U.S. Department of Education
2013 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program
A Public School - 13CA17

	Charter	Title 1	Magnet	Choice
School Type (Public Schools):	☐	☐	☐	☑

Name of Principal: Ms. Sarah Ott

Official School Name: Torrey Pines Elementary School

School Mailing Address: 8350 Cliffridge Avenue
La Jolla, CA 92037-2106

County: San Diego State School Code Number*: 37683386040232

Telephone: (858) 453-2323 E-mail: jsolo@sandi.net

Fax: (858) 452-6923 Web site/URL: www.sandi.net/torreypines

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that all information is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Mr. William Kowba Superintendent e-mail: wkowba@sandi.net

District Name: San Diego Unified District Phone: (619) 725-8000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. John Evans

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

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

**Non-Public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*
The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Director, National Blue Ribbon Schools (Aba.Kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, National Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

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 configuration includes one or more of 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 (AYP) or its equivalent each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's AYP requirement or its equivalent in the 2012-2013 school year. Meeting AYP or its equivalent must be certified by the state. Any AYP status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take foreign language courses.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2007 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for that period.

6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 or 2012.

7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.

8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

10. 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.

11. 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

1. Number of schools in the district
   - 140 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
   - 31 Middle/Junior high schools
   - 34 High schools
   - 18 K-12 schools
   - 223 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 8541

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Urban or large central city

4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 10

5. Number of students as of October 1, 2012 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0
K	38	26	64
1	46	44	90
2	37	38	75
3	47	51	98
4	50	41	91
5	32	25	57
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total in Applying School:			475

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 %	American Indian or Alaska Native
17 %	Asian
0 %	Black or African American
11 %	Hispanic or Latino
0 %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
60 %	White
12 %	Two or more races
100 %	Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2011-2012 school year: 11%

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

Step	Description	Value
(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year.	23
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year.	31
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	54
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2011	480
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.11
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	11

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school: 13%

Total number of ELL students in the school: 60

Number of non-English languages represented: 15

Specify non-English languages:

Arabic, Chinese-Mandarin, Chinese-Other, French, German, Hungarian, India-Other, Japanese, Korean, Persian-Farsi, Pilipino-Tagalog, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 10%

Total number of students who qualify: 45

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 4%

Total number of students served: 19

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

6	Autism	0	Orthopedic Impairment
0	Deafness	1	Other Health Impaired
0	Deaf-Blindness	4	Specific Learning Disability
0	Emotional Disturbance	5	Speech or Language Impairment
1	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
1	Mental Retardation	1	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0	Multiple Disabilities	0	Developmentally Delayed

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

	Full-Time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	1	0
Classroom teachers	19	1
Resource teachers/specialists (e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.)	3	3
Paraprofessionals	1	6
Support staff (e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.)	3	0
Total number	27	10

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1: 24:1

13. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Daily student attendance	98%	97%	97%	97%	96%
High school graduation rate	%	%	%	%	%

14. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools):**
Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2012.

Graduating class size:	_____
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____%
Enrolled in a community college	_____%
Enrolled in vocational training	_____%
Found employment	_____%
Military service	_____%
Other	_____%
Total	**0**%

15. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award:

☉ No

○ Yes

If yes, what was the year of the award?

PART III - SUMMARY

Overlooking the Pacific Ocean, Torrey Pines Elementary School (TPES) is within walking distance of the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus. Tucked at the end of a cul-de-sac, bordered on two sides by open space, and situated across the street from a major regional YMCA, the school's spectacular setting represents but a small part of its appeal. The real magic of TPES is going on inside the classrooms.

Our vision - - to provide an environment conducive to student learning in which each child feels successful, achieves academically, and thinks critically, and in which administrators, teachers, parents and the community work together to create and maintain a comprehensive curriculum based on student needs and state standards - - is lifeless next to the reality of our school. Our location allows TPES to draw from a truly international population. Our students have made their way here from China, France, Germany, India, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Spain, as well as several local neighborhoods—together they overlay a vibrant cultural texture upon the uniformly high level of thinking, learning, and understanding that characterize TPES. The uniformly high level of thinking and learning that complements the natural beauty of our school site is substance that we are carefully crafting over time.

The broad strokes of the past ten years at TPES have marked a shift from the instructional models and objectives of bygone industrial eras to a school built in the image of a dynamic society that demands agility and creativity in ever-increasing quantities. Our general expectations in regards to bold transformation are envisioned site-wide, but the details that ultimately define and drive our evolution are engineered and revised within unique professional structures. These grade-level collaboration structures ("collaboratives") represent a serious investment in the professionalism and responsibility of teachers as the primary classroom decision-makers; building and sustaining them requires a combination of tireless fundraising and acrobatic scheduling—challenges that all our stakeholders have embraced in earnest enthusiasm. As a result of their remarkable efforts, our teachers collaborate meaningfully for extended periods every week while their students study science, music, and art with specialists. The intense, job-embedded professional development that unfolds during these sessions fuels the continuous growth of our teachers as expert practitioners and the continued gains expected and achieved in each classroom.

The spirit of inquiry that drives the collaboratives both draws from and feeds our general curricular emphasis on thinking. Along with the professional growth built into school-week, curriculum has figured prominently in the transformation of our school from yesterday's worksheet, recall, discrete-skill-dominated set of classrooms to the thinking-community we seek to nurture today. A watershed in this transition, our implementation of the Seminars in Critical Literacy [six years ago] launched us on a study of thinking and understanding. Through the Seminars, students become increasingly aware of the ideas that live just below the surfaces of texts. As discussions of these ideas unfold, students share perspectives from around the world, sometimes in emergent English. Teachers listen artfully to discern the understanding and clever insights that these students offer—sometimes in staggeringly beautiful and sophisticated English, sometimes in phrases and intonations that mark them clearly as emergent speakers—always confirming and marking the thinking behind the language, affirming its value to the conversation and to the class as a community of thinkers.

Realizing each vision of students as thoughtful consumers and creators of information propels us incrementally towards the next curricular horizon. Our work with the Seminars prompted writing instruction that positions students to write from a place of real authority based on their profound understanding of story. The results of the work in literacy, a deepened and expanded understanding of the nature of understanding that is shared by the entire community, compelled us to completely revise our math curricula and instruction. From this solid ground we have begun to address the thinking dispositions intrinsic to all the disciplines we teach.

We celebrate the real impact of our work on individual students monthly at “Student in the Spotlight” assemblies. These joyful outdoor ceremonies gather the entire community to cheer the academic achievements of students selected from each classroom. Of the many opportunities for parents to participate at TPES, this is the most loved. As the principal reads the teacher’s statements about each of the student’s academic accomplishments, parents blink back proud tears behind various recording devices and children beam. All children know they will merit a turn at the center of this celebration, which serves as a consistently inspirational reminder of what is possible in schools. As proud as we are of our honors, our achievement on state exams, our being twice recognized as a California Distinguished school among them, we are most proud of the honors we are able to sincerely bestow on our children.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

A.

In California, standardized assessment scores are reported in five bands of achievement: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient and advanced in mathematics and English language arts. As delineated by the California Department of Education, the advanced level "represents a superior level of performance," the proficient level "represents a solid performance," the basic level "represents a limited performance" and the far below and below basic levels "represent a serious lack of performance." California schools generally consider attaining the proficient or the advanced level as the mark of acceptable achievement. Because our students consistently score in the proficient and advanced bands, at TPES, we work in earnest to bring *all* students to the advanced band—anything short of this triggers a concerted effort on the part of the entire school. Our teachers work tirelessly to create and deliver curriculum that gives all students regular access to the kind of experiences and thinking that characterize truly advanced performance. The few students, usually new-comers to the school or the country, who score significantly below this threshold—at basic or below basic—receive intensive intervention in addition to classroom instruction to bring them to the levels we feel will allow for their continued academic success.

B.

The overwhelming trend in our data is one of increasing achievement. Our data tables evidence growth in both the math and language arts sections of the California Standards Test (CST) within our general population and in all subgroups. Because our starting points make it impossible to secure "long-distance" gains with respect to the span of achievement from below and far below basic to advanced, the heart of our success is the uniformly large portions of all segments of the population that our efforts have shifted into the advanced band of achievement.

In English Language Arts (ELA), our overall proficiency rate has risen slightly from 83% (averaged across the 3 grade-levels) in 2008, to 97% scoring proficient or advanced in 2012. Again, the significant gains lie in the number of students scoring advanced. Overall, 76% are now advanced up from 56% in 2008, and while all groups have made growth, what is most notable—and exciting— is that these gains have been made largely in our subgroups. In 2008, 20 % of Hispanic students scored advanced; in 2012, 53% were advanced. Among the ELL population, 28% were advanced in 2008, which has grown to 73% currently.

We attribute our in ELA achievement to the implementation of the Seminars in Critical Literacy that began six years ago. The Seminars contain symbiotic elements—a curricular design that supports a carefully engineered progression of content in the classroom *and* a professional development initiative that develops teacher expertise in literary interpretation, pedagogy, and assessment. Because of this simultaneous engagement of teachers and students in high-level, high-quality work, it appears the Seminar impact is twofold. While many of our students can no longer demonstrate significant statistical gains on standardized measures, their discussion of increasingly sophisticated texts and topics, their narratives, and their expository compositions all document constant growth. These expanded data points reflect a level of literacy that would likely be considered advanced several grades ahead of the students.

Owing to the efforts of our speech and resource teachers to actively seek out understanding of the Seminars, our students with disabilities have gone from 45% scoring proficient and advanced to 79%. Similarly, our Hispanic students have gone from 59% scoring proficient and advanced to 93%, and our socially disadvantaged from 65% to 90%. The data suggest that high-level instructional approaches and expectations that may have previously reserved for those considered high achieving are actually

beneficial to all students. To address the remaining discrepancy between the achievement of these groups and the general population (97% of which scored proficient and advanced), we are strategically supporting the growth of pre-proficient students by supplementing their classroom guided reading with 4-5 extra sessions per week. The sessions focus on coaching their encounters with new texts and helping them anticipate the content of texts they will encounter in whole-group classroom sessions

The trends in mathematics are nearly identical. In 2008, 93% of third through fifth grade students scored proficient or advanced and in 2012 the proportion rose to 97%. Again the pooling of students into the advanced band is our significant achievement. Currently 80% are advanced, up from 72% in 2008. Several instructional innovations have factored in these gains. Early in this span of years, the grouping of fourth and fifth grade students for strategically focused math instruction, translated into such significant gains that we instituted the practice school-wide. This practice lead to closer examination of math practice in general and eventually spurred our curricular shift towards algebraic reasoning.

Despite our growth, our socio-economically disadvantaged group, at 87% proficient and advanced, still falls too far behind our general population, which is currently at 97%. Students with disabilities have grown from 65% proficient and advanced in 2008 to the current 84%, yet they also trail the general population. The students who have not attained proficiency receive targeted small group or individual instruction in their regular classroom both from their teacher and from support teachers who rotate among classrooms to provide strategic interventions.

2. Using Assessment Results:

This data set contained in this application captures the immediate effects of a concerted effort to purposefully translate data into meaningful practice. In 2007, after several years of close study of instructional practices—an inquiry that resulted in numerous instructional innovations—we turned our attention deliberately to the analysis of formal data, expecting that it would guide our next steps in defining and refining our instructional course. At that time, the vertical planning team—a standing committee made up of the principal and teacher representatives from each grade-level—returned to school early to pore over the data and discern trends. The team found a significant gap in language arts proficiency related to three subgroups: Our English language learner (ELL), Hispanic, and special education populations were scoring remarkably lower than their white, regular-education counterparts. At that time, 50% of ELL and Hispanic students were scoring basic and below basic on the English language arts (ELA) portion of the CST battery—versus 10% of the white population. This was unacceptable. By contrast, CST results in ELA showed 32% of all students were scoring proficient and 52% scored advanced. Although these students were achieving well, the team was concerned that the progress of the majority of the students in the higher bands had slowed, as had our success in continuing to move substantial numbers of students into advanced achievement.

The team recognized that the problem had two faces; we needed to accelerate the growth of the subgroups who were struggling in order to close an obvious and disconcerting achievement gap *and* to address the population of the higher achieving students who were failing to progress towards the advanced levels of literacy we seek for all students. Fortunately, our math scores were consistently high across populations, so for several years we could square or focus most intensely on the challenge and responsibility of raising the entire spectrum of achievement in language arts.

The principal charged the team to determine the course of action that would simultaneously address the needs of our disparate populations. They doubled their monthly meeting schedule, adding one meeting per month to accelerate their progress towards a viable means of approaching the problem. Because most, if not all, of the well-respected and researched balanced literacy approaches were already in place in each of our classrooms, as was the rigorous district-created language arts curriculum, finding a truly dynamic and innovative approach to language arts instruction was necessary. They considered several reputable intervention programs, but any one of them would target English learners *or* proficient readers only, just a portion of the students the data called us to impact.

Ultimately, a local resource offered the only possibility the team deemed viable. Several members had noticed that one of the teachers who provided extra support to targeted students was using a unique approach that engaged her students in high-level discourse around provocative texts and cognitively challenging literacy tasks. The team learned that this approach, which offered the real promise of moving in earnest towards our goal of advancing all learners, was the curricular component of a system that was in pilot stages in various classrooms around the district. It decided to bring the system to TPES and devised a plan for gradually implementing it school wide.

At this juncture, the nature of the work shifted and was transferred to the grade-level collaborative teams. These structures, which are formally made up of the teachers at each grade-level and the school professionals who support them and their students on a more informal basis, were ideally suited to govern and guide the implementation. While apprised and aware of the formal, school-wide data that prompted the larger decision making, the collaboratives used data that was immediate and informal to drive shorter-term monthly, weekly and daily instructional decisions as they studied and implemented the new curriculum. The collaborative time supported teachers in developing consensus around the types of classroom data they would collect and examine as they studied and adjusted their implementation, as well as strengthening their ability to analyze and interpret that data in a manner that engendered meaningful instructional improvements. The principal also engaged in the collaborations, sharing informal data he collected during regular classroom observations.

The "local" data that these efforts and improvements produced were shared with the community at large through several vehicles. In his monthly *Branching Out* article, the principal addressed the global decisions and their instructional outcomes, in language that made the information accessible to all stakeholders. The monthly "Students in the Spotlight" celebrations provided an ideal forum for communicating expectations and achievements to the community at large; the teachers' summaries of their students' accomplishments clearly conveying the rigorous aims of their shared expectations.

This experience has become a template for continued growth at TPES. Because the school's standing entities compose a system in which data is regularly sought and analyzed on both macro- and micro-levels in order to drive instruction that is carefully engineered on both levels as well, stories like this one can and do repeat across the disciplines and across the years.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

The instructional initiatives and innovations that have ushered the overwhelming majority of our students into the advanced and proficient bands of achievement have drawn many educators to study our school. We embrace the opportunity to host visitors and share the mechanisms and philosophies behind our success.

The visitors typically arrive in teams, composed of a principal, an assistant-principal and several key teachers. Based on our colleagues' particular area of interest, the inter-school visits take on various formats. According to their focus, the principal and lead teachers may escort them in walk-throughs of classrooms, they may observe grade-level Collaborative sessions, they may study student-work samples, or any combination of those.

Invariably, though, the visits begin in the principal's office. Often our guests are interested in learning about our math initiative or the Seminars in Critical Literacy, so they take eager notes as the principal sketches out our path to K-5 implementation and explains the structures and procedures that have nurtured its development, namely the grade-level Collaboratives. In order to allow the visitors to assemble an understanding of the strategically engineered manner in which the teaching and learning advance from Kindergarten, the walk-throughs are performed in grade-level order. The principal will have arranged for several of the teachers to be actively engaged in the teaching to enable the visitors to experience the flavor of instruction here at TPES. The teachers and students have grown accustomed to visitors, and are comfortable with carrying on as usual despite extra adults being in the room. The Grade-Level

Collaborative meetings, however, allow the teachers to pause the work at hand to engage with curious administrators and teachers.

Most often, we host schools from within our district who have heard about our school by word of mouth or local media, but we have also shared our practice with district-level administrators and school board members who are interested in taking our projects to scale in San Diego Unified. Recently, principals from 10 schools came to visit classrooms and participate in a forum facilitated by two of our lead-teachers on building the structures similar to the ones that are behind the practices they saw at their own schools. On several occasions, we have also received visits from schools as far away as northern California. In addition to an opportunity to share with colleagues, we appreciate these occasions as invigorating affirmations of our efforts.

4. Engaging Families and Communities:

Parents are foremost among the many community members who figure vitally in our school's success. Their contributions enrich the school immeasurably, and they will attest to the fact that the roles they take on to strengthen our school enrich their families as well. The strength of their participation derives from a well-defined, well-communicated, shared vision of the roles that the larger community plays in a world-class school. That vision features parents and community partners functioning in both official capacities, such positions on the School Site Council, the School Governance Team, and the TPES Foundation from which they assist in shaping the larger architectural elements of the school, and in less-official capacities, from which they help define and refine the more nuanced aspects of the school. The range of involvement we offer allows us to appeal to the broadest swath of parents and community members.

Marshaling their varied talents in volunteer efforts is only one facet of our productive relationship with parents. We also carefully develop the capacity of parents and guardians to assist us in keeping their children on pace towards our rigorous expectations. Our hope and expectation of cooperation has inspired novel structures for making parents familiar with the look and feel of deep understanding in math and literacy. In addition to typical academic back-to-school night, our teachers and support staff annually present several community curriculum nights. During these popular events, parents engage in the type of interactions with text and numbers that occupy their children over the course of each day at school, gaining first-hand knowledge of the complex nature and cognitive demands involved in such work. They also receive strategies and materials to assist them in supporting their children's growth toward meaningful understanding.

The result of these practices is a parent community that is well informed about and invigorated by the particular wonders of our classroom instruction. Reflecting on their participation in a discussion of a well-known picture book, *The Rainbow Fish*, many parents remarked about the fact that they would have never guessed that such a book might inspire them to do real and honest thinking. Initially they questioned the process, doubting the potential of conversation to bring them to any deeper understanding, appreciation—or in some cases loathing—of a book they thought they knew so well. The experience of co-constructing a new understanding of the story opened parents to appreciation of the power of picture books, a mainstay of our literacy instruction, to the strengthening of thinking.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The curricula taught across the disciplines at TPES derive from a hybrid of district- and state-provided designs and materials that we have sought out or developed on-site. In each area of instruction, we use district-provided materials that were vetted at the state level to ensure their thorough addressing of the California state standards to ensure a basic proficiency and supplement those to meet our unique learning goals. These goals are the result of our careful "backwards" (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998) curricular design, a process that involves simultaneously deliberating the California state standards and the essential thinking dispositions for each content area to generate learning outcomes that serve as endpoints from which we then engineer coherent instructional paths back to the emergent understandings of kindergarten. Creating these endpoints requires that we consider and reconsider the standards alongside the questions What does it mean to think like a scientist? …a mathematician? …an artist? We have both crafted answers to these questions and defined our curricula by engaging meaningfully with compelling content and by seeking out experts in the various fields of study. The result is a thinking-based curriculum that meets and exceeds the standards while honoring the essence of each content area.

Seeking out local expertise to support us in deepening and advancing our expectations in language arts resulted in our implementation of the Seminars in Critical Literacy curriculum. In addition to addressing and exceeding the state standards for Reading Comprehension and Literary Response and Analysis, the Seminars inform and guide our thinking and learning objectives in literacy. The rich experiences in interpretation of fiction and non-fiction texts that characterize the Seminar portion of our literacy instruction complement our word- and language-study, text-management and fluency skill building, and writing development—each of which advance deliberately from the basic foundation provided by the standards.

We have constructed all our curricula in a similar manner, enhancing standards-based materials with instructional designs focused on the intentional development of essential disciplinary thinking and understanding. Our math curriculum is designed to infuse mathematical thinking dispositions and algebraic reasoning into the core math curriculum outlined by the state-adopted materials. Our science teacher has drawn upon professional resources and the local UCSD community to enhance the standards-based curriculum in physical, life and earth sciences, by amplifying the investigation and experimentation dimensions of study that align with the real habits of scientists. In social studies, teachers use simulation modules and various field experiences to invite students to discover and reflect meaningfully on patterns and concepts in history and economics. Our expert art teacher used the standards as the foundation for a comprehensive curriculum that combines various media and art history which allows the students to create inspired and unique products.

Partnering with both the YMCA conveniently located directly across the street, we have implemented the standards-based Coordinated Approach to Child Health physical education program, which emphasizes cooperation, noncompetitive activities, participation by all students, progressive skill development and health and nutritional awareness. Three additional features round out our comprehensive physical education program: a unique water safety and swimming curriculum for third graders, a tennis program for fourth graders, and a lacrosse program for fifth graders that take wonderful advantage of both YMCA facilities and instructors.

Recent local bond measures have infused the school with current technological advances. We approach technology as a tool for eliminating many of the cognitive distractions that can prevent students from training their minds and their focus on the essentials of learning, thinking and understanding. Our part-time technology teacher supports teachers in using technology to ensure that students spend maximum

instructional time on the type of engagement with content and ideas that will develop their expertise in various fields of study.

2. Reading/English:

The balanced literacy approach to reading, which holds as its premise that we best develop robust and agile literacy by providing students with various complementary contexts for engaging meaningfully with words, language and texts, provides the foundation of our language arts instruction. Over the past decade, our district has provided teachers with extensive professional development in the various elements of this approach (read aloud and modeled writing, shared reading and writing, guided reading and writing, independent reading and writing, word and language study, and interactive writing for primary grade students)—within these structures students see, practice and master literate behaviors and literary content. Our teachers orchestrate them intentionally and artfully; the approaches allow them to teach in response to the constantly shifting needs of their learners, strategically coordinating various levels of instructional support as they nurture emergent readers who are just beginning to skillfully manage print in the primary grades and challenge the range of sophisticated readers in the upper grades. On-going assessments equip teachers to move fluidly among the whole group, small group, and individual approaches, appropriately scaling back support as students gain confidence and independence in particular skills and dispositions while re-employing those most supportive contexts to introduce ever increasing text challenges. The results of this approach to literacy instruction, consistent measures of strongly proficient and advanced literacy among nearly all our students, spurred us to seek new dimensions of literacy on their behalf and prompted our implementation of the Seminars in Critical Literacy.

The Seminars serve as coherent continuum of content and thinking expectations that are infused into the other approaches largely through the familiar avenues of read aloud and shared reading. The instructional outcomes, which are carefully engineered from kindergarten to fifth grade, ensure that students make constant and measurable progress toward an overarching objective: the ability and inclination to agilely use both content expertise and productive thinking-dispositions to interpret fiction and masterfully manage informational text in the abstract and conceptual manner that characterizes the highly literate citizen. The curriculum enables children to begin making substantial progress towards this goal in kindergarten, through a rational and realistic set of gradual progressions: young children move naturally from the solid-ground of understandings that they, regardless of socioeconomic status, invariably bring to their first day of school toward abstract and complex understanding. Even (or perhaps *especially*) the kindergarten goals appear extremely ambitious, but the carefully mapped progress of the curriculum from one strategically constructed understanding to the next places all young children on a trajectory towards truly advanced literacy.

3. Mathematics:

Our standardized test scores suggest that the math instruction at TPES has been remarkably effective over the last five years. However, in the latter span of those years, parents and students who returned to visit from middle school have shared personal experiences that forced us to suspect otherwise: despite their success at TPES, many of our former students were now struggling with algebra in middle school. Parents also expressed that while their children were doing well on tests, the math they did wasn't challenging them or significantly deepening their thinking. Also, several years of working with the Seminars in Critical Literacy had made obvious the discrepancy between the type of thinking they were expecting, nurturing and achieving in literacy and the nature of our math instruction, which was far more procedural in nature. We recognized a need for a significant deepening of mathematical thinking and reasoning.

In our efforts to supplement the textbook content our students were mastering well and without exception, we sought out professional texts as well as local experts to synthesize a new approach to teaching mathematics. As we studied the concept of algebraic reasoning and its theoretical underpinnings, our central goal crystalized: advancing mathematical thinking from facts and procedures towards *algebraic reasoning*. The core elements of mathematically productive thinking norms—supporting and expecting

clear student-explanations, using multiple representations of mathematical scenarios, assembling and refining conjectures about key mathematical concepts, engaging in rational justification of those concepts through examples and mathematical reasoning, and creating generalizations that unify examples and represent abstract understanding—became the focus of our instruction. As natural extension of our homegrown efforts, and a complement to our literacy work, we are currently piloting the Seminars in Mathematical Reasoning. This research-based approach to aligning math instruction with the productive habits of mind of successful mathematicians (and with the new Common Core State Standards) through mathematically productive teaching routines is revolutionizing our math instruction and our students' mathematical understanding.

An example of productive math routines is the Structured Math Talk. This specialized protocol for classroom discourse establishes a predictable context in which all students assume the expectation of sharing and contemplating mathematical reasoning and understanding. The structure promotes equity among students at all levels of achievement by eliminating status through even expectations and opportunities while highlighting the habits of seeking multiple representations, providing reasoned explanations, and seeking connections between representations to discover generalizations. Such innovative approaches have become common practice across the school, and productive mathematical thinking and reasoning are becoming systematic. The practice of thinking carefully, abstractly and intentionally about mathematical principles and concepts are becoming permanently ingrained mental habits for our students. Held beside our huge numbers of advanced students, the decreasing numbers of students who require our standard in-class support intervention suggests our innovations have a universally positive impact.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Despite our drive for academic success, we are deeply committed to the development of the whole child at TPES. Our visual and performing arts program was carefully designed to address two dimensions of the school's mission: *to provide an environment… in which each child feels successful… and thinks critically.* Our expert art and music teachers created and oversee a program that recognizes the complete person within each of our students by thoughtfully combining the realms of thinking and feeling.

What does it mean to think like an artist? Ask a second grader or a kindergartner at TPES. They will tell you (though likely not in so few words) that it means approaching and using media with forethought and intention to communicate a vision and create beauty. Our art teacher has made scarcity of materials into an asset: one piece of paper per student necessitates creative problem-solving as students are regularly forced to contemplate how to make their inevitable mistakes into artistic opportunities. She helps students come to appreciate that building a composition is not capricious or random as she coaches their thoughtful manipulation the elements of art (color, line, shape, form, space, texture, and value) to transform materials into works that evoke joy and pride.

The major focus of our performing arts strand is singing, and our students can really harmonize! The magic of music relates partly to its power to transcend cultural and language differences—a quality that has particular relevance in our population. When students first encounter pieces sung in unfamiliar languages, they often laugh and experience them as silly. With time and reflection, however, students inevitably grow in understanding, which opens them to genuine appreciation of the art that previously "sounded funny." Our music teacher remarks on the maturity and wisdom with which they approach and experience global music.

The remainder of the music curriculum vacillates between the antiquity of music history and the familiarity of modern music, tracing concepts across the ages. Considering musical ideas, like the use of rhythm to create feeling and style in Beethoven's compositions for example, equips them to do likewise with modern pieces and positions them to approach all music from an informed and critical stance.

5. Instructional Methods:

Our teachers draw from a wide repertoire of instructional methods: they are able to tailor their instructional approaches to the particular needs of students and the specific demands of learning objectives. They teach from the guiding belief that all students benefit from rich, challenging, meaningful instructional opportunities, and therefore typically begin in whole group contexts. Within the whole-group setting, teachers move flexibly along a continuum ranging from direct to experiential approaches, according to the nature of the content and the objectives. In instances where the instructional goal is close-ended, learning a procedure—how to format a document on the computer, for example—or fixed knowledge, a more direct approach is appropriate. When divergent- thinking or creativity are central to the objective, a more experiential, student-driven/teacher-facilitated approach is fitting. Partnerships and groups-within-the-group add a dynamic element to the whole-group approach that enables quick shifts into independent processing by larger proportions of students. Teachers monitor these smaller exchanges for bits of student understanding that they can bring to the whole-group to advance learning or help untangle confusions.

On-going assessments indicate student's need for additional support in meeting expectations. Depending on the evidence of understanding or mastery, teachers may offer further experiences in whole- or small-group or individual settings. In math, reading, and writing, small-group guided and individual "independent" contexts are built into the schedule to ensure regular support targeted at students' zone of proximal development. In other subject areas, these contexts happen regularly, but in a more ad hoc manner, according to assessed needs.

We are particularly attentive to the needs of the seventeen percent of our students who are learning English as a second language. These students are assessed immediately upon arrival and provided small-group support beyond the classroom matched to their particular language needs. Constant informal assessment guides the fluid movement of these students into appropriate instructional contexts that prepare them linguistically to meet the demands of their classroom.

The importance of engagement to the learning process transcends all instructional methods. As technology becomes more widely available—several classrooms have computers for all students along with interactive smart boards and all classes can access our portable computer labs—we are learning how to use it to engage students wholly in their learning and minimize cognitive distractions to focus young learners on thinking and understanding. Currently, our special education support teachers are piloting technological means of recording the thinking of students who struggle with the fine motor demands of pencils and keyboards.

6. Professional Development:

The professional development that currently takes place at Torrey Pines builds upon the massive initiative our district launched in 1999. In engaging every teacher in professional development that addressed broad pedagogical practices, theories of the reading process, and the standards, the district helped usher in the intensive, assessment-centered models that characterize our current design for professional growth.

Here at Torrey Pines, the nature of our curriculum creates real and immediate demands for professional growth and collaboration among teachers. Both the Seminars in Critical Literacy and our math initiative require such keen instructional savvy and sophisticated understanding of content that implementation must be complemented with regular professional development. Our existing structures, namely the grade-level collaboratives, facilitate immediate implementation. The mainstay of our professional development design, these two hour blocks of weekly release time for every teacher provided a ready-made forum for the intimate and intense learning required to sustain the demanding courses of instruction we have chosen. The meetings bring together classroom teachers, various school-based experts, and occasionally consultants in close study of student work, instructional contexts and supports, and disciplinary content. Their continuous clarification of the essential understandings embedded in their literacy, math and content-area instruction allows teachers to develop, refine and apply a common awareness of proficiency markers to a variety of assessments and documents of student understanding. Simultaneously, teachers

grow in their knowledge of content through the study of professional readings and research chosen for its immediate relevance, of the standards, and of grade-level appropriate texts and problems. Ultimately, teachers bring their enhanced knowledge and understanding to the design of instruction that results in truly advanced performance and understanding in their students.

Additionally, teachers have individual access to literacy experts who provide classroom-based support several days a week and math consultants who are available several days a month. Modeling and side-by-side teaching opportunities allow teachers to view the dynamics of their classroom through a shifted lens that often enables them to see new possibilities. Co-planning and reflecting alongside the experts strengthens their instructional intuition as well as the disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge that fuels it.

The smaller structures are complemented as necessary, approximately once a quarter, by sessions where the entire staff comes together for site-wide professional development that focuses on broad, cross-grade-level topics like supporting English language learners through Guided Reading. In the short term, these dynamic sessions allow for cross-pollination of ideas and, in the long-term, for co-construction of a unified vision of what it means to be well educated.

7. School Leadership:

Just as the talent and expertise are spread across the school, so should the responsibility. This is the logic that drives the leadership philosophy and practice at TPES. Accordingly, the principal has orchestrated and oversees a system of leadership that maximizes the potential of all school shareholders to inspire and support student learning. At TPES, numerous leadership bodies focused unanimously on ensuring the academic success of all students function inter-dependently in a coordinated approach to advancing student achievement. They accomplish this through disciplined study of student proficiency and careful allocation of resources. The design gives paramount importance to meaningful assessments as the documents of proficiency. The system's various components, then, represent the gathering and empowering of different perspectives on these documents.

Among the components, the School Site Council (SSC) is both the most formal and the most representative of the school's spectrum of stakeholders. The SSC studies summaries of formal and informal assessments of language arts, math and science in order to compose the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA). This document steers allocation of monies. Given the data, parents, community members, teachers, classified-staff, and the principal, cooperate to translate their interpretations of the hard-numbers into a united vision for improvement—the SPSA.

The governing vision of the SPSA is realized through the actions of other leadership entities. Made up largely of teachers representing each of the grade levels, the Vertical Planning Team (VPT) represents the structure by which the SPSA goals are woven into the everyday workings of the school. As they consider instructional issues across the school, ensuring articulation between grade-levels, the VPT studies shared learning outcomes, curriculum, and assessment. Recently the VPT did a careful examination of one of the key SPSA goals: advancing writing proficiently. After collecting and analyzing a body of student's written responses to literature, the VPT determined that there was not sufficiently strong articulation across the grade-levels. The next step was to engage in a revision and strengthening of expected outcomes. The adjustments they engineered were shared at large in Grade-Level Collaborative meetings, where teachers worked to design the particulars of classroom instruction as well as appropriate assessments for the revised outcomes. The collaboratives provide action-summaries to the principal, who then focuses his classroom visits and feedback accordingly. In the following days and weeks, he studies in-classrooms manifestations of goals, in this case listening to instruction and classroom interactions, taking inventories of the thinking represented in conversations and in the environment on student/teacher co-created visual supports, and chatting with students about their current responses. His feedback emphasizes the results of their efforts and assures teachers that their tremendous efforts are recognized and valued by him and the community at large.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: STAR/CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: ETS

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient Advanced	99	100	98	99	97
Advanced	87	89	90	86	82
Number of students tested	91	54	59	81	62
Percent of total students tested	100	100	98	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	93	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	71	Masked
Number of students tested	7	5	6	14	8
2. African American Students					
Proficient Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient Advanced	100	Masked	91	92	90
Advanced	68	Masked	73	69	40
Number of students tested	19	6	11	13	10
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	2	5	3	3	7
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient Advanced	96	100	100	93	Masked
Advanced	83	80	100	71	Masked
Number of students tested	24	10	14	14	9
6. Asian American					
Proficient Advanced	100	Masked	Masked	100	Masked
Advanced	100	Masked	Masked	100	Masked
Number of students tested	17	8	4	12	9

NOTES:
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.

13CA17

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: STAR/CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: ETS

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient Advanced	93	96	100	96	79
Advanced	68	63	78	71	53
Number of students tested	91	54	59	80	62
Percent of total students tested	100	100	98	99	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	2	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	93	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	50	Masked
Number of students tested	7	5	6	14	8
2. African American Students					
Proficient Advanced					
Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient Advanced	79	Masked	100	92	50
Advanced	42	Masked	73	39	10
Number of students tested	19	6	11	13	10
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	2	5	3	3	7
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient Advanced	96	90	100	93	Masked
Advanced	71	30	79	36	Masked
Number of students tested	24	10	14	14	9
6. Asian American					
Proficient Advanced	100	Masked	Masked	100	Masked
Advanced	82	Masked	Masked	92	Masked
Number of students tested	17	8	4	12	9

NOTES:
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.

13CA17

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: STAR/CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: ETS

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient Advanced	97	95	97	90	91
Advanced	88	80	91	75	72
Number of students tested	57	59	76	60	64
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	93	Masked	82
Advanced	Masked	Masked	87	Masked	46
Number of students tested	5	7	15	8	11
2. African American Students					
Proficient Advanced					Masked
Advanced					Masked
Number of students tested					4
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	92	60	70
Advanced	Masked	Masked	75	20	30
Number of students tested	6	9	12	10	10
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	3	6	4	5	6
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	100	100	Masked	100
Advanced	Masked	92	85	Masked	55
Number of students tested	9	13	13	8	13
6. Asian American					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	100
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	100
Number of students tested	8	3	7	9	10

NOTES:
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.

13CA17

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: STAR/CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: ETS

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient Advanced	100	97	97	87	91
Advanced	91	83	88	65	73
Number of students tested	57	59	76	60	64
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	100	Masked	82
Advanced	Masked	Masked	73	Masked	46
Number of students tested	5	7	15	8	11
2. African American Students					
Proficient Advanced					Masked
Advanced					Masked
Number of students tested					4
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	100	80	70
Advanced	Masked	Masked	58	10	30
Number of students tested	6	9	12	10	10
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	3	6	4	5	6
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	100	100	Masked	85
Advanced	Masked	85	69	Masked	54
Number of students tested	9	13	13	8	13
6. Asian American					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	100
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	100
Number of students tested	8	8	7	9	10

NOTES:
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.

13CA17

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: STAR/CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: ETS

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient Advanced	96	96	97	89	90
Advanced	64	73	64	68	63
Number of students tested	66	75	59	63	71
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	100	100	80	83
Advanced	Masked	46	30	20	50
Number of students tested	8	13	10	10	12
2. African American Students					
Proficient Advanced				Masked	Masked
Advanced				Masked	Masked
Number of students tested				4	2
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	86	100	80	81
Advanced	Masked	36	20	20	50
Number of students tested	9	14	10	10	16
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	7	5	9	3	4
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient Advanced	96	92	100	Masked	82
Advanced	64	46	55	Masked	55
Number of students tested	15	13	11	9	11
6. Asian American					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	6	9	5	9	6

NOTES:
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.

13CA17

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: STAR/CST

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: ETS

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
Proficient Advanced	97	96	81	86	78
Advanced	70	71	58	56	41
Number of students tested	66	75	57	63	71
Percent of total students tested	100	99	97	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	87	60	70	75
Advanced	Masked	53	10	30	17
Number of students tested	8	15	10	10	12
2. African American Students					
Proficient Advanced				Masked	Masked
Advanced				Masked	Masked
Number of students tested				4	2
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	86	60	60	56
Advanced	Masked	36	10	20	19
Number of students tested	9	14	10	10	16
4. Special Education Students					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	7	5	9	3	4
5. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient Advanced	93	100	Masked	Masked	73
Advanced	60	46	Masked	Masked	18
Number of students tested	15	13	9	9	11
6. Asian American					
Proficient Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Advanced	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	6	9	5	9	6

NOTES:
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.

13CA17