and the S.S.C. In a site based decision-making model, which our district strongly supports and encourages, the school staff has aligned curriculum with content standards to reflect the cultural diversity of in our school community. After evaluation of the research materials as a part of a yearlong district piloting project, the district implemented the use of a variety of materials. These programs included *Houghton-Mifflin* Language arts program this past year. Supplemental materials have been purchased at the site using a similar process as the district. After reviewing our school data and finding the gaps in our supplemental materials, our teachers reached consensus through the inquiry method of review and decided to purchase programs such as *Exemplars for higher thinking skills in math*, the *Fisher-Fitzer* writing materials and *Accelerated Literacy* program. We have worked arduously to gain input from all of our school community members in the selection of instructional materials. We survey all staff, students and parents on an annual basis to gather the necessary information to purchase materials that would meet the needs of our students. Every teacher and support staff was trained in the new standards aligned language arts program by publisher consultants and district support staff. This ongoing training allows our teachers to examine and determine the effectiveness of this program in meeting the educational needs and the cultural diversity of our school community. We reach out to community resources to enhance the core curriculum to reflect real-world experiences. Our teachers produce reader's theater productions, plays and musicals involving themes and standards in our language arts program. We invite the *Mad Science* program to deliver school assemblies as well as a hands-on after school science program. In our emphasis of our theme of "literature comes to life", teachers arrange visitations to the Oceanside City Library and the Oceanside Museum of Art so students may experience community agencies firsthand.

Professional Development: The process of creating a powerful professional development plan lies in our ability to build the capacity of every staff member. The objective of our professional development plan is to provide a focused and systematic process that is aligned with school goals, district and state standards, and meets student instructional needs by creating continuity across the grade level. The School Site Council has approved a budget that helps to provide the necessary funding sources to coordinate all training. The district has adopted a new language arts program aligned with state standards. In order to implement the transition of a new program into the classrooms, the district coordinated a day before school started in which similar grade level teams from throughout the district met with a consultant to discuss implementation issues and guidelines. Further support from the district occurred through the use of trained teachers, called Lead Learners, from each grade level to help colleagues with concerns. These Lead Learners were also given training from Marilyn Tabor to build capacity through coaching. The Lead Learners and their colleagues meet weekly to align daily instruction to match the social, academic and emotional needs of every student. Our recent district grade level writing prompts given in November 2004, confirm our observations of daily work that in the area of writing, we continue to prioritize the areas of application, organization and conventions. District support allowed us to have grade level trainers in order to help train their colleagues in the use of a four-point rubric. We held site level training on the third Wednesdays of the month in order to have teachers increase their understanding of the instructional standards imbedded in the new four-point rubric. The training of writing strategies presented in the past by a consultant, Nancy Fetzner, incorporated sentence, paragraph and vocabulary development. These resources continue to be discussed in weekly teacher planning meetings.

The principal keeps current of scientific research, explicit instructional practices, and has participated in training related to the effective implementation of the standards based reading and math

adoptions. The principal has received *Evaluator as a Coach* and *DATA Source* training. The principal has been an advisory member and group facilitator for the last twelve years at a principal institute sponsored by the *Association of California School Administrators* held each summer at the University of California at Los Angeles. Staff benefited with updated research based instructional strategies as a result of this experience by the principal. We have made significant growth based on the STAR assessment results over the last five years. Collaboration is a real strength at Santa Margarita Elementary. Grade level teams volunteer to meet during the summer, weekends, and after school hours to plan and help one another provide a differentiated curriculum to meet the needs of all students. Grade level teams meet weekly for forty minutes during the student day and after school on two minimum day Wednesdays a month. It is during these meetings that the teachers review student work, examine assessment data for reading, writing, and math, discuss research articles, and plan curriculum. Summaries of the grade level meetings are given to the principal to review each week. It is at these meetings that the teachers develop monthly Teacher Learning Logs as well as review assessment data to determine student progress towards the grade level SMART goals in writing, math, and reading. As an instructional leader, the principal attends the weekly meetings to provide resources and support teacher discussions and student interventions. Our staff has additional time built in to the school year calendar in which to collaborate on strategic interventions: three buy-Back days, two in-service days before/after the student school year and a midyear professional growth day.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Santa Margarita Elementary California Standards Test (CST)

English-Language Arts

2001-2004

Scores reported based on available State data: Average percent of students who perform in each of the categories defined by the California State Department of Education: Far Below Basic, Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. The State designates the cut-point grade level standards to be at or above Proficiency. The CST is published by the State of California and is administered April and May of each year.

Grade 2	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
English-Language Arts- All students	% students	% students	% students
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	96%	95%	92%
At or above Basic	75%	79%	79%
At or above Proficient	41%	41%	44%
At Advanced	10%	12%	10%
# of students tested	68	109	79
% of students tested	100%	99%	100%
# of students excluded	0	0	0
% of students excluded	0	0	0
School Mean Score	338.9	342.7	343.6
African-American			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	91%	100%	100%
At or above Basic	72%	86%	86%
At or above Proficient	36%	38%	52%
At Advanced	9%	5%	14%
# of students tested	11	21	14
# of students tested	17	19	11

English Language Arts 2001-04 (continued)

Hispanic or Latino	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or Above Below Basic	94%	90%	91%
At or Above Basic	70%	69%	72%
At or Above Proficient	41%	37%	36%
At Advanced	6%	5%	9%
# of students tested	17	19	11
White			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	97%	94%	90%
At or above Basic	77%	78%	84%
At or above Proficient	41%	41%	47%
At Advanced	9%	12%	10%
# of students tested	34	49	49
Economic Disadvantaged			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	91%	98%	86%
At or above Basic	65%	83%	74%
At or above Proficient	35%	41%	38%
At Advanced	9%	13%	8%
# of students tested	23	53	36
State Scores			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	87%	87%	85%
At or above Basic	65%	68%	63%
At or above Proficient	35%	36%	32%
At Advanced	12%	12%	9%
Mean scaled score	330.5	332.3	324.1

(In 2000-2001, school and state overall scores noted as average number correct /number of possible and not as mean scaled scores)

Grade 3	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
English-Language Arts- All students	% students	% students	% students
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	97%	95%	94%
At or above Basic	82%	95%	86%
At of above Proficient	40%	72%	56%
At Advanced	8%	32%	25%
# of students tested	62	62	64
% of students tested	100%	98%	98%
# of students excluded	0	0	0
% of students excluded	0	0	0
School Mean Score	345.1	376.6	356.3

Grade 3 Language Arts (Continued)

African-American	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	0%	88%
At or above Basic	70%	100%	76%
At or above Proficient	60%	64%	51%
At Advanced	0%	18%	13%
# of students tested	10	11	8
Hispanic or Latino			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	88%	0%	100%
At or above Basic	76%	100%	89%
At or above Proficient	38%	63%	78%
At Advanced	0%	27%	22%
# of students tested	8	11	9
White			
At or above Far Below Basic	3%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	97%	94%	94%
At or above Basic	83%	94%	86%
At or above Proficient	41%	77%	53%
At Advanced	8%	40%	28%
# of students tested	36	35	40
Economic Disadvantaged			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	93%	93%
At or above Basic	91%	93%	83%
At or above Proficient	46%	73%	50%
At Advanced	13%	33%	27%
# of students tested	31	30	30
State Scores			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	83%	84%	84%
At or above Basic	61%	63%	62%
At or above Proficient	30%	33%	34%
At Advanced	9%	10%	11%
Mean scaled score	321.5	323.9	323.5

(In 2000-2001, school and state overall scores noted as average number correct /number of possible and not as mean scaled scores)

Grade 4	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
English-Language Arts- All students	% students	% students	% students
At or above Far Below Basic	N/A	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	98	96%
At or above Basic	92%	93%	92%
At of above Proficient	61%	66%	54%
At Advanced	37%	27%	21%
# of students tested	50	51	52
% of students tested	100%	94%	83%
# of students excluded	0	0	0
% of students excluded	0	0	0
School Mean Score	369.2	367.2	356.9
African-American			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	0%	100%	0%
At or above Basic	100%	88%	100%
At or above Proficient	88%	66%	73%
At Advanced	75%	22%	18%
# of students tested	8	9	11
Hispanic or Latino			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	100%	0%	0%
At or above Basic	90%	100%	100%
At or above Proficient	60%	43%	40%
At Advanced	30%	29%	30%
# of students tested	10	7	10
White			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	96%	94%
At or above Basic	83%	96%	87%
At or above Proficient	54%	68%	49%
At Advanced	31%	25%	14%
# of students tested	26	28	29
Economic Disadvantaged			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	96%	97%
At or above Basic	91%	92%	90%
At or above Proficient	55%	56%	60%
At Advanced	27%	28%	20%
# of students tested	22	29	30
State Scores			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	91%	92%	89%
At or above Basic	73%	74%	71%
At or above Proficient	39%	39%	36%
At Advanced	16%	15%	14%
Mean scaled score	338.5	339	332.9

(In 2000-2001, school and state overall scores noted as average number correct /number of possible and not as mean scaled scores)

Grade 5	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
English-Language Arts- All students	% students	% students	% students
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	87%	98%	90%
At or above Basic	85%	83%	74%
At or above Proficient	65%	35%	39%
At Advanced	25%	7%	12%
# of students tested	40	46	52
% of students tested	100%	96%	88%
# of students excluded	0	0	0
% of students excluded	0	0	0
School Mean Score	355.9	337.8	334.8
African-American			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	0%	100%
At or above Below Basic	83%	0%	83%
At or above Basic	66%	100%	76%
At or above Proficient	33%	51%	34%
At Advanced	0%	13%	17%
# of students tested	6	8	12
Hispanic or Latino			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	0%	100%
At or above Below Basic	85%	100%	83%
At or above Basic	85%	82%	50%
At or above Proficient	71%	9%	17%
At Advanced	14%	0%	0%
# of students tested	7	11	6
White			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	87%	96%	96%
At or above Basic	87%	78%	78%
At or above Proficient	69%	39%	41%
At Advanced	30%	4%	15%
# of students tested	23	23	27
Economic Disadvantaged			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	0%	100%
At or above Below Basic	88%	100%	92%
At or above Basic	88%	88%	74%
At or above Proficient	66%	41%	39%
At Advanced	22%	8%	8%
# of students tested	18	24	26
State Scores			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	87%	89%	91%
At or above Basic	71%	72%	71%
At or above Proficient	40%	36%	31%
At Advanced	16%	10%	9%
Mean scaled score	337.7	332	327.7

(In 2000-2001, school and state overall scores noted as average number correct /number of possible and not as mean scaled scores)

**Santa Margarita Elementary
California Standards Test (CST)**

Mathematics

2001-2004

Scores reported based on available State data: Average percent of students who perform in each of the categories defined by the California State Department of Education: Far Below Basic, Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. The State designates the cut-point grade level standards to be at or above Proficiency. The CST is published by the State of California and is administered April and May of each year.

Grade 2	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Mathematics- All students	% students	% students	% students
At or above Far Below Basic	N/A	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	99%	97%
At or above Basic	91%	84%	89%
At or above Proficient	69%	63%	70%
At Advanced	26%	28%	318%
# of students tested	68	109	79
% of students tested	100%	99%	100%
# of students excluded	0	0	0
% of students excluded	0	0	0
School Mean Score	378.7	370.9	391.8
African-American			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	0%	93%
At or above Basic	91%	100%	85%
At or above Proficient	64%	76%	64%
At Advanced	18%	14%	50%
# of students tested	11	21	14
Hispanic or Latino			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	100%	0%
At or above Below Basic	0%	95%	0%
At or above Basic	100%	63%	100%
At or above Proficient	87%	42%	82%
At Advanced	26%	21%	36%
# of students tested	17	19	11
White			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	100%	98%
At or above Basic	89%	87%	88%
At or above Proficient	65%	67%	74%
At Advanced	27%	38%	39%
# of students tested	34	49	49

Grade 2 Mathematics-All Students 2001-04

Economic Disadvantaged			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	100%	100%	95%
At or above Basic	96%	75%	78%
At or above Proficient	57%	54%	61%
At Advanced	13%	28%	39%
# of students tested	23	53	36
State Scores	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	95%	95%	92%
At or above Basic	73%	76%	68%
At or above Proficient	48%	53%	43%
At Advanced	21%	24%	16%
Mean scaled score	358	356.7	342.7

Grade 3	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Mathematics- All students	% students	% students	% students
At or above Far Below Basic	N/A	N/A	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	100%	98%
At or above Basic	85%	96%	88%
At of above Proficient	67%	90%	63%
At Advanced	40%	53%	25%
# of students tested	62	62	64
% of students tested	100%	98%	100%
# of students excluded	0	0	0
% of students excluded	0	0	0
School Mean Score	384.4	420.4	370.6
African-American			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	100%
At or above Below Basic	100%	0%	89%
At or above Basic	70%	100%	76%
At or above Proficient	40%	91%	63%
At Advanced	20%	27%	13%
# of students tested	10	11	8
Hispanic or Latino			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	100%	0%	0%
At or above Basic	75%	0%	100%
At or above Proficient	75%	100%	66%
At Advanced	50%	46%	22%
# of students tested	8	11	9

Grade 3 Mathematics- 2001-04 (Continued)

White	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Basic	87%	94%	88%
At or above Proficient	69%	91%	63%
At Advanced	39%	69%	25%
# of students tested	36	35	40
Economic Disadvantaged			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Proficient	74%	90%	64%
At Advanced	45%	53%	27%
# of students tested	31	30	30
State Scores			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	96%	93%	91%
At or above Basic	73%	71%	65%
At or above Proficient	48%	45%	38%
At Advanced	21%	19%	12%
Mean scaled score	353.1	344.3	331.6

Grade 4	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Mathematics- All students	% students	% students	% students
At or above Far Below Basic	N/A	100%	N/A
At or above Below Basic	N/A	98%	100%
At or above Basic	100%	92%	93%
At of above Proficient	72%	78%	70%
At Advanced	28%	41%	33%
# of students tested	50	51	57
% of students tested	100%	94%	90%
# of students excluded	0	0	0
% of students excluded	0	0	0
School Mean Score	372.3	388.1	378.2
African-American			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	100%	0%
At or above Below Basic	0%	89%	100%
At or above Basic	100%	77%	92%
At or above Proficient	63%	68%	67%
At Advanced	38%	57%	17%
# of students tested	8	9	12

Grade 4 Mathematics (Continued)

Hispanic or Latino	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Proficient	80%	86%	66%
At Advanced	20%	29%	33%
# of students tested	10	7	12
White			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	0%	100%	100%
At or above Basic	100%	93%	93%
At or above Proficient	75%	75%	72%
At Advanced	32%	32%	36%
# of students tested	28	28	31
Economic Disadvantaged			
At or above Far Below Basic	0%	100%	0%
At or above Below Basic	0%	97%	100%
At or above Basic	100%	91%	91%
At or above Proficient	56%	67%	72%
At Advanced	17%	35%	36%
# of students tested	23	29	33
State Scores			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	97%	93%	93%
At or above Basic	73%	72%	67%
At or above Proficient	45%	45%	37%
At Advanced	18%	18%	13%
Mean scaled score	343.2	343.6	332.4

Grade 5	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Mathematics- All students	% students	% students	% students
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	92%	96%	98%
At or above Basic	80%	92%	74%
At or above Proficient	45%	78%	53%
At Advanced	5%	41%	15%
# of students tested	40	46	53
% of students tested	100%	96%	90%
# of students excluded	0	0	0
% of students excluded	0	0	0
School Mean Score	341.7	388.1	350.7
African-American			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	0%
At or above Below Basic	88%	88%	100%
At or above Basic	88%	75%	77%
At or above Proficient	33%	51%	42%
At Advanced	0%	13%	17%
# of students tested	6	8	12
Hispanic or Latino			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	0%	0%
At or above Below Basic	86%	100%	100%
At or above Basic	71%	72%	50%
At or above Proficient	29%	18%	17%
At Advanced	0%	0%	0%
# of students tested	7	11	6
White			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	96%	95%	96%
At or above Basic	78%	64%	63%
At or above Proficient	48%	43%	59%
At Advanced	9%	9%	19%
# of students tested	23	23	27
Economic Disadvantaged			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	0%
At or above Below Basic	89%	96%	100%
At or above Basic	83%	75%	77%
At or above Proficient	39%	46%	50%
At Advanced	6%	13%	19%
# of students tested	18	24	26
State Scores			
At or above Far Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or above Below Basic	90%	87%	91%
At or above Basic	65%	61%	59%
At or above Proficient	38%	35%	29%
At Advanced	12%	10%	7%
Mean scaled score	335.8	332.1	322.5

SANTA MARGARITA ELEMENTARY

1999-2004 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE INDEX (A.P.I.)

GROUPS	1999	2000	+/-	2001	+/-	2002	+/-	2003	+/-	2004	+/-	TOTAL
All Students	637	745	+108	790	+55	805	+15	823	+18	818	-5	+181
Hispanic	675	759	+84	*	N/A	*	N/A	770	+11	803	+33	+128
White	630	768	+158	799	+31	804	+5	835	+31	816	-19	+186
African American	572	670	+98	*	N/A	801	+131	824	+23	800	-24	+228
Economically Disadvantaged	619	727	+108	737	+10	779	+42	827	+48	807	-20	+188

* Data not provided due to lack of classification by the State as a significant subgroup

SIMILAR SCHOOLS & STATE SCHOOLS RANKING

(Ranking 1-10 with 10 the highest)

Year	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Similar Schools	7	10	10	10	10
State School Rank	6	7	8	9	9

SANTA MARGARITA ELEMENTARY
Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (SAT/9)
1999-2002

Reported in Percentile Rankings

The State designates the cut-point grade level standards to be at or above 50%. The SAT/9 is published by Hartcourt-Brace Publishing Company and is administered April and May of each year.

Grade 2	2002	2001	2000	1999
Reading	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	64	61	64	48
# Students Tested	79	77	68	65
% Students Tested	100%	99%	100%	97%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	59	61	59	40

Grade 3	2002	2001	2000	1999
Reading	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	72	73	50	54
# Students Tested	64	65	55	53
% Students Tested	98%	92%	100%	98%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	69	62	45	48

Grade 4	2002	2001	2000	1999
Reading	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	69	54	59	49
# Students Tested	55	47	33	57
% Students Tested	97%	92%	97%	97%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	72	46	54	48

Grade 5	2002	2001	2000	1999
Reading	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	53	56	56	39
# Students Tested	52	43	48	122
% Students Tested	98%	100%	100%	98%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	56	39	51	41

SANTA MARGARITA ELEMENTARY
Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (SAT/9)
1999-2002

Reported in Percentile Rankings

The State designates the cut-point grade level standards to be at or above 50%. The SAT/9 is published by Hartcourt-Brace Publishing Company and is administered April and May of each year.

Grade 2	2002	2001	2000	1999
Language Arts	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	70	63	59	47
# Students Tested	79	77	68	64
% Students Tested	100%	99%	100%	96%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	61	55	55	37

Grade 3	2002	2001	2000	1999
Language Arts	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	67	70	51	63
# Students Tested	65	65	55	52
% Students Tested	100%	92%	100%	96%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	69	63	43	60

Grade 4	2002	2001	2000	1999
Language Arts	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	69	58	55	56
# Students Tested	57	47	34	59
% Students Tested	100%	92%	100%	100%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	69	53	50	54

Grade 5	2002	2001	2000	1999
Language Arts	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	63	59	61	50
# Students Tested	53	43	48	124
% Students Tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	62	40	59	48

SANTA MARGARITA ELEMENTARY
Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (SAT/9)
1999-2002

Reported in Percentile Rankings

The State designates the cut-point grade level standards to be at or above 50%. The SAT/9 is published by Hartcourt-Brace Publishing Company and is administered April and May of each year.

Grade 2	2002	2001	2000	1999
Spelling	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	69	66	57	48
# Students Tested	79	76	68	67
% Students Tested	100%	97%	100%	100%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	70	63	56	43

Grade 3	2002	2001	2000	1999
Spelling	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	70	69	52	55
# Students Tested	65	65	55	54
% Students Tested	100%	92%	100%	100%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	70	58	49	53

Grade 4	2002	2001	2000	1999
Spelling	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	72	54	57	51
# Students Tested	56	47	34	59
% Students Tested	98%	92%	100%	100%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	70	53	45	54

Grade 5	2002	2001	2000	1999
Spelling	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	58	55	55	42
# Students Tested	53	42	48	124
% Students Tested	100%	98%	100%	100%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	62	39	50	44

SANTA MARGARITA ELEMENTARY
Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (SAT/9)
1999-2002

Reported in Percentile Rankings

The State designates the cut-point grade level standards to be at or above 50%. The SAT/9 is published by Hartcourt-Brace Publishing Company and is administered April and May of each year.

Grade 2	2002	2001	2000	1999
Mathematics	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	81	76	65	42
# Students Tested	79	77	68	64
% Students Tested	100%	99%	100%	96%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	74	72	60	39

Grade 3	2002	2001	2000	1999
Mathematics	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	86	84	61	50
# Students Tested	79	65	55	53
% Students Tested	100%	92%	100%	98%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	85	76	52	43

Grade 4	2002	2001	2000	1999
Mathematics	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	78	74	65	56
# Students Tested	57	47	34	58
% Students Tested	100%	92%	100%	98%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	77	63	55	55

Grade 5	2002	2001	2000	1999
Mathematics	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9	SAT/9
Total Score	71	75	73	46
# Students Tested	53	40	48	124
% Students Tested	100%	93%	100%	100%
# Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
% Students Excluded	0	0	0	0
Economic Disadvantaged	72	61	71	44

Private Schools

Report the school's assessment results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics for at least the last three years for all grades tested on state tests or assessments referenced against national norms. For formatting, use or adapt the sample tables (no charts or graphs) at the end of this application. Present data for all grades tested for all standardized state assessments and for assessments referenced against national norms administered by the school.

If at least 90 percent of the students take the PSAT, PLAN, SAT, or ACT, high schools should report the data.

The school must disaggregate the data for students eligible for free or reduced-priced meals and for ethnic/racial groups if a specific group comprises 10 percent or more of the student body of the school. The school must disaggregate the data whether or not the school actually offers the federal school lunch program. Show how all subgroups of students achieved at high levels or improved dramatically in achievement for at least three years. Explain any disparity among subgroups.

The school must specify the number and percentage of students assessed by alternative methods. Attach all tables that show test data to the end of this application. Continue to number the pages consecutively.