

# 2006-2007 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

## U.S. Department of Education

**Cover Sheet** Type of School: (Check all that apply)  Elementary  Middle  High  K-12  Charter

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

Official School Name Robert M. Bracker Elementary School  
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 121 Camino Diez Mandamientos  
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

Nogales AZ 85621-9648  
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Santa Cruz State School Code Number\* 120201103

Telephone ( 520 ) 377-2886 Fax ( 520 ) 377-0885

Web site/URL http://www.nusd.k12.az.us/Schools/Bracker/ E-mail molguin@nusd.k12.az.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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Superintendent\* Dr. Guillermo Zamudio  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Nogales Unified School District #1 Tel. ( 520 ) 287-0800

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

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.

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

*\*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 for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2006-2007 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 2001 and has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
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:       6   Elementary schools  
   2   Middle schools  
    Junior high schools  
   2   High schools  
    Other:  
  
    10  TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:      \$6,234   
  
     Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:  \$6,864

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city  
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area  
 Suburban  
 Small city or town in a rural area  
 Rural
4.   1   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.  
  8   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	17	19	36	8			
1	27	9	36	9			
2	25	27	52	10			
3	29	20	49	11			
4	23	20	43	12			
5	19	25	44	Other			
6							
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →</b>							<b>260</b>

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- |                   |                                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>.7</u>         | % White                          |
| <u>0</u>          | % Black or African American      |
| <u>99</u>         | % Hispanic or Latino             |
| <u>0</u>          | % Asian/Pacific Islander         |
| <u>0</u>          | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| <b>100% Total</b> |                                  |

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: 11 %

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

<b>(1)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year	14
<b>(2)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year	14
<b>(3)</b>	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	28
<b>(4)</b>	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	259
<b>(5)</b>	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	.11
<b>(6)</b>	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	11%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 64 %  
166 Total Number Limited English Proficient

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

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 74 %  
Total number students who qualify: 192

10. Students receiving special education services: 6%  
17 Total Number of Students Served

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

<u>    </u> Autism	<u>    </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>    </u> Deafness	<u>  1  </u> Other Health Impaired
<u>    </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>  4  </u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>    </u> Emotional Disturbance	<u> 12  </u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>    </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>    </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>    </u> Mental Retardation	<u>    </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>    </u> Multiple Disabilities	

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>    </u>
Classroom teachers	<u> 12  </u>	<u>    </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>  5  </u>	<u>  1  </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>  3  </u>	<u>    </u>
Support staff	<u>  2  </u>	<u>    </u>
Total number	<u> 23  </u>	<u>  1  </u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 22:1

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. Also explain a high teacher turnover rate.

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Daily student attendance	95%	97%	94%	96%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	7%	5%	6%	Not available	Not available
Teacher turnover rate	11%	5%	1%	17%	5%

---

## **PART III - SUMMARY**

---

Robert M. Bracker Elementary is one of ten schools in Nogales Unified School District #1. We are in a small community, located on the border with our sister city, Nogales, Sonora, Mexico. Ninety-nine percent of Bracker Dolphins, as the student body is lovingly called, are Hispanic and one percent is White. A majority of the Dolphins are English Learners (EL's), sixty-six percent in 2005-2006. Poverty is high in the school, with seventy-four percent of the students qualifying for free or reduced lunch.

The vision for students at Robert M. Bracker is clear and focused, *all students achieving*. Everyone in our school has high expectations for student success. Curriculum, instruction and assessment all work together at Robert M. Bracker. The teachers and paraprofessionals implement instruction based on scientific research to deliver the curriculum built on the Arizona Articulated Academic standards. Assessment is used to drive instruction in the classroom and during intervention programs. Teachers have made the commitment to teach reading and math lessons every day, regardless of early releases, inservices, assemblies and special events.

The staff implements scientifically based, research proven strategies. All students are provided with extra support based on their skill levels. During the school day, each student receives targeted instruction in reading. Students are grouped according to their instructional needs, as determined by assessment data. Students who are above grade level participate in accelerated instruction. Students who are significantly below grade level are placed in the smallest groups with the most qualified instructors, with the majority receiving another session of intervention instruction. The instruction for all groups is coordinated with the regular classroom core program, so that each student is receiving support and extra practice with these lessons. Extra support for reading and math are provided in tutoring outside of regular school hours.

All classroom instruction utilizes the Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) model for English language support for all students. These techniques include: systematic and explicit instruction, scaffolding, differentiation, focus on vocabulary, repeated opportunities to practice, think time, immediate, specific feedback and student engagement. Through our own research and experience, we have learned that these SEI strategies work for all at-risk students, not just the EL's.

Assessment plays a major role in determining appropriate instruction for our students. Student data is analyzed frequently, both formally and informally, by teachers and the intervention teams, to modify and adjust the instructional program of students. Teachers adjust instruction based on assessment data to provide the most appropriate education possible for each and every student. Teachers adjust one or more of the following variables based on the data: intervention group placement, skill focus, materials, instructor, duration of support, additional support before, during or after school, flexible grouping during the core reading block, or cross-grade level grouping.

Parental engagement is a high priority. Our parent training program, called *Parent Power Program*, provides parents with valuable information on how to reinforce and support our academic program at home. Parents are kept informed about their children's achievement on a weekly basis, as students take home their assessment binders, which hold all of the assessments completed during that school week. Grade levels send home newsletters monthly, and the district sends a newsletter once each quarter. Parent-teacher conferences are held twice per year. All communication is provided in English and Spanish, to ensure there are no communication gaps between staff and parents.

Faculty continuously seeks out formal professional development through classes and workshops, in addition to taking advantage of informal sources of professional development, such as peer coaching and classroom observations. The Reading First reading coach is invaluable in providing assistance to the teachers, through observation and feedback to teachers, including advice and strategies on how to implement ideas learned from professional development. The principal also conducts weekly walk-through observations of instruction in all content areas and provides feedback to teachers. The district reading coordinator works closely with our staff, providing training in reading instruction to all grade level teachers upon request. The district has made the commitment to provide release time for the instructional staff to attend trainings and collaborate with each other. The commitment to continually improving instructional delivery is strong at Robert M. Bracker.

## PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

1. **Assessment Results:** There are four categories for proficiency on the state criterion-referenced test AIMS. “Exceeds” indicates superior academic performance on challenging subject matter reflected by the content standards. “Meets” indicates a solid understanding of the state content standards. “Approaches” indicates a partial understanding of the skills and knowledge necessary for grade level proficiency. “Falls Far Below” indicates an insufficient understanding of the prerequisite skills necessary for grade level proficiency. Further information on AIMS can be found at <http://www.ade.state.az.us/AIMS/educators.asp>.

On the state criterion-referenced test, AIMS, student achievement has consistently increased. In grade 3 reading, the percent passing increased from 52% in Spring 2002 to 76% in Spring 2006. The percent of students at the highest level, “Exceeds,” increased from 16% in Spring 2002 to 24% in the Spring of 2006. The three statistically significant subgroups, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient (LEP), and Economically Disadvantaged, consistently demonstrate more than 50% of students passing the reading test each year. The math results show a much larger increase in the percent of students passing, from 58% in Spring 2002 to 90% in Spring 2006. The percent of students at the highest level in math, “Exceeds,” increased from 18% in Spring 2002 to 33% in the Spring of 2006. In the subgroups, there are increasing amounts of students achieving at the highest level in math, “Exceeds,” 18% of Hispanics, 18% of LEP’s, and 26% of Economically Disadvantaged in Spring 2006.

The school year of 2005-2006 was the first year the state department of education required fourth grade students take the AIMS. There were more than half, 64%, of the students pass the reading test. The math results were much higher, with 88% passing.

The fifth grade students show a large increase in the percent passing the reading test, from 43% in Spring 2002 to 56% in Spring 2004, to 91% in Spring 2006. The Hispanic subgroup results mirror the total group results. The percent passing in reading was 27% in Spring 2003 and increased to 94% in Spring 2006. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup increase was similar, from 27% in Spring 2003 and increased to 93% in Spring 2006. The LEP subgroup results showed dramatic increases, from only 6% passing the reading test to 72% passing in Spring 2005. The results of the math tests show huge increases. In Spring 2002, there were only 14% passing the test, increasing to 49% in Spring 2004, and up to 94% in Spring 2006. The percent of students at the “Exceeds” level also increased, from 3% in Spring 2002 to 25% in the Spring of 2006.

The norm-referenced test results show similar increases. In grade two reading, the increase was from an average of 30 percentile in Spring 2002 up to 48 percentile in Spring 2006, and language, from average of 19 percentile in Spring 2002 up to 56 percentile in Spring 2006. The average percentile for grade three in reading was 34 percentile in Spring 2002 and increased to 54 percentile in Spring 2006. The achievement of the LEP’s in reading stayed essentially constant between 2002, 27 percentile, and 2006, 28 percentile. The language results for the total group and the subgroups were essentially constant over the past five years. The grade three math average percentile increased from 52 percentile in 2002 to 65 percentile in 2006.

The results for our fourth grade students are stable over the five years, in all three areas. The fifth grade results, however, show dramatic increase in the average reading percentile, from 23 in 2002 to 48 in 2004 to 61 in 2006. The subgroups show the same increase. The average for Hispanic students was 26 percentile in 2002 and increased to 44 in 2004. The increase by the LEP students was 14 percentile in 2002 to 33 in 2004. The increase by the Economically Disadvantaged students was 27 percentile to 50 in 2004. The language percentile also increased, from 33 percentile in 2002 to 67 in 2006. The average for Hispanic students was 33 percentile in 2002 and increased to 57 in 2004. The increase by the LEP students was 23 percentile in 2002 to 47 in 2004. The increase by the Economically Disadvantaged students was 27 percentile to 50 in 2004.

Our programs are effective in increasing proficiency in English, as indicated by the decrease in number of students classified as LEP in fifth grade, from twenty-three in Spring 2003 to fewer than ten in

Spring 2006. We also have increased the number of students who take the test in English.

2. **Using Assessment Results:** Teachers are very adept at using data to make appropriate instructional decisions. The teachers use DIBELS benchmark and progress monitoring assessments in reading, and the following assessments in all content areas: core assessments, district and state designated reading assessments, diagnostic assessments, and intervention program assessments. Teachers disaggregate AIMS, TerraNova, EL data, classroom assessment and district assessment data to determine what instructional needs exist for each individual student. Groups of students with similar instructional needs are created. Teachers use the data to make flexible groups in reading during the school day, both in their classrooms and during intervention. Teachers also use this data to identify students for tutoring outside of the school day in reading and math. The curriculum and instruction in the tutoring program is designed to correlate and support classroom instruction.

In math, teachers used standardized testing and classroom assessment data to identify gaps in the district-adopted program. The teachers work hard to find research-based strategies and materials to supplement the core program during the school day. Assessment data is also used to identify students in need of tutoring outside of the school day. Informal classroom assessments identify students' instructional needs for the tutoring sessions and provide data to the teachers on their students' progress.

Grade level teams meet frequently to analyze assessment data and make any necessary changes in instructional groups. The reading specialist, principal and reading coach meet with grade level teams after each round of DIBELS progress monitoring and after the administration of End-of-Theme tests to discuss results, develop short-term goals and use of data to plan next steps in instruction. The Literacy Team, which consists of one teacher per grade level, reading specialist, reading coach, special education resource teacher and principal, meets every month for this same purpose, only with a focus school-wide data. At this time, the team looks to see what changes need to be made school-wide to improve the instructional programs for our Dolphins.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:** Teachers review their in-class assessments with students, going over the answers and determining why answers are correct or not. Teachers also do this with the results of the Galileo, the district assessment administered quarterly. All K-5 students are administered the progress monitoring probes of the DIBELS, Dynamic Indicators of Early Literacy Skills, a research-proven, standardized, early literacy assessment. Students are provided with their results as soon as the assessment is finished. Teachers chart their progress and share the chart with students. Together, they review what the student did correctly and what skills need improvement. Parents also receive DIBELS, Galileo and in-class assessment results with progress reports and report cards. Formal parent-teacher conferences are held twice a year during which teachers discuss the students' report cards with parents. Progress reports are sent home to the parents during the fourth week of each nine-week grading period.

Each student has a parent communication folder or binder. Each grade level is slightly different, based on developmental levels of the students, but they all contain communication regarding homework and behavior. Each student also has an assessment binder, which contains all assessments students do during the week. The students file the assessments and review their progress over the course of the week. They take the binder home and share it with their parents. Parents also have online access to their children's grades, and can email or speak personally with the teacher about any concerns.

The child study team process or Student Intervention Program at Robert M. Bracker is critical to ensuring that all students achieve. The team, consisting of the counselor, principal, parent(s), classroom teacher, reading specialist, and special education resource teacher support personnel, reviews data on the student and discusses ways to assist the student. The group periodically meets to review the student's progress, in order to determine if further assistance through special education is a possible need for the student.

The superintendent presents state assessment data on each school to the school board, which is broadcast to the community on the district's Title I television station. Each year, the principal presents the assessment data to parents and community, in conjunction with the School Improvement Plan. Assessment data is posted in the entrance of the building for all community members to review.

4. **Sharing Success:** Once each quarter, the district hosts grade level meetings district-wide. Each session focuses on instructional needs identified by teachers and administrators. The teachers share what they are doing with their grade level colleagues from the other district elementary schools. Elementary principal meetings are held regularly with the assistant superintendent. The principal shares strategies being implemented at Bracker, and learns different strategies used at other schools. Various staff have presented at state and national conferences, and will continue to do so whenever invited.

## PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:** Curriculum, instruction and assessment all work together at Robert M. Bracker. The teachers implement instruction based on scientific research to deliver the curriculum built on the Arizona Articulated Academic standards. Frequent assessments are utilized to determine what instruction is most appropriate for the students in reading, writing and math. Teachers have made the commitment to teach reading and math lessons every day, regardless of early releases, inservices, assemblies and special events.

The demographics of the school dictate that the faculty provides a wide range of opportunities for all the groups. All classroom instruction utilizes the SEI model for English language support for EL's, at the same time supporting all students. These techniques include: systematic and explicit instruction, scaffolding, differentiation, focus on vocabulary, repeated opportunities to practice, think time, immediate, specific feedback and student engagement. By using these techniques, the teachers teach grade level content to all students, regardless of their English proficiency levels.

The language arts program is designed to follow the scientifically-based reading research of Reading First. The staff implements a core reading program that addresses grade level standards, supplemented by research-proven targeted intervention programs for addressing skill gaps. Each student receives one hundred and twenty minutes of reading which focus on the "Big Five" of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension, as well an additional hour of language arts instruction. In addition, all students receive thirty to forty-five minutes of targeted instruction to either address skill gaps or accelerate their skills in reading.

The writing program is based on the AZ Articulated Writing Standards and the Six Traits of writing. Student writing is assessed in class using the Six Trait Analytical Writing Rubric developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL), which prepares them for the way they are assessed on the state accountability measure, AIMS. Our students also participate in the district quarterly writing assessment, in which their work is scored in a process that mirrors how the AIMS is scored. Two teachers conduct 'blind' scoring of the writing, and the scores are combined. After each scoring, our teachers meet with the school writing specialist to refine the curriculum and instruction in writing for the upcoming quarter. In this way, our writing program is continually modified based on student instructional needs.

The math program also has a scientifically-based program at its center. Frequent assessment indicates what standards are not being mastered, so the teachers can provide supplemental materials and re-teaching as needed. Manipulatives and technology are utilized frequently to enhance the curriculum and differentiate instruction for all learners in the classroom.

General Music is provided to all students twice a week, for forty-five minutes each session. The teacher uses Arizona Music standards when designing lessons. Each class works on their own grade level articulated standards. The teacher uses the SEI model for English language support for all students as they learn the music standards. The curriculum includes activities that actively involve students and address the standards. Repetition of key skills is provided across the lessons to promote mastery of the skills.

The Physical Education curriculum provides a balance between the academic and physical programs. Each class attends twice a week, for forty-five minutes per session. The teacher implements the Arizona Physical Activity standards, and emphasizes the basic skills of throwing, catching, kicking, running and playing cooperatively. These foci give students the necessary skills to channel their energy in positive ways during the unstructured times throughout the day. Another strong component of the curriculum is the integration of the Character Counts program. The PE teacher explicitly explains to students how they work on building their character during physical activities, and makes the connection for them between his class, the regular class, recess, home and community. The PE program shows the students the benefits that physical activity, diet, health have on their academic lives and their personal lives.

2a. **Reading:** The reading program is designed to prevent reading difficulties in grades kindergarten through third grade, and to maintain student achievement throughout fourth and fifth grades. The program is centered on teaching all students grade level content, while providing additional support to fill in any skill gaps that exist. Extra support for the high number of EL's is provided while teaching the grade level

content, with a strong emphasis on vocabulary building, scaffolding, differentiation, repeated opportunities to practice, think time, immediate, specific feedback and student engagement. The teachers have participated in three years of intensive professional development in implementing the best scientifically-based reading research methods, along with utilizing assessment data for planning and delivering instruction. In 2003, the school was labeled as ‘Underperforming’ by the Arizona Department of Education. The faculty realized that the program being delivered at that time was not successful with enough students. We realized that a change was necessary from the pure Balanced Literacy approach that had been in place. Key staff members reviewed the research on what works with at-risk populations such as ours, and determined that a systematic and explicit program, with key balanced literacy activities of read aloud, shared reading, guided reading and independent reading, is what was necessary for our students. The assessment data from the first year demonstrated that this approach is successful with our population, so the faculty has fully committed to this program.

**3. Additional Curriculum Area:** Character Counts has existed at RMBracker for four years. The intervention specialist provides bi-weekly lessons to each class using the Character Counts program. Character Counts uses the concept of Six Pillars of character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship. The same lessons are delivered to all grades, but the level of sophistication changes according to the developmental differences of each grade. Each month, the intervention specialist focuses on one character trait, or pillar, with all of the classes. Students discuss the meaning of this specific pillar, see videos representing examples and non-examples of the pillar, and then brainstorm how they can apply this pillar to their own behavior at school and in the community. The intervention specialist connects current events at school and in the community with the character pillars, to give real life examples of each pillar. The school-wide discipline program is based on Character Counts and the Six Pillars of character. All staff members have color-coded forms to give to students based on their behavior. A green slip is given when a student’s behavior shows an appropriate example of the six pillars. A blue slip is given when a student’s behavior does not show an appropriate example of the six pillars. Random drawings of students’ green slips are held for small and large prizes frequently. A negative consequence, referral to principal and parental contact, is given when a student has too many blue slips, more than five.

The language of the six pillars is utilized throughout the day in different settings, such as in PE class, at recess, during assemblies, at lunch, at the bus loading area. The school’s mission is for all students to achieve, and Character Counts makes the connection between the academic program and a student’s character. The intervention specialist supports the academic curriculum with Character Counts, providing explicit examples of how the six pillars help them learn. The intervention specialist also works very closely with parents, teachers and the principal, when either academic or behavioral concerns arise.

**4. Instructional Methods:** In effective schools, all children are given the opportunity to learn and the staff, parents and students have high expectations for success. At Robert M. Bracker, everyone adheres to the saying that *in order for all children to succeed, each child must be successful*. The demographics of the school dictate that the staff provides a wide range of opportunities for all the groups. All classroom instruction in all curriculum areas utilizes the SEI model to support our large number of EL’s. Intervention in reading and language arts is provided by the classroom teachers, Title I reading specialist, instructional assistants, and the special education teacher. All personnel have received training in delivering these programs, from both the reading specialist and reading coach. Students who are at or above grade level receive accelerated instruction during the time when students below level are receiving intervention support. The principal made a commitment to provide intervention support to the students in fourth and fifth grade levels with funding other than Reading First.

Before, during and after school tutoring is provided to students who are not at grade level. The foci of these extra instructional sessions are math, reading and English language development. Our grade level teams meet monthly to review student progress and determine which students would benefit most from this extra support, and what materials and instructional methods need to be implemented with them. These

decisions are a team effort, with the support of the curriculum coordinator, reading specialist, Reading First interventionist, paraprofessionals, principal and classroom teachers.

**5. Professional Development:** Professional development is viewed by all staff as on-going. We have made great advances in providing school wide sessions with topics common to all grades and subject areas. The management team looks at student assessment data and compares them to classroom observation data gathered by the principal and Reading First reading coach, to determine what professional development topics need to be addressed, in addition to using staff input regarding their needs and wants. The staff looks at student assessment data to create a plan for future professional development sessions.

The staff at Robert M. Bracker is flexible and committed to using planning time or after school meeting time to participate in additional trainings. The principal has used creative strategies to find time for instructional staff to meet for these trainings, such as holding whole school assemblies and providing field day activities. One avenue for collaboration is during grade level team meetings. The principal created cross-grade level teams for the purpose of collaboration. The special education resource teacher, physical education and music teachers are also part of grade level teams.

Coordination of all of the professional development has been vital to getting the trainings into the classrooms. The principal and curriculum coordinator work together to implement the Effective Schools research and ensure the professional development sessions are meeting their teachers' and students' needs.

The reading coach, hired as part of the Reading First program, provides the link between the trainings and implementation in the classrooms. The coach models the strategies, observes the teachers using newly learned strategies, and gives them feedback on the effectiveness of their implementation. The principal conducts informal observations to look for implementation these new, research-based instructional strategies. The faculty is using these scientifically based research strategies in all content areas.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject Reading Grade 3 Test Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards

Edition/Publication Year 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB-McGraw Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	76%	68%	89%	75%	52%
% "Exceeding" State Standards	24%	7%	31%	9%	16%
Number of students tested	46	46	43	39	44
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1 Hispanic</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	68%	64%	88%	75%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	7%	3%	28%	9%	
Number of students tested	28	31	41	39	
<b>2 Limited English Proficient</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	68%	64%	NA	NA	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	7%	3%	NA	NA	
Number of students tested	28	31	17	17	
<b>3 Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	74%	64%	82%	75%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	16%	3%	13%	9%	
Number of students tested	38	38	25	39	

--indicates fewer than 10 students

NA indicates not available

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards

Edition/Publication Year 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB-McGraw Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	90%	72%	73%	59%	58%
% "Exceeding" State Standards	33%	2%	23%	9%	18%
Number of students tested	46	46	43	39	45
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1 Hispanic</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	89%	67%	72%	59%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	18%	3%	20%	9%	
Number of students tested	28	31	41	39	
<b>2 Limited English Proficient</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	89%	67%	NA	NA	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	18%	3%	NA	NA	
Number of students tested	28	31	17	17	
<b>3 Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	92%	69%	65%	59%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	26%	3%	6%	9%	
Number of students tested	38	38	25	39	

Subject Reading Grade 4 Test Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards

Edition/Publication Year 2006 Publisher CTB-McGraw Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April			
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	64%	69%			
% "Exceeding" State Standards	5%	3%			
Number of students tested	41	41			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	64%	69%			
% "Exceeding" State Standards	5%	3%			
Number of students tested	41	40			
2 Limited English Proficient					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	46%	10%			
% "Exceeding" State Standards	0%	0%			
Number of students tested	26	12			
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	61%	66%			
% "Exceeding" State Standards	0%	0%			
Number of students tested	33	29			

*Not required by state*

Subject Math Grade 4 Test Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards

Edition/Publication Year 2006 Publisher CTB-McGraw Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April			
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	88%	82%			
% "Exceeding" State Standards	15%	13%			
Number of students tested	41	41			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	88%	81%			
% "Exceeding" State Standards	15%	13%			
Number of students tested	41	40			
2 Limited English Proficient					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	81%	50%			
% "Exceeding" State Standards	12%	0%			
Number of students tested	26	12			
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	88%	83%			
% "Exceeding" State Standards	15%	10%			
Number of students tested	33	29			

*Not required by state*

Subject Reading Grade 5 Test Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards

Edition/Publication Year 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB-McGraw Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	91%	58%	56%	56%	43%
% "Exceeding" State Standards	8%	2%	7%	3%	3%
Number of students tested	36	42	51	44	35
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	92%	58%	54%	56%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	9%	3%	8%	3%	
Number of students tested	35	41	50	44	
2 Limited English Proficient					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	--	50%	44%	41%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	--	0%	0%	0%	
Number of students tested	--	14	19	23	
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	90%	59%	54%	56%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	4%	0%	4%	3%	
Number of students tested	28	34	35	44	

--indicates fewer than 10 students

Subject Math Grade 5 Test Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards

Edition/Publication Year 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB-McGraw Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	94%	78%	49%	27%	14%
% "Exceeding" State Standards	25%	10%	29%	16%	3%
Number of students tested	36	42	51	44	35
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	94%	78%	48%	27%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	23%	10%	28%	16%	
Number of students tested	35	41	50	44	
2 Limited English Proficient					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	--	72%	22%	6%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	--	11%	11%	6%	
Number of students tested	--	14	19	23	
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	93%	75%	50%	27%	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	14%	9%	25%	16%	
Number of students tested	28	34	35	44	

--indicates fewer than 10 students

**ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS**

Subject Reading Grade 2 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject Reading Grade 2 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>
Total Score	48%	42%	58%	45%	30%
Number of students tested	45	48	50	38	31
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	93	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1 Hispanic</b>					
Total Score	47%	42%	32%	44%	39%
Number of students tested	44	48	48	37	28
<b>2 Limited English Proficient</b>					
Total Score	43%	30%	27%	37%	31%
Number of students tested	28	27	42	30	17
<b>3 Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Total Score	44%	41%			
Number of students tested	31	40			

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Language \_\_\_\_\_ Grade 2 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Language \_\_\_\_\_ Grade 2 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<u>TerraNova</u>	<u>TerraNova</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>
Total Score	56%	44%	52%	32%	19%
Number of students tested	45	48	50	41	35
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	100	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	55%	44%	24%	32%	18%
Number of students tested	44	48	48	40	32
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	52%	31%	18%	27%	13%
Number of students tested	28	27	42	33	21
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	49%	42%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	31	40	35	44	

Subject Mathematics Grade 2 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject Mathematics Grade 2 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>
Total Score	50%	46%	52%	53%	46%
Number of students tested	45	48	50	43	35
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	100	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	49%	46%	35%	52%	46%
Number of students tested	44	48	48	42	32
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	48%	40%	30%	48%	36%
Number of students tested	28	27	42	35	21
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	43%	45%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	31	40	35	44	

Subject Reading Grade 3 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject Reading Grade 3 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<u>TerraNova</u>	<u>TerraNova</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>
Total Score	54%	44%	57%	35%	34%
Number of students tested	46	44	40	35	38
Percent of total students tested	100	98	95	100	94
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	54%	44%	45%	35%	34%
Number of students tested	46	44	38	34	48
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	28%	28%	16%	27%
Number of students tested	--	31	20	13	33
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	49%	39%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	39	30	35	44	

--indicates fewer than 10 students

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Language \_\_\_\_\_ Grade 3 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Language \_\_\_\_\_ Grade 3 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<u>TerraNova</u>	<u>TerraNova</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>
Total Score	52%	42%	69%	57%	53%
Number of students tested	46	44	40	36	48
Percent of total students tested	100	98	95	100	94
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	52%	42%	61%	57%	53%
Number of students tested	46	44	38	35	48
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	31%	48%	38%	45%
Number of students tested	--	31	20	14	33
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	58%	36%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	39	30	35	44	

--indicates fewer than 10 students

Subject Mathematics Grade 3 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject Mathematics Grade 3 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>
Total Score	65%	45%	58%	45%	52%
Number of students tested	46	44	40	35	50
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	65%	45%	50%	45%	52%
Number of students tested	46	44	38	34	50
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	35%	39%	28%	46%
Number of students tested	--	31	20	13	35
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	49%	36%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	39	30	35	44	

Subject Reading Grade 4 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject Reading Grade 4 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>
Total Score	46%	49%	50%	36%	48%
Number of students tested	41	40	46	46	45
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	94	94
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	46%	49%	38%	36%	48%
Number of students tested	41	39	44	46	44
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	30%	17%	27%	30%
Number of students tested	--	12	21	33	24
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	43%	47%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	358	29	35	44	

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Language \_\_\_\_\_ Grade 4 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Language \_\_\_\_\_ Grade 4 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>
Total Score	44%	52%	52%	36%	48%
Number of students tested	41	40	47	48	40
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	100	94
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	44%	52%	41%	46%	49%
Number of students tested	41	39	45	48	44
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	33%	26%	38%	40%
Number of students tested	--	12	22	34	24
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	39%	53%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	38	29	35	44	

Subject Mathematics Grade 4 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject Mathematics Grade 4 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>
Total Score	52%	59%	58%	56%	70%
Number of students tested	41	40	47	52	46
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	100	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	52%	59%	50%	56%	70%
Number of students tested	41	39	45	52	45
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	14%	34%	47%	59%
Number of students tested	--	12	22	38	25
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	47%	62%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	38	29	35	44	

Subject Reading Grade 5 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject Reading Grade 5 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<u>TerraNova</u>	<u>TerraNova</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>	<u>Stanford 9</u>
Total Score	61%	40%	48%	45%	23%
Number of students tested	35	41	49	41	40
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	61%	39%	44%	45%	26%
Number of students tested	34	40	48	39	35
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	--	33%	33%	14%
Number of students tested	--	--	21	20	17
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	55%	48%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	29	25	35	44	

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Language \_\_\_\_\_ Grade 5 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject \_\_\_\_\_ Language \_\_\_\_\_ Grade 5 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>
Total Score	67%	43%	60%	51%	33%
Number of students tested	3555	41	49	41	40
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	66%	42%	57%	52%	33%
Number of students tested	34	40	48	40	37
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	--	47%	39%	23%
Number of students tested	--	--	21	21	19
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	82%	49%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	29	25	35	44	

Subject Mathematics Grade 5 Test TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year 2005, 2006 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

Subject Mathematics Grade 5 Test Stanford 9

Edition/Publication Year 9<sup>th</sup> edition Publisher Harcourt

\*\*Starting in Spring of 2004-2005, students were tested using the TerraNova. In the Springs of 2002, 2003 and 2004, students were tested on the Stanford 9.

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	March	March	March
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>TerraNova</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>	<i>Stanford 9</i>
Total Score	61%	48%	66%	64%	35%
Number of students tested	35	41	51	43	40
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1 Hispanic					
Total Score	60%	47%	65%	64%	35%
Number of students tested	34	40	50	42	37
2 Limited English Proficient					
Total Score	--	--	58%	53%	29%
Number of students tested	--	--	23	23	19
3 Economically Disadvantaged					
Total Score	59%	52%	50%	27%	
Number of students tested	29	25	35	44	

An explanation of the assessment data is provided in Part IV. There is discrepancy amongst the results for our Limited English Proficient students and the subgroups Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged, particularly in grades four and five. The largest discrepancies are in the areas of Reading and Language. The principal reason for this discrepancy is the phenomenon that occurs frequently of students enrolling in our school without any previous education in the English language. In the primary grades, language development is part of the regular education curriculum. For any non-English speaking student, the curriculum provides multiple opportunities to learn basic English in addition to the academic content. In grades four and five, however, the curriculum dictates a heavy emphasis on academic content and language, with minimal basic English skills and language development. Students who enter our school as non-English speakers in grades four and five have a larger amount of basic English and academic English to learn in order to be successful.