

***U.S. Department of Education***  
***2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program***

---

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [ ] Title I      [ ] Charter      [ ] Magnet      [X] Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. April Scott

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

Official School Name Monta Vista High School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 21840 McClellan Rd

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

City Cupertino      State CA      Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 95014-4055

County Santa Clara County      State School Code Number\* 053466

Telephone 408-366-7600      Fax 408-252-1519

Web site/URL http://www.mvhs.fuhsd.org/      E-mail april\_scott@fuhsd.org

Twitter Handle \_\_\_\_\_ Facebook Page \_\_\_\_\_ Google+ \_\_\_\_\_

YouTube/URL \_\_\_\_\_ Blog \_\_\_\_\_ Other Social Media Link \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name of Superintendent\* Mrs. Polly Bove      E-mail: Polly\_Bove@fuhsd.org  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Fremont Union High School District      Tel. 408-522-2200

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

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

*\*Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

## **PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

---

**Include this page in the school’s application as page 2.**

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) 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 a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) 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, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any 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.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.
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** (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
- 0 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
  - 0 Middle/Junior high schools
  - 5 High schools
  - 0 K-12 schools
- 5 TOTAL

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

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city
  - Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
  - Suburban
  - Small city or town in a rural area
  - Rural
3. 10 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade                 | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK                  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| K                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 1                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 2                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 3                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 4                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 5                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 6                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 7                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 8                     | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 9                     | 274        | 287          | 561         |
| 10                    | 283        | 288          | 571         |
| 11                    | 293        | 306          | 599         |
| 12                    | 302        | 310          | 612         |
| <b>Total Students</b> | 1152       | 1191         | 2343        |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
  - 80 % Asian
  - 0 % Black or African American
  - 2 % Hispanic or Latino
  - 1 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - 17 % White
  - 0 % Two or more races
  - 100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report 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.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 3%

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

| <b>Steps For Determining Mobility Rate</b>   | <b>Answer</b> |
|--|---------------|
| (1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year             | 35            |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year | 28            |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]  | 63            |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1   | 2343          |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)   | 0.027         |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100  | 3             |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 3%  
68 Total number ELL  
 Number of non-English languages represented: 14  
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish, Cantonese, Korean, Mandarin (Putonghua), Japanese, Farsi (Persian), French, Hindi, Punjabi, Russian, Polish, Gujarati, Taiwanese, Other non English Languages
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 2%  
 Total number students who qualify: 42

If this method is not 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.

9. Students receiving special education services: 5 %  
117 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.

- |                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| 19 Autism               | 1 Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| 1 Deafness              | 27 Other Health Impaired                |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness        | 50 Specific Learning Disability         |
| 5 Emotional Disturbance | 8 Speech or Language Impairment         |
| 2 Hearing Impairment    | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| 0 Mental Retardation    | 2 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 1 Multiple Disabilities | 1 Developmentally Delayed               |

10. Use Full-Time Equivalent (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

|   | <b>Number of Staff</b> |
|---|------------------------|
| Administrators  | 6                      |
| Classroom teachers  | 102                    |
| Resource teachers/specialists<br>e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.  | 102                    |
| Paraprofessionals   | 13                     |
| Student support personnel<br>e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc. | 99                     |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 23:1

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

| <b>Required Information</b> | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance    | 97%       | 97%       | 98%       | 98%       | 98%       |
| High school graduation rate | 99%       | 99%       | 98%       | 98%       | 98%       |

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

| <b>Post-Secondary Status</b>                  |     |
|---|-----|
| Graduating class size                         | 629 |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university    | 78% |
| Enrolled in a community college               | 19% |
| Enrolled in career/technical training program | 0%  |
| Found employment                              | 0%  |
| Joined the military or other public service   | 0%  |
| Other   | 2%  |

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

Yes  No

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award. 2008

## **PART III – SUMMARY**

---

Located in Cupertino, in the heart of the Silicon Valley, Monta Vista High School is in its 45th year as one of the top comprehensive high schools in California and the United States. The school population is approximately 2350 students. The major subgroups are Asian (80%) and White/Not Hispanic (17%). Our most recent API is 956. Approximately 99% of our students will graduate and 97% will attend college. The class of 2014 boasts 63 National Merit Semi-finalists and 152 Commended students. Monta Vista has been both a California Distinguished School (2006) and a National Blue Ribbon School award winner (2008). A teaching staff of about 113 with six administrators and a support staff of 40 provide an environment which is academically challenging and culturally enriching.

Our reputation for rigorous academics and extensive elective and co-curricular programs supports our pursuit in achieving our vision: “Graduates of Monta Vista High School become informed, ethical, and active citizens; knowledgeable self-directed workers; discerning participants in the arts; and lifelong learners in the pursuit of personal excellence who can adapt to the challenges of the future.” In November 2007, Monta Vista was ranked #59 in the first annual ranking of America’s Best High Schools by the US News and World Report and has been ranked among the top 100 high schools in the nation almost every year since. Most recently Monta Vista was ranked #97 among the top 100 high schools in the nation. In 2011 Monta Vista was ranked #2 in Math and Science for open enrollment schools; more than 18,000 schools were analyzed in the US. The list focuses on broad achievement; measuring how well schools educate all of its students and their college readiness, using a 3-step analysis (Students’ state testing data, performance of disadvantaged students, and availability of college-level coursework along with AP test results).

Curriculum is geared to achieving our ESLRs (referred to as LeGos) and is aligned to California State Standards. Many departments are beginning to examine the Common Core Standards. To help all students achieve their academic potential, MVHS enriches its comprehensive curricula with 26 advanced placement and honors courses in seven departments, special day classes for Special Education students, sheltered Social Studies, Science and English classes, ELD classes as well as an AVID (Advancement via Individual Determination) Program, and a variety of elective choices. Students also have access to De Anza Community College through Middle College, College Now, or concurrent enrollment in our Adult and Community Education School. For support outside the classroom, students can get help from one of the four Guidance Counselors, our school psychologists (2.0 FTE), a student advocate, the Study Buddy Society (SBS, an after school peer-tutoring program), or from teachers through weekly Tutorial. Academically at-risk students can recover credits for graduation through concurrent enrollment, on-line classes or at De Anza Community College. As an initial intervention, we are offering Engage, an elective course to support struggling students. Students can also recover credits by taking advantage of our seven-period schedule. Co-curricular activities abound, offering over 80 clubs. Students can also access our award-winning Career Center with computerized college and career-search services staffed with a full time technician and open to students, daily. The Naviance, on-line student guidance system, provides college and career exploration and is a valuable source of information for students and parents. Naviance is used to submit Secondary School Reports and is regularly used by our Guidance Counselors when working with students.

Student support comes from students as well as staff. Link Crew involves approximately 150 students working to make high school a positive experience for incoming freshmen by easing their transition to high school. Monta Vista continues to offer Challenge Day twice a year, maximizing student and staff involvement. Monta Vista and our PTSA have partnered with Stanford University’s Challenge Success program with the goal of developing a community of engaged and healthy learners. Our Student Advocate provides professional psychological and emotional assistance, dealing with the full spectrum of adolescent issues. Monta Vista’s Leadership students, active participants in the governance of the school, continue to create innovative ways to unite students and staff into a single learning community which values responsibility, respect, and honesty.

The strong parental support and outstanding early education provided by the Cupertino Union School District provides the foundation to place Monta Vista students among the highest achievers in California.

Parents provide unwavering support by creating booster clubs, volunteering, giving career presentations, and building the scene for the Senior All-Night Party. Parents and students have access to staff, course information, student grades, and transcripts through School Loop and Infinite Campus. Guidance presentations are held several times a year for students and parents covering topics ranging from high school life and co-curricular involvement to course selection and the college application processes.

Monta Vista is wonderful for all learners.

## **PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

---

### **1. Assessment Results:**

The CAHSEE passage rates for first time test-takers remains consistently high, 100% in English Language Arts and 99% in math. Our challenge is to address the needs of our students who are not at the proficient level yet. In math and ELA, our target group is our Hispanic population, totaling 12 tests (6 in ELA and math).

The percentage of students performing at or above proficient on the CSTs in ELA, Social Science and Science has consistently increased over the past three years and continues to exceed state and district averages in all subject areas. While it is easy to focus on the successes, it is critical that we do not ignore the percentage of students scoring below proficient on the April 2013 administration of the CSTs in the ELA (8%), Math (18%), Science (7%) and Social Studies (10%).

In a response to these consistent numbers, our school is in the midst of developing strong, cohesive, course-like professional learning communities. Each department through the development of course-like PLCs is dedicated to developing essential learnings, common formative assessments, and data analyses to guide instruction or intervention, determined to provide access for all learners. Many departments have embedded effort and mastery into the curriculum and assessment, fostering a growth mindset for all students.

The vast majority of our students is considered on-track for college and is performing exceptionally well on our statewide assessments. We do, however, have a small population of mathematics students who begin in Algebra I and typically continue to struggle year to year. In a school that functions at such a rigorous academic level, it is easy to lose track of these struggling students despite the significant decrease in Algebra I students from 2008 (131 students) to 2013 (34 students). Even though the number of students has dropped, exactly half of them perform below the proficient level. Despite these numbers, our Algebra I teachers continue their amazing efforts in support of our Algebra I Initiative. Our 10th grade Geometry students (60 students) struggled in their performance on the CSTs, with 63% performing below the proficient level. By 11th grade, student performance in Algebra II (57 students) continued with the same pattern, with 88% of our 11th grade students scoring below proficient. The math department is continually seeking various instructional strategies and assessment tools to help support all students. In addition, the Special Education department has placed an emphasis in hiring para-educators who are versed in mathematics to provide additional support for students.

Moreover, the math department is working to identify the essential skills at each level and to better identify and integrate those essential skills that are common across all math courses. For example, in Algebra I, the teacher identifies the essential learnings and assesses those skills, providing the teacher with data or evidence unique to each student indicating mastery or the possible need for intervention. One example intervention is allowing students the opportunity to re-take tests to display mastery. Another intervention strategy is the use of peer tutors within the Algebra I classes. The peer tutors for Algebra I were recommended by other math teachers as a result of their mathematical knowledge, supportive nature, and ability to explain concepts fully. Targeted tutorials also support students, as do graphic organizers and structured notes. Interventions are continually being developed, but the structure of the learning itself is also being adapted. Geometry teachers are beginning that same support structure.

The 10th grade Life Science scores took a significant jump. The Science department members have collaborated on unit development, common assessments, and collaborative support of students. Their work epitomizes the results that come from collaborative dialog, strategic interventions, and the team approach expected in a professional learning community. Most important, our students are benefiting from such professionalism modeled by our staff.

As a staff, we are continuously striving to find ways to best improve instruction and learning. Over the past few years, we have delved deeply into professional learning communities, exploring the importance of identifying essential learnings, establishing guaranteed and viable curriculum, creating authentic common

formative assessments, and reserving guarded time to analyze student work. This school year, we are moving deeper into professional learning communities, sending nearly 27 of our teachers to PLC at Work, a nationally recognized conference for professional development centered on professional learning communities.

## **2. Using Assessment Results:**

Monta Vista teachers constantly revise and update their instructional practices based on the outcomes of our assessments. Interventions are set up based upon the evidence provided by analyzing student work. We are looking to improve how we deliver instructional changes based on the data discovered from student assessments, both formative and summative. This is the critical element of our work.

In the Social Studies department, the World History PLC has been looking at improving student in-text citations of work. Based on observations and examination of student work, the PLC found this is an area where students need more practice and have devised assignments for students to improve their skills before being assessed in research and other written work. World History has also identified document-based questions as an area where students need intervention in developing analysis and synthesis skills.

In our Science department, re-teaching after tests as well as after assignments is common practice. Analysis of student performance on tests and assignments is reviewed by our course-alike PLC. Modifications of assessments and assignments occur to achieve greater clarity and to increase student mastery. Biology uses STAR data to indicate areas of strength as well as areas for growth in their teaching practices.

In the Art department, visual assessment of student work allows teachers to determine if students understand the concepts which are being learned. The focus for future units will change based on the assessment findings from previous units. Students who need to improve on a product will be asked to show the original alongside the final project.

Our English department has coordinated release days to look at common assessments, and eventually student work, to better inform teachers about improving practices and engaging students. Individual teachers give the EAP multiple times a year, creating opportunities for feedback and improvement. Moreover, the use of passage response assignments allows teachers to be efficient in receiving student work and determining what instructional needs are still required for student mastery.

The Math Department, based on quiz and test data, engages in corrections, re-teaching, or "challenge" questions. Student work is assessed utilizing a variety of mediums to track growth and understanding over time. Geometry teachers give projects in addition to traditional assessments, thus offering a variety of assessment options for students to display attainment of standards and LeGos.

At Monta Vista, three communication tools are used to inform students and parents of academic progress: School Loop, Infinite Campus, and mail. Eighty-five percent of our teachers use School Loop as their main source of communication, often updating the grade book, calendar, assignments, and other pertinent information on a weekly basis. School Loop is our official website and also is organized to disseminate school wide information through emails and the daily bulletin. Infinite Campus houses all of our student data. Parents and students can login to find live transcripts, progress reports and attendance. The traditional mail system delivers our progress reports.

## **3. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

### Sharing Strategies

The collaborative efforts within Monta Vista are practiced beyond our walls as well. The five high schools within the Fremont Union High School District share strategies and expertise to further our practice. Monta Vista is an active member of the five-year old Algebra Initiative, continuing to perfect strategies and develop curriculum that support our most foundational mathematics students.

This year the district embarked on 9th grade Biology and 9th grade Literature/Writing professional learning communities, identifying essential learning outcomes and developing common formative assessments in alignment with Common Core expectations, supporting our students in required initial courses.

The Department Chairpersons of the five major subject areas (Science, Math, English, Social Science and World Languages) meet monthly with their partner colleagues as a district liaison group to discuss emerging issues, strategies, texts, and assessments.

Departments such as Drama, that are small or one-person departments, meet regularly with their course-alike peers across the district.

Athletic Directors, Activities Directors and job-alike Assistant Principals from the five high schools meet a minimum of monthly with district personnel to strengthen their practice and to collaboratively determine best approaches.

Many of our Advanced Placement teachers belong to on-line AP networks, sharing questions, strategies, and assessments to better prepare students for the associated AP exam.

Monta Vista has partnered, with other schools beyond our district, with the Challenge Success Program at Stanford University to better determine ways to support students and families confronting increased stress and academic demand. These partner schools, some local and others within the state and beyond, have collaboratively discussed time management strategies, emotional-social strategies, course and homework load expectations, etc.

Monta Vista has set a goal to have every teacher, within the next five years, attend the Solution Tree “PLC at Work” conference to bring common experience and a collective language to support our professional development activities and goals.

#### **4. Engaging Families and Community:**

Parent and student survey evidence showed a high achieving environment, yet parents were unclear about course pathways. In response, Monta Vista High School (MVHS) implemented grade level and department elective nights to provide more information about course options prior to course selection. Course selection nights include translation services in three languages. In addition, MVHS created a Course Information Fair, built into the school day, for students to visit classrooms to find out more about classes and assist in their informed decision-making.

Data showed English Language Learner (EL) parents participate in school activities at a lower rate than English speaking parents. In response, an EL parent group was established which meets four times per year in person or by phone check in.

We did not have an early warning system to reach out and intervene with struggling students before the first marking period. Administration implemented a referral system within the first three weeks of school for students struggling academically. In addition, each Guidance Counselor and administrator meets with every student earning a D/F/I in any given grading period, establishing another adult contact on campus for struggling students.

Parent and student survey results from 2007, 2011, and 2013 showed that managing student academic and personal stress as a high priority. In response, staff implemented Challenge Day twice a year involving 100 students and 25 adults each time to address the needs of our students and staff. As a spinoff, our Student Advocate (Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist) holds parenting classes to assist parents in navigating the nuances of raising adolescents. Parent information nights are held for all incoming 9th grade parents and students as well as 10th and 11th grade parents and students for both our general and special education populations where Guidance Counselors, Administrators and Department Chairs inform the community

about our programs, LeGos, and co-curricular activities. Furthermore, we include students, parents, administrators and Guidance Counselors in community events like Running of the Bulls, Freshmen Orientation, Back-to-School Night, and Explore Careers.

Monta Vista's community is strong and dynamic. The connections made throughout the year are promising and supportive of all students. With a strong and informed Parent Teacher Student Association and School Site Council, we are always looking for ways to better Monta Vista in partnership with our community.

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

---

### **1. Curriculum:**

Monta Vista's bell schedule generates guarded time, allowing our teachers to work in course-alike Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) on Wednesday mornings. During Wednesday morning meetings, teachers develop and review curriculum (essential learnings), instructional practice, and interventions as a result of analyzing student work. In addition, release days are available for more extensive research that will benefit all learners. Holistically, Monta Vista courses were aligned to California State Standards and are rapidly transitioning to Common Core State Standards. Moreover, they have always been aligned to our school wide LeGos. In addition, PLCs are working diligently to explicitly develop the essential learnings that seamlessly align with our LeGos and our five guiding questions: 1.) What do we want our students to know and be able to do? 2.) Before it is too late, how will we know when they can do it? 3.) What research-based practices do skillful teachers use that ensure student learning? 4.) How will we respond and intervene when they are not learning? 5.) How will we respond if they already know it?

The English department is using project-based learning through the "encyclopedia of an ordinary life" project, which reflects a focus on the Common Core.

Social Studies is focused on primary source analysis and critical thinking skills which are used as a basis for junior level courses and used as the focus for junior year research projects.

Science uses individual research projects to effectively integrate Next Generation science standards that are oriented towards inquiry and science as a process. In the meantime, Monta Vista's Learning Goals (LeGos) are implicitly addressed in these student projects; teachers recognize a need to become more explicit with these connections for our students.

Science and music teachers are "flipping" the classroom, implementing blended learning (videos and investigations) in their courses and affording teachers the opportunity to make meaningful connections during class time.

Within the World Languages department, state standards and LeGos are at the center of curriculum development. Project reviews are performed as classes in order to better connect their work to standards and LeGos. In Chinese, a unit on family helps to teach culturally specific information along with the spoken language.

Many courses on campus, including all English courses, involve some type of public speaking for students utilizing a school-wide oral communication rubric developed by the English department. Other types of public speaking opportunities for students come in the form of debates, academic discussions, and analysis of content across the curriculum.

World Studies and AVID courses engage in direct instruction regarding student collaboration including how to work in small groups and respectfully raise questions as well as disagreements. Self-management is at the core of our AVID program as students are explicitly taught to record assignments, take notes skillfully, manage time, and self-advocate.

In Science courses, real world skills are taught and enhanced through the use of technology-based labs. While LeGos are implicit in projects assigned, teachers continue to make their projects more explicitly connected to our LeGos.

The addition of the "Why Try" course within our Special Education department has helped students make connections toward better and appropriate life choices while supporting the development of their academic skills.

In Social Studies, Historical Analysis Writing with peer editing offers students opportunities to practice proper essay writing techniques, which supports skills necessary for success in subsequent courses. In Math courses, projects are developed which tie math to other content areas. For example, a Valentine's Day project has students create art and poetry in a creative way to explain how triangles are related (named "Love Triangle").

In Physical Education, students create and follow their personally developed workout plans. Each plan is relevant to the student's needs and requires them to manage their time in class in order to achieve desired outcomes.

## **2. Reading/English:**

As our data clearly shows, English is one of our most impressive statistical lines. Over the past five years, we have experienced excellence across all grade levels as our students routinely earn proficient and advanced results. With that, it is important to interject that our English department is not complacent and continues to pursue excellence through the development of course-alike professional learning communities and professional development. While it is clear that reading is the focal point in this prompt, it is difficult to eliminate the importance of writing in developing solid readers.

Across English courses, challenging texts are supplemented with academic literary criticism, which all students must integrate into their interpretations of the texts. Options for student self-selection regarding essay prompts, projects, etc. allows for differentiation. Summative assignments check for mastery of essential skills or understandings. To teach the material and ensure students understand the topics in a piece of literature, we discuss the books in small and large groups through writing and quizzes. At the junior level, students have greater opportunities for independent and student-directed learning through Socratic seminars where students work together to build their understanding of complex texts. Students have greater flexibility to generate their own essay prompts and choose their focus for exploration.

SPED/Sheltered Literature assignments are adjusted for quantity (length) but not for quality or rigor. This gives students the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and mastery of a subject without being overwhelmed by length.

The English department allows essay rewrites to improve writing and to emphasize the importance of the writing process as it pertains to textual analysis. Students fill out essay rewrite forms to identify areas of improvement. This form serves as the starting point for a one-on-one student/teacher conference about the student's writing. This gives students individual feedback and a chance to master key skills.

Furthermore, teachers within the English department, along with administrators attended several trainings including the English Reading and Writing Course (ERWC) that is designed to prepare juniors and seniors for the California State University (CSU) English placement exam and Inquiry by Design (IBD). IBD is a powerful strategy that supports readers of all levels and supports the work already being done within our English department through close textual analysis. While our scores indicate that our English Language Arts program is advanced, our English department continues to learn and develop ways to make our students better readers and writers.

## **3. Mathematics:**

In our Math department, many of our teachers use rubrics and clear directions on larger, open-ended projects. Additionally, math teachers routinely demonstrate how problems should be completed, how students can show their homework, and how to effectively work through the more performance-based assignments. Additionally, two years ago the district began an initiative regarding the use of academic language across all courses. This training motivated math teachers to communicate both verbally and in writing more clearly what skills are desired as well as the appropriate mathematical language used to do so. Along with academic language production, clear and concise objectives are shared in all mathematics courses.

Instruction within our Math department focuses on solving a multitude of mathematical problems collaboratively. Initially, teachers walk around the classroom to work with individuals or groups who need help while others complete problems on the white board. This type of initial instruction of the lesson supports the learning by all students in a comfortable and collaborative manner. In addition, students complete test and quiz corrections to improve the skills of all students. Teachers have students perform test corrections with an explicit format to guide metacognition and academic literacy. Projects are assigned which require group work; thus helping to drive a deeper understanding of mathematical foundations. The entire department strives to challenge students to mastery, apply it to real-world scenarios, and work through a variety of problem solving strategies. Modified “contracts” or homework arrangements support a student’s rigorous course load. The majority of the math department uses graphing calculators or online digital tools like Desmos to support instruction. Students more immediately and richly understand mathematical syntax and processes through exposure to these tools.

Our upper level courses are very project heavy, culminating with a final long-term project which synthesizes all the students have learned. There are several projects requiring students to design assessments, collect data, and analyze the data.

The Math department instructional model is deliberately set up to support our LeGos. The next steps for our Math department are to develop strong relationships within the course-alike PLCs, strongly reinforcing the essential learnings in all math levels, while creating common formative assessments to help the department generate student evidence that will guide instruction and / or intervention.

#### **4. Additional Curriculum Area:**

##### Science – STEM

The STEM independent study research class, coupled with the research club, gives Monta Vista students the opportunity to conduct their own research projects and compete in various science competitions. Students must conduct significant background research in order to select their hypothesis or determine what they want to build. They then test their hypothesis or build and test their device. Finally they must communicate their results to competition judges both orally and in writing. The process of conducting research provides an authentic opportunity for students to practice all of Monta Vista's LeGos.

Information processing is required in order for students to find the information that they need on a topic of interest. Once they have found the background information they must synthesize it to determine if what they are interested in is novel and possible. They will have to repeat this process many times during their project whenever things are not going as expected or they need to test something else.

Thinking is absolutely critical throughout their projects but especially during the experimentation design. They are, by definition, conducting new research; it is not something that has a right answer. They must design their own experiment that often requires significant modifications from any previously published methods due to either their new application or the equipment/cost limitations.

Self-management is required throughout these projects, which require concentrated effort for a period of 2-5 months. Since there are no day-to-day assignments and no grades until the final judging at the competition, students must manage their own time, know when to seek additional guidance, and display considerable personal initiative.

During their research, students communicate with scientists to get materials and information. For most competitions, students produce either a poster or a paper describing their project and frequently must also answer questions during the judging process. Students have found that effective communication often makes the difference between winning an award or not.

Students may choose to do their projects as a team, which requires strong collaboration skills. There is no one telling the students how to divide tasks, nor is there a specific time scheduled for their research

activities. They work this out among themselves with some teams choosing to conduct their research together at all times while others divide the tasks and work individually until the judging.

Our STEM program is centered around ninth and tenth grade students. It is the foundation from which they will build research habits ultimately providing them with the capacity to become excellent researchers regardless of subject matter. Moreover, STEM promotes mentoring and coaching by all staff members as they support the learner and the research progress. It literally is a school wide initiative supporting the importance of research, writing, and communication.

## **5. Instructional Methods:**

Teachers work extremely hard to modify instructional practices to meet individual student needs. Each department is unique in its approach to intervention and targeted support, but all of them are constantly developing ways to support student learning. A common support system across the curriculum is a dedication to blended learning and incorporating technology as an instructional tool.

Teachers use Quizlet, a web based support site, to expand vocabulary practice and study guides as a supplement to the work completed during class. Others use social networking to create study groups and utilize other online tools to support student learning. For example, students interact through teachers' blogs and create audio files, expanding the classroom while supporting introverted learners and written and oral communication. Teachers use curriculum aligned multimedia clips and political speeches to support classroom discussions through the evaluation of rhetoric and writing while encouraging critical thinking and organize arguments with evidence. Students are encouraged to audiotape class lectures. In some instances, audio summaries of chapter texts and supplemental videos for each unit and topic are downloadable for student use. Many teachers use turnitin.com to ensure authentic work, and more importantly, to evaluate and support revisions of written essays aligned to rubrics supporting Common Core standards.

Students in need of accommodations or modifications are well supported. Sheltered students are given character lists, guided reading questions, chapter summaries, and visuals for some of the vocabulary. Often PowerPoint presentations are posted on School Loop available ahead of time for guided and individual instruction or review. Audio enhancers may be used during class to make lectures and class discussions accessible to all. Many teachers use email to provide additional feedback to struggling writers determined to develop quality essays. Some teachers show the corresponding film to the current novel being read and even play some or all of the text aloud as students read along. This modification is even used for non-sheltered students during some units.

Students regularly use the library to conduct research and have access to a PC and mobile computer lab. Monta Vista also created a Study Buddy support group, pairing juniors and seniors highly qualified in subject matter competence with struggling freshmen and sophomore students, available four days a week.

While we understand that we are diversified in our instruction and use of technology, our staff knows we still need to develop strategic interventions to support all learners.

## **6. Professional Development:**

Monta Vista has a three-pronged approach to professional development and is supported by our school district: locally, district wide, and externally. Locally, we use of our own staff members to provide professional development. District wide, our colleagues from our sister schools and district office provide exemplary professional development supporting district led initiatives. Externally, we branch out and learn from experts across the nation to build our capacity to support all learners and educators.

Locally, each month, prior to our Department Chair meeting, a small group of educators (teacher and administrators) gather together to provide thematic professional development to our Leadership Team. The targeted professional development supports the needs of our staff and is timely. It provides the foundation

we will build upon for future professional development supporting the ongoing work of our PLCs. Through the collaboration of our Department Chairs and teacher led Leadership team; we are able to better support our PLCs while building our own capacity regarding PLCs.

District wide opportunities abound with superb professional development for all stakeholders. Most recently, every administrator received professional development on balanced analysis and teacher supervision. Yearly, teacher leads from across the district provide opportunities for teachers to participate in the Skillful Teacher and Courageous Leaders and Followers. These courses provide another venue to collaborate with other district colleagues and to learn new instructional strategies. The response by attendees has been overwhelmingly positive, crediting the courses with providing renewed inspiration and invaluable collaboration. Additionally, the district recently implemented a “Teaching with Technology” series designed to assist teachers in their use of technology applications and hardware in everyday curriculum, instruction, and assessment. In years past, teachers and administrators participated in professional development focused on academic language production, resulting in teachers and administrators visiting a multitude of classrooms to monitor student progress and academic language production.

Externally, our teachers get to experience the best professional development offered, nationwide. Our AVID teachers and administrator attended the Summer Institute, which provides information that has supported the improvement of our AVID program. Our student activities directors and support staff learned about accounting and character at the CADAtoons conference. Most recently, we sent 12 educators to the PLC at Work Summit, further supporting the PLC movement.

The professional development mentioned above is a glimpse at our opportunities. More important, every professional development is attended with the mindset that the learning will improve our capacity to support all of our students.

## **7. School Leadership**

For many teachers, LeGos are an integral part of the MV culture; however, a stronger commitment is required to overtly connect students and teachers to our LeGos. LeGos are posted in every classroom, included in the School Plan, posted on the school’s website and in the student handbook. Teachers continue to incorporate them into curriculum and assessment while students demonstrate aspects of our LeGos through student activities. Annually, students are recognized for success and modeling of the LeGos.

At the beginning of each year our LeGos are discussed at our faculty meeting. It was the beginning of this year where a side-by-side comparison was presented of our LeGos and 21st Century Skills. As a result, the teachers determined that our LeGos were still appropriate for our school.

The School Site Council (SSC) supports our LeGos as well as the school’s mission statement; and our PTSA offers support for student learning and provides educational forums for parents to express concerns about or accolades for school policies and procedures. Our SSC reviews and approves requests for professional development activities, requiring all requests to identify how the professional development will address one or more of the LeGos.

Transitioning, this year we adopted a mission statement committing our school to excellence and equity. The Monta Vista leadership team implemented this mission under the motto “All means All”, with respect to standards and frameworks and refers to “all students will. . .” This is an important cultural shift for our school, which balances responsibility among students, staff, and families to ensure all students succeed.

With the implementation of the Common Core Standards, we feel the LeGos will be reinforced. The thematic approach of the Common Core will reinforce students becoming better Information Processors, Thinkers, and Communicators. Monta Vista students currently excel in collaboration. Self-management continues to be of concern as Monta Vista students typically over-commit and struggle to maintain a sense of balance.

The Monta Vista administration communicated details of the new mission and its impact on our weekly PLC work. Staff-meetings and annual conferences with teachers have helped to bring clarity to the new mission statement that helps to guide our weekly PLC foci. As a result, additional groups were formed to support the PLC work and to continue to build PLC capacity in our members. The two groups include all Department Chairs and a group of volunteer teachers referred to as the Leadership Team.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Subject:</b> <u>Math</u>  | <b>Test:</b> <u>Algebra II</u>               |
| <b>All Students Tested/Grade:</b> <u>10</u>  | <b>Edition/Publication Year:</b> <u>2013</u> |
| <b>Publisher:</b> <u>California Department of Education (STAR - California Standards Test)</u> |  |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month  | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 74        | 82        | 80        | 74        | 77        |
| % Advanced   | 35        | 49        | 44        | 34        | 29        |
| Number of students tested  | 337       | 341       | 351       | 360       | 261       |
| Percent of total students tested   | 56        | 56        | 55        | 53        | 44        |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 76        | 85        | 82        | 79        | 78        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 253       | 274       | 285       | 271       | 206       |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 | 68        | 70        | 68        | 64        | 72        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    | 60        | 61        | 62        | 80        | 47        |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:** Algebra II is the assessment most of our 10th graders take.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Subject:</b> <u>Math</u>  | <b>Test:</b> <u>Summative High School Math</u> |
| <b>All Students Tested/Grade:</b> <u>11</u>  | <b>Edition/Publication Year:</b> <u>2013</u>   |
| <b>Publisher:</b> <u>California Department of Education (STAR - California Standards Test)</u> |  |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month  | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 89        | 87        | 86        | 93        | 83        |
| % Advanced   | 57        | 55        | 52        | 62        | 48        |
| Number of students tested  | 524       | 522       | 522       | 417       | 484       |
| Percent of total students tested   | 86        | 83        | 79        | 73        | 80        |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 90        | 87        | 90        | 93        | 88        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 457       | 446       | 428       | 348       | 387       |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 | 85        | 86        | 74        | 90        | 63        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    | 59        | 71        | 82        | 60        | 86        |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:** Summative High School math is the assessment most juniors take.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Subject:</b> <u>Math</u>  | <b>Test:</b> <u>Algebra I</u>                |
| <b>All Students Tested/Grade:</b> <u>9</u>   | <b>Edition/Publication Year:</b> <u>2008</u> |
| <b>Publisher:</b> <u>California Department of Education (STAR - California Standards Test)</u> |  |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month  | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 50        | 46        | 66        | 61        | 40        |
| Number of students tested  | 54        | 74        | 74        | 98        | 148       |
| Percent of total students tested   | 9         | 12        | 12        | 15        | 24        |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 80        | 52        | 77        | 75        | 72        |
| Number of students tested  | 20        | 31        | 35        | 32        | 64        |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 | 26        | 52        | 61        | 59        | 59        |
| Number of students tested                                    | 19        | 23        | 31        | 49        | 54        |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:** The data on this table came from our STAR results over the past five years. It does not appear that any of our students were alternatively assessed. In addition, based on the 10% of our school's population our only sub-groups are Asian and White. We do not use super sub-groups. Additionally, the information above reflects Algebra I.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Subject:</b> <u>Math</u>  | <b>Test:</b> <u>Geometry</u>                 |
| <b>All Students Tested/Grade:</b> <u>9</u>   | <b>Edition/Publication Year:</b> <u>2013</u> |
| <b>Publisher:</b> <u>California Department of Education (STAR - California Standards Test)</u> |  |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month  | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 90        | 90        | 94        | 84        | 89        |
| % Advanced   | 51        | 51        | 55        | 39        | 42        |
| Number of students tested  | 302       | 337       | 341       | 364       | 365       |
| Percent of total students tested   | 52        | 56        | 56        | 57        | 52        |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 93        | 92        | 94        | 86        | 91        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 218       | 252       | 270       | 288       | 268       |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 | 89        | 85        | 91        | 76        | 85        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    | 62        | 61        | 65        | 68        | 87        |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:** The majority of our students take Geometry as 9th graders. We used this data set along with Algebra I to illustrate some of the findings stated earlier in the application.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Subject:</b> <u>Reading/ELA</u>   | <b>Test:</b> <u>English Language Arts</u>    |
| <b>All Students Tested/Grade:</b> <u>10</u>  | <b>Edition/Publication Year:</b> <u>2013</u> |
| <b>Publisher:</b> <u>California Department of Education (STAR - California Standards Test)</u> |  |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month  | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 91        | 93        | 88        | 91        | 85        |
| % Advanced   | 69        | 78        | 68        | 73        | 64        |
| Number of students tested  | 592       | 605       | 636       | 676       | 592       |
| Percent of total students tested   | 99        | 100       | 99        | 99        | 99        |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 93        | 95        | 91        | 92        | 88        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 459       | 497       | 486       | 508       | 441       |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 | 85        | 87        | 83        | 86        | 80        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    | 87        | 93        | 127       | 144       | 129       |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:**

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Subject:</b> <u>Reading/ELA</u>   | <b>Test:</b> <u>English Language Arts</u>    |
| <b>All Students Tested/Grade:</b> <u>11</u>  | <b>Edition/Publication Year:</b> <u>2013</u> |
| <b>Publisher:</b> <u>California Department of Education (STAR - California Standards Test)</u> |  |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month  | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 91        | 86        | 87        | 82        | 83        |
| % Advanced   | 74        | 65        | 69        | 65        | 62        |
| Number of students tested  | 604       | 630       | 650       | 567       | 602       |
| Percent of total students tested   | 99        | 100       | 99        | 99        | 99        |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 93        | 90        | 90        | 86        | 86        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 494       | 486       | 488       | 427       | 443       |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 | 85        | 82        | 82        | 74        | 76        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    | 92        | 122       | 135       | 117       | 139       |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:**

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Subject:</b> <u>Reading/ELA</u>   | <b>Test:</b> <u>English Language Arts</u>    |
| <b>All Students Tested/Grade:</b> <u>9</u>   | <b>Edition/Publication Year:</b> <u>2013</u> |
| <b>Publisher:</b> <u>California Department of Education (STAR - California Standards Test)</u> |  |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month  | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 95        | 93        | 95        | 93        | 93        |
| % Advanced   | 78        | 77        | 80        | 72        | 76        |
| Number of students tested  | 568       | 598       | 606       | 637       | 695       |
| Percent of total students tested   | 98        | 99        | 99        | 100       | 99        |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   | 97        | 95        | 96        | 95        | 94        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 430       | 462       | 492       | 479       | 513       |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |

| School Year  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 | 92        | 89        | 95        | 89        | 89        |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    | 97        | 88        | 100       | 130       | 157       |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>             |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced                                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                    |           |           |           |           |           |

**NOTES:**