U.S. Department of Education

2003-2004 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program Cover Sheet

NI CD: 1	Dr. Eleanor Love		
Name of Principal(Speci	fy: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As i	t should appear in the offici	al records)
(Speci	Los Cerritos Middle School		ar records)
Official School Name			
	(As it should appear in the official		
	2100 Avenida de las Flores	3	
School Mailing Address	(If address is P.O. Box, also include	de street address)	
Thousand Oaks,	(11 audiess is 1.0. Box, also illetud	CA	91362-1530
i nousana Oaks,		CA	71302-1330
City		State	Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)
Tel. <u>(805) 492-3538</u>	Fax <u>(80</u>	5) 493-8854	
Website/URL www.cone	ejo.k12.ca.us/los_cerritos/	E-mail <u>(</u>	elove.conejo.k12.ca.us
	nation in this application, inclu ny knowledge all information is		requirements on page 2, and
		Date	2/4/04
(Principal's Signature)			
Name of Superintendent*	Dr. Robert Fraisse (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr	, Other)	
District Name Conejo V	alley Unified School District	Tel. <u>(805)</u>	<u>497-9511</u>
	nation in this application, including knowledge it is accurate.	nding the eligibility	requirements on page 2, and
		Date	2/4/04
(Superintendent's Signature)			
Name of School Board President/Chairperson —	Mrs. Dorothy Beaubi	en	
	(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr	., Other)	
	mation in this package, including knowledge it is accurate.	ling the eligibility r	requirements on page 2, and
		Date	2/4/04
(School Board President's/Ch	nairperson's Signature)		
•	2		
*Private Schools: If the in	formation requested is not appl	licable write N/A in	the snace

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has not been in school improvement status <u>or been identified by the state as</u> "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
- 3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
- 4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
- 5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1.	Number of schools in the district:	
2.	District Per Pupil Expenditure:	<u>\$6385 (2002/2</u> 003)
	Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:	<u>\$6719 (2002/2</u> 003)

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

|--|

	Urban or large central city
[]	Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
[X]	Suburban
[]	Small city or town in a rural area
[]	Rural

4.	7	Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
----	---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

 $\underline{N/A}$ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

2003/2004

Grade	# of	# of	Grade	Grade	# of	# of	Grade
	Males	Females	Total		Males	Females	Total
K				7	203	197	400
1				8	216	187	403
2				9			
3				10			
4				11			
5				12			
6	170	143	313	Other			
		TOT	AL STUDEN	TS IN THE AP	PLYING S	CHOOL →	1116

6.			in the school:	5 % Hispanic o 0 % Asian/Paci	
7.	Stuc	dent turn	over, or mobility rate, duri	ing the past year:	3% (per '02 STAR)
					erred to or from different schools between all number of students in the school as of
	Oct	ober 1, m	nultiplied by 100.)		
	г	(4)	N. 1. C . 1 . 1	2002-2003	1
		(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	43	
		(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	47	
		(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sun of rows (1) and (2)]	n 90	
		(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	1,078	
		(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.083	
		(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	8.3	
8.	Nur Spe	nber of la	German Japanese Korean	44 Mandarin Chines Russian Spanish Pashto	Total Number Limited English Proficient
9.	Stuc	dents eng	gible for free/reduced-price		% Total Number Students Who Qualify
	low	-income	families or the school doe	onably accurate esting s not participate in the	nate of the percentage of students from the federally-supported lunch program, it, and explain how it arrived at this
10.	Stud	dents reco	eiving special education se		% otal Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

<u>1</u> Autism	<u>2</u> Orthopedic Impairment
Deafness	33 Other Health Impaired
Deaf-Blindness	41 Specific Learning Disability
3 Hearing Impairment	19 Speech or Language Impairment
1 Mental Retardation	Traumatic Brain Injury
Multiple Disabilities	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
	0 Emotional Disturbance

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

Number of Staff

	Full-time	Part-Time
Administrator(s) Classroom teachers	<u>3</u> <u>38</u>	<u>5</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u> </u>	<u>3</u>
Paraprofessionals Support staff	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u> <u>25</u>
Total number	<u>52</u>	<u>45</u>

- 12. Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio: 34:1
- 13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	96%	95.9%	96.2%	95.8%	
Daily teacher attendance	96%	96%	97%	96%	97%
Teacher turnover rate	8%	20%	12%	11%	2%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Student drop-off rate					

Part III – Summary

Los Cerritos Middle School, home of the Leopards, is one of 5 middle schools located in the city of Thousand Oaks, California. We are known for high academic achievement, outstanding award-winning music programs, strong student-support programs and activities, highly skilled and dedicated teachers and staff, a welcoming and friendly front office, and an active, hard-working and supportive PTSA group volunteering thousands of hours a year for the benefit of students. We are also lucky to have a supportive local community, including companies that partner with our school district, such as Amgen, the Rockwell Science Center, Sage Publications, Baxter Healthcare, and California Lutheran University. We are fortunate to have a flourishing cultural community, and strong connections to several local universities and colleges. Our active city government supports our schools and our children in a partnership with the Conejo Valley Unified School District. Recent community efforts have resulted in significant support to our schools: Measure R provided \$90 million dollars for school renovation and innovation; the city has co-funded a number of facilities for our district's students; and the recently established Conejo Schools Foundation will further support our schools now and in the future

Students attend Los Cerritos from 6 feeder elementary schools, as well as other outlying schools through our district's school choice program. Our increasing enrollment reflects the growing respect and demand for our services and instructional programs, particularly in the 6th grade where our program has more than doubled over the last 5 years from 144 students to a current enrollment of 316.

Our culturally diverse student body creates a rich school environment for all students with proven results of excellence. Our school wide API (Academic Performance Index) score has risen steadily over the last three years to a score of 840; subgroups have also shown growth in scores: the scores for our white students have risen from 807 to 841 to 851. But one of our proudest accomplishments has been the success we have experienced with our Hispanic students as their scores have also risen due to our efforts. They have improved from a score of 585 to 650 to our current score of 709, a single-year jump of 59 points after previous increases over two years of a total of 124 points.

Our comprehensive program is designed to ensure success for all students. We devote resources to meeting the needs of under-performing groups of students: our economically disadvantaged students as well as our English Learner population. That effort also benefits the school population as a whole. What we do for struggling students helps all students.

The mission of Los Cerritos Middle School is to promote a safe, supportive and creative environment so that all students strive for and achieve high academic standards. We understand, value, and address the complex social, emotional, and physical needs of middle school students. We provide a structured transition as students progress from elementary school to high school and beyond. Working as partners with their parents, we guarantee them a quality education through a varied, comprehensive, and rigorous curricular and extra curricular program designed to nurture ethical citizens and life-long learners. In order to fulfill our mission, we currently focus our standards-based program on four major goals to guide our decision-making, our work and our resources: improvement in 1) student achievement in English, language arts, and reading; 2)student achievement in math; 3)skills and achievement for struggling, and identified "at risk" students; and maintenance and improvement in current excellent quality programs and services.

Part IV – Indicators of Academic Success

1. School Assessment Results

Since spring of 2001, the California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program has been in place to reflect how students in our school achieve annually in various subject areas. Currently, the STAR program includes California Standards Tests (CST) for English/Language Arts and Mathematics and shows how well students are doing in relation to the state content standards. Student scores are reported as five performance levels: Advanced (exceeds state standards), Proficient (meets standards), Basic (approaching standards), Below Basic (below standards), and Far Below Basic (well below standards). Students scoring at the Proficient or Advanced levels have met state standards in that content area.

Our school has consistently scored well above state average scores in all areas, especially for the economically disadvantaged and Hispanic students. We have also seen dramatic results in our standardized test scores over the last few years, and we attribute those increases to a school-wide focus on reading, math and writing, as well as to our over-arching and continuous focus on helping struggling and at-risk students. By incorporating instructional and program strategies to help those struggling at-risk students, we have helped all students and witnessed increases in all scores.

For English/Language Arts, our data shows student proficiency scores that are high or increasing over three years. Our 6th graders consistently score the highest of the three grade levels, with 2003 scores ranging from 55% proficient or advanced, to 79% for various disaggregate groups. Only one group, a severely educationally disabled group, shows low scores. We continue our search for instructional methods to help them achieve at higher levels. Our 7th graders' 2003 scores show a similar pattern: a range of proficient or advanced scores of 55% to 71%. Eighth graders performed consistently also in 2003. In most cases, scores over the last three years have risen for all grade levels in English/Language Arts. Data from previous state standardized tests in our district's internal system show high scores and growth.

In the area of Mathematics, the achievement gap between all students and sub-groups of students is closing. The most significant information shows that the three sub-groups represented at Los Cerritos: socio-economically disadvantaged, Hispanic students (many of whom also appear in the disadvantaged group) and disabled students, show consistently improving scores well above the average scores for those groups in the state of California. This is particularly significant because, as our total school population has remained relatively steady, these subgroups have all grown in size. Our total socio-economically-disadvantaged student group has in the last year nearly doubled in size, and yet their percentages of proficient and advanced scores have risen by 10%. The number of our disabled students has also grown by 30% and their scores have risen also. Several years ago, our district made 3 changes to our math program based on comparative state and nationwide data. We concluded that 8th grade students were capable of learning Algebra (a course for 9th graders, primarily in California), and that students who came to Los Cerritos from feeder elementary schools needed a different program and approach in order to learn algebra successfully. Our district adopted Every Day Math for students K through 6th grade, we used class size reduction funding from the state to lower the class ratio of Algebra classes to 20 to 1, and we also designated the college prep 7th grade math course as pre-algebra, all in an effort to "raise the bar" for our students and help them succeed.

2. Use of Assessment Data to Improve Student and School Performance

Our process of staff, program and student evaluation is directly linked to our analysis of student assessment data aligned with standards, and we rely on a wide spectrum of data sources for information about our students, including daily classroom and anecdotal information; writing and work samples; discipline records; benchmark assessments; Edusoft, a standards-based computer program that administrators and teachers are currently being trained to use; and standardized testing data, to improve student performance and to improve the programs at our school. Staff review different kinds of data from their own angle to help struggling students, enrich the program of already successful students, and challenge the exceptional/very bright students so that all can have their best experience with us and learn as much as they can before they move onto high school. In order to understand a myriad of data, we continually distribute the various forms of data all through the year to groups of staff and ask for their conclusions about what they "see." We discuss those perspectives and analyze the information at staff meetings, case conferences, department meetings, administrative meetings, looking closely to see which groups are doing well, why, and how we can use that information to help groups of students.

To improve school performance we use the same wealth of data sources, but view them with different "eyes" that analyze how we can improve our courses and programs to help students be successful. For example, teachers look specifically at math benchmark exams to see where our students need further instruction on concepts. Also, teachers, counselors and the principal look at ELL (English Language Learner) students' scores on the CELDT (California English Language Development Test) and other indicators for information about how to improve the program for those students. As our staff works through the year to monitor student progress with the data we use, we discuss strategies and formulate plans to devote resources such as School Improvement funds, master schedule/course offerings, personnel, etc. We draw upon a number of types of funds to most efficiently support programs for students and staff.

3. Communicating School Performance

We have numerous ways to communicate our students' performance to parents, students and the community. All members of the school community receive the annual School Accountability Report Card, a profile of our school, containing demographic and assessment data, the school mission, and goals. Along with the regular tools schools use to communicate individual student progress, such as report cards and email to and from homes, our school features a computer program called Edline that allows parents to access their student's records in the district system. Through this program, parents can also see a standardized test score history for their child and access to classroom data, class work, and homework from each of the student's teachers using GradeQuick. To communicate whole-school and/or disaggregate group information to our school community, we use a number of venues, including School Site Council meetings, monthly PTSA meetings, our school website, the School Accountability Report Card, bi-monthly bulletins and the Leopard Letter. We have an active ELAC committee (English Learners' Advisory Council) where we regularly share information and data about our English learners and about the entire school population.

We celebrate students' hard work and good behavior through the Renaissance program, which rewards students for excellent performance as well as for improved performance, a feature that allows all students to achieve and be acknowledged. DARE culmination celebrates 6th grade students' hard work and dedication in the DARE curriculum. We hold Student of the Month luncheons, give Principal's Honor Roll certificates, and end the year with awards nights in June separately for 7th and 8th graders to honor them for their outstanding work in all subject areas, not just academics.

4. Sharing Success

Because we are part of a unified school district in a county devoted to educational collegiality, it is easy for us to share our success with other schools. Our school district structures and supports articulation efforts among all our schools and school levels so that we can learn from each other the instructional strategies and programs that best benefit our students. Parents at all schools are very active and involved and help spread success. The district also sponsors a monthly District Advisory Council, an active forum where schools send representative parents to communicate and share their school's ideas, information, and successful programs, among other topics as they act as an advisory group for the Instructional Division. Secondary principals also share ideas through regular focus group meetings. Through a comprehensive and excellent county inservice program coordinated by our county superintendent's office, administrators and groups of lead teachers regularly attend to hear nationally recognized researchers and speakers such as Doug Reeves, Robert Marzano, Deborah Pickering, and Grant Wiggins, on instructional topics focused on ways to improve schools. Through these workshops, teachers and administrators have opportunities to share ideas with colleagues from sites around the county. We always welcome visiting teachers and staff who want to garner ideas from us; we have sent staff to area schools to glean ideas from them. We are willing givers and takers.

PART V Curriculum and Instruction

1. The School Curriculum

A strong core curriculum, based on state frameworks and standards adopted by our district in each curricular area, stresses the mastery of basic skills and their application when solving problems and thinking critically. Continuous work by site and district teachers and administrators to analyze, refine, and implement the curriculum, provides students with a comprehensive, rigorous, and rich educational program.

Visual, practical, and performing **arts** are an integral part of our curriculum, offering students courses of their interest taught by teachers with a passion for their particular expertise. Nearly 200 students elect to take either beginning, intermediate or advanced band and strings classes open to all students, as well as a jazz band class.

Students at all three grade levels take **English** and social studies as a two-period core block or core team, emphasizing reading, writing, speaking and listening and grammar/conventions through varied genres of literature representing diverse cultures.

The California Content Standards for middle school **social studies** require study of the origin and development of major Western and non-Western civilizations. Eighth graders at Los Cerritos also study an in-depth unit called "We the People," developed and distributed by the national Center for Civic Education, about our Constitution and its application throughout our country's history as well as its impact today. Students use a "debate style" format, culminating with a district-wide competition for all 8th graders in front of panels of judges from the community. Our middle school embraces this program because of its depth and the results we see among our students who can eloquently explain, analyze and argue/defend constitutional issues. Also, teachers trained in the Teacher's Curriculum Institute's "History Alive!" program augment our social studies lessons focusing on different learning styles to help meet the needs of diverse learners.

Our **foreign language** program has doubled in size in the last three years. Almost half of our 8th graders take Spanish I for high school credit, and 80% of those students enroll in the second year language course at the high school to be able to continue through advanced placement studies in the 4th and 5th years. We offer French I when demand supports it. Depending on student interest and staff, we offer 7th graders Spanish, French and German for 13 weeks each as part of an elective wheel. Languages are taught with the "language acquisition"

approach, integrating reading, writing, speaking and listening skills with a natural use and study of grammar.

Math courses offer students conceptual understanding, problem solving, algebraic preparedness, and mathematical thinking. Eighth graders take Algebra I in classes limited to 20 students

Students learn that the **sciences** affect practically everything around them. They use the scientific method for meaningful, engaging, thought-provoking projects, hands-on labs, fieldtrips, and technology to help them achieve with high results. The teachers also expect that students will learn valuable life skills critical to the world of work later in high school and beyond. They do this by teaching them the safe use of scientific equipment, listening skills, following directions, note taking, and the ability to work cooperatively in small groups with a common purpose.

2. English Language Arts Curriculum and Reading

We improve the reading skills of students reading below grade level by assessing and identifying their skill level and enrolling them into a number of appropriate courses. Special education students receive instruction within the special education program. Students who do not qualify for special education, but read below grade level, take a reading class staffed at 20 students to one teacher, in addition to the English/social studies core. The special education and reading teachers have at their disposal a number of research-based programs to target particular reading weaknesses: Academy of Reading is a computer program that addresses automaticity and fluency; Soar to Success focuses on reading comprehension; Corrective Reading is a direct instruction program that has been statistically proven to increase decoding and reading comprehension skills. The reading teacher also offers students an individualized program which is highly motivational, turning non-readers into avid enthusiasts!

Our school has won the Governor's Reading Award for using Accelerated Reader, a program to help English teachers to guide students to choose and read challenging books. Students read a designated number of pages per month to prove their comprehension through the program specifically designed to improve the skills of less able readers. A newly-purchased computer program called Successmaker helps students remediate the gaps in their reading and language arts skills. Its use in reading classes, our ELL class, special education classes, and our after-school Boys' and Girls' Club promises to improve students' reading skills in yet another way.

3. Math, Essential Skills, and Knowledge

Los Cerritos math teachers offer a balanced curriculum emphasizing basic skills, problem solving, and conceptual understanding based on the state math framework/standards and district standards. Teachers design lessons to meet a variety of learning styles using whole class instruction, cooperative learning groups, independent work, and activities and projects with real-world applications. In support of the school's emphasis on writing across the curriculum, the math teachers design and implement specific real-life math problems that students must analyze, solve, and explain in expository writing assignments. Other cross curricular integration includes time lines, map skills, the stock market, mini-society in social studies, and measurement in science, elective and physical education classes.

Sixth grade features Everyday Math, a challenging and comprehensive program designed to train students to view concepts, problems, and solutions in varied ways. Students receive instruction in "cored" math/science blocks to allow students time to achieve mastery in standards. Pre-algebra is the focus of the seventh grade curriculum; Algebra is the focus for eighth grade in classes enrolled at 20 to 1. Approximately 80% of both seventh and eighth grade students are enrolled in college prep or honors math. Morning Math Help offers all students daily math help before period 1. We also offer a before-school remedial math class for students

struggling with basic skills in addition to their regular math class. There is on-going communication between our teachers and the high school math teachers to ensure that all students are prepared for their next level of schooling.

4. Instructional Methods That Improve Student Learning

At Los Cerritos, a strong, collaborative instructional emphasis on improvement of students' reading and writing and math skills across the curriculum permeates all content area courses, including Physical Education and electives. Teachers document their work with students, and students receive instruction in a reading or writing "strategy of the month" and submit essays to the principal. Reading strategies are used with content area text, while writing strategies can either be implemented directly from the "Writing Plan" or modified to fit the nature of writing instruction within the subject area, particularly in math where formal "essays" are replaced by real life math problems which students must explain in expository writing assignments.

Our teachers use a variety of proven traditional and cutting edge instructional methods in all subjects, including teacher-directed lessons, student presentations, innovative class projects, computer and video technology, hands-on lessons, and on-line research and networking. Math 8/Algebra teachers focus on effective small group instruction with maximum enrollment ratios of 20 students per teacher.

5. Professional Development and Its Impact on Improving Student Achievement

Collegial review of school data has led us to a renewed commitment and collaboration among teachers and staff school-wide, in departments, grade levels, and programs. We use many opportunities to discuss, analyze, plan, share ideas, and formulate goals. We support staff in their own professional growth by, for example, teaching the school's monthly reading strategy to all teachers, analyzing and scoring student writing samples as a group, designing units and lessons collegially, reviewing and analyzing content standards in small and large groups, designing benchmark tests in math,

Teachers in English/Language Arts, social studies, and math work together on planning days throughout the year to share new instructional strategies, plan units and lessons, share workshop ideas, and analyze student work in order to refine their teaching and their classes. Teachers in other curricular areas meet on a regular basis for decision making and instructional planning. Teams of secondary teachers meet quarterly in articulation meetings to ensure that standards are implemented uniformly without sacrificing creativity.

Our leadership team of teacher leaders provides staff development, data analysis and reflection, teaching ideas and strategies, and inspiration to all staff. We provide these experiences at monthly staff meetings, department meetings, planning days and pupil-free days.

Our School Site Council dedicates large portions of improvement funds, from 30 to 35% of an annual budget, to support teacher planning days, technology training, workshop attendance, peer observation, etc.

In 1999 Los Cerritos received its baseline API score of 805. We were proud of that score, but knew from our PQR (Program Quality Review) process and our own internal indicators of growth and success that we could raise the bar and work to improve not merely the number, but, more importantly, our students' skills. Our school wide API score has risen steadily to 838 for the spring 2003 testing. One of our proudest accomplishments has been the success we have experienced with our Hispanic students as their scores have risen steadily, an increase of 124 points in the last three years. This is clear evidence that our efforts have had an impact on student achievement.

	Los Cerritos			Statewide		
	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
Testing Month	April	April	April			
All Students	•					
Students Tested	290	283	273	490783	466011	435575
% of Enrollment	100	97	94	98	93	91
% Advanced	40	30	23	13	9	8
% Proficient	34	36	46	23	21	23
% Basic	21	26	25	35	36	36
% Below Basic	3	6	4	16	19	20
% Far Below Basic	1	2	3	13	15	13
Economically Disadvantaged						
Students						
Students Tested	19	15	13	257717	237131	213971
% of Enrollment	6	5	4	52	48	45
% Advanced	21	13	0	4	2	2
% Proficient	42	13	31	15	12	12
% Basic	36	53	46	38	36	36
% Below Basic	0	13	8	23	27	29
% Far Below Basic	0	7	15	19	23	21
Non Economically Disadvantaged						
Students						
Students Tested	272	268	255	231678	227523	220084
% of Enrollment	93	92	88	46	46	46
% Advanced	42	31	23	22	16	15
% Proficient	34	37	47	32	31	33
% Basic	19	25	24	31	35	35
% Below Basic	3	5	4	9	11	12
% Far Below Basic	2	2	2	6	6	6
Students with Disabilities						
Students Tested	21	16	29	48929	37789	36399
% of Enrollment	7	5	10	10	8	8
% Advanced	4	6	21	2	2	1
% Proficient	9	19	14	6	6	6
% Basic	38	25	28	20	21	22
% Below Basic	28	38	24	23	26	31
% Far Below Basic	19	13	14	49	46	40

Students with No Reported						
Disability						
Students Tested	269	267	244	440289	426330	397754
% of Enrollment	92	91	84	88	86	84
% Advanced	43	32	23	14	9	9
% Proficient	36	37	50	25	23	24
% Basic	19	26	24	37	37	37
% Below Basic	1	4	2	16	19	19
% Far Below Basic	0	1	1	9	12	11
White Students						
Students Tested	239	221	216	164324	N/A	N/A
% of Enrollment	82	76	75	33	N/A	N/A
% Advanced	41	31	22	23	N/A	N/A
% Proficient	33	35	44	33	N/A	N/A
% Basic	19	24	25	30	N/A	N/A
% Below Basic	3	5	5	8	N/A	N/A
% Far Below Basic	1	2	2	6	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Students						
Students Tested	20	30	20	223076	N/A	N/A
% of Enrollment	7	10	6	45	N/A	N/A
% Advanced	15	13	5	4	N/A	N/A
% Proficient	40	26	50	15	N/A	N/A
% Basic	45	46	35	39	N/A	N/A
% Below Basic	0	13	0	23	N/A	N/A
% Far Below Basic	0	0	10	19	N/A	N/A

	Los Cerritos		Statewide			
	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
Testing Month	April	April	April			
All Students	•	•	•			
Students Tested	397	342	357	493364	421745	426371
% of Enrollment	99	92	94	98	87	88
% Advanced	24	25	22	10	7	9
% Proficient	41	35	36	26	26	23
% Basic	24	29	31	33	32	33
% Below Basic	7	6	9	18	20	21
% Far Below Basic	4	5	3	14	15	15
Economically Disadvantaged						
Students						
Students Tested	49	24	32	236253	192285	191422
% of Enrollment	12	6	8	47	40	40
% Advanced	2	4	3	3	2	2
% Proficient	28	25	16	16	14	12
% Basic	46	33	41	36	33	33
% Below Basic	18	13	28	25	28	28
% Far Below Basic	4	25	13	20	23	24
Non Economically Disadvantaged						
Students						
Students Tested	356	318	321	255666	228508	233288
% of Enrollment	89	85	84	51	47	48
% Advanced	28	26	24	16	12	14
% Proficient	43	36	38	35	36	31
% Basic	21	29	29	30	31	33
% Below Basic	5	6	7	12	14	14
% Far Below Basic	3	3	2	7	7	8
Students with Disabilities						
Students Tested	43	25	59	48816	33583	35937
% of Enrollment	11	7	16	10	7	7
% Advanced	6	0	8	1	1	1
% Proficient	6	0	12	5	5	4
% Basic	32	28	39	17	16	17
% Below Basic	34	36	27	24	28	29
% Far Below Basic	16	36	14	53	50	48

Students with No Reported						
Disability						
Students Tested	355	316	298	442960	386737	388991
% of Enrollment	89	85	78	88	80	81
% Advanced	26	27	24	11	8	10
% Proficient	44	37	41	28	28	24
% Basic	22	29	29	35	33	34
% Below Basic	3	4	6	18	20	20
% Far Below Basic	1	2	1	9	12	12
White Students						
Students Tested	275	255	291	171291	N/A	N/A
% of Enrollment	69	64	77	34	N/A	N/A
% Advanced	27	24	20	17	N/A	N/A
% Proficient	41	36	39	37	N/A	N/A
% Basic	20	30	28	29	N/A	N/A
% Below Basic	6	5	8	10	N/A	N/A
% Far Below Basic	3	2	2	6	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Students						
Students Tested	72	52	42	216180	N/A	N/A
% of Enrollment	18	13	11	43	N/A	N/A
% Advanced	9	7	11	3	N/A	N/A
% Proficient	27	26	11	17	N/A	N/A
% Basic	41	34	45	36	N/A	N/A
% Below Basic	13	9	21	25	N/A	N/A
% Far Below Basic	6	21	9	20	N/A	N/A

		Los Cerritos			Statewide	
	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
Testing Month	April	April	April			
All Students	-					
Students Tested	395	364	345	466735	432738	409105
% of Enrollment	100	95	96	98	93	90
% Advanced	23	21	17	8	10	9
% Proficient	38	41	39	22	22	23
% Basic	29	29	33	34	34	35
% Below Basic	6	7	7	20	19	19
% Far Below Basic	4	2	3	15	14	14
Economically Disadvantaged						
Students						
Students Tested	49	19	36	207145	185845	170724
% of Enrollment	11	5	10	43	40	38
% Advanced	4	5	3	2	2	2
% Proficient	16	26	19	13	12	12
% Basic	51	37	39	35	36	35
% Below Basic	10	21	25	28	27	28
% Far Below Basic	18	11	14	22	23	23
Non Economically Disadvantaged						
Students						
Students Tested	349	345	304	258138	245589	236841
% of Enrollment	88	90	84	54	53	52
% Advanced	26	22	19	13	16	14
% Proficient	41	42	42	30	30	31
% Basic	26	28	32	34	34	34
% Below Basic	6	6	5	14	13	13
% Far Below Basic	1	1	2	9	8	8
Students with Disabilities						
Students Tested	40	26	62	46525	35845	33880
% of Enrollment	10	7	17	10	8	7
% Advanced	2	4	5	1	1	1
% Proficient	12	12	18	4	4	4
% Basic	30	46	39	16	17	18
% Below Basic	27	31	21	27	28	29
% Far Below Basic	27	8	18	52	49	48

Students with No Reported						
Disability						
Students Tested	355	338	283	418656	395178	373959
% of Enrollment	89	88	78	88	85	83
% Advanced	25	22	20	9	11	10
% Proficient	40	43	44	24	24	24
% Basic	29	28	32	37	36	36
% Below Basic	3	5	4	20	18	18
% Far Below Basic	1	1	0	10	11	11
White Students						
Students Tested	289	290	262	166804	N/A	N/A
% of Enrollment	73	73	73	35	N/A	N/A
% Advanced	22	21	19	15	N/A	N/A
% Proficient	43	43	40	32	N/A	N/A
% Basic	26	28	33	33	N/A	N/A
% Below Basic	5	6	4	12	N/A	N/A
% Far Below Basic	1	1	2	7	N/A	N/A
Hispanic Students						
Students Tested	58	47	46	196635	N/A	N/A
% of Enrollment	15	12	13	41	N/A	N/A
% Advanced	8	6	2	2	N/A	N/A
% Proficient	20	31	21	13	N/A	N/A
% Basic	46	36	36	36	N/A	N/A
% Below Basic	8	14	26	28	N/A	N/A
% Far Below Basic	15	10	13	21	N/A	N/A

	Sch	nool	State	wide
	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April		
All Students	•	•		
Students Tested	290	283	490430	473049
% of Enrollment	100	97	98	95
% Advanced	33	30	10	10
% Proficient	38	35	24	22
% Basic	19	23	30	30
% Below Basic	9	10	28	29
% Far Below Basic	1	2	8	8
Economically Disadvantaged				
Students				
Students Tested	18	15	257532	241878
% of Enrollment	6	5	52	49
% Advanced	17	7	3	4
% Proficient	39	13	16	15
% Basic	28	20	31	31
% Below Basic	17	40	38	39
% Far Below Basic	0	20	11	12
Non Economically Disadvantaged				
Students				
Students Tested	272	268	231519	229770
% of Enrollment	93	92	46	46
% Advanced	34	32	18	17
% Proficient	38	36	33	31
% Basic	19	23	28	30
% Below Basic	9	9	17	18
% Far Below Basic	1	1	4	4
Students with Disabilities				
Students Tested	21	15	48928	39112
% of Enrollment	7	5	10	8
% Advanced	0	13	2	2
% Proficient	19	7	7	7
% Basic	24	20	15	17
% Below Basic	43	40	41	16
% Far Below Basic	14	20	34	27

Students with No Reported				
Disability				
Students Tested	269	268	439951	432003
% of Enrollment	92	92	88	87
% Advanced	35	31	11	11
% Proficient	39	36	26	24
% Basic	19	23	32	31
% Below Basic	7	9	27	27
% Far Below Basic	0	1	5	6
White Students				
Students Tested	239	221	164162	N/A
% of Enrollment	82	76	33	N/A
% Advanced	30	29	17	N/A
% Proficient	39	36	35	N/A
% Basic	19	23	28	N/A
% Below Basic	8	8	16	N/A
% Far Below Basic	1	2	4	N/A
Hispanic Students				
Students Tested	20	30	222991	N/A
% of Enrollment	7	10	45	N/A
% Advanced	15	13	3	N/A
% Proficient	35	20	16	N/A
% Basic	30	26	32	N/A
% Below Basic	20	33	38	N/A
% Far Below Basic	0	6	10	N/A

	School		State	wide
	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April		
All Students	•	•		
Students Tested	396	357	492411	447826
% of Enrollment	99	96	98	92
% Advanced	16	16	7	6
% Proficient	37	39	23	24
% Basic	27	31	32	31
% Below Basic	17	11	26	29
% Far Below Basic	3	3	12	11
Economically Disadvantaged				
Students				
Students Tested	41	26	235758	206489
% of Enrollment	10	7	47	43
% Advanced	2	0	2	2
% Proficient	15	23	14	14
% Basic	46	42	32	30
% Below Basic	32	27	35	39
% Far Below Basic	5	8	17	17
Non Economically Disadvantaged				
Students				
Students Tested	355	331	255232	239851
% of Enrollment	89	89	51	49
% Advanced	18	17	12	9
% Proficient	39	40	31	32
% Basic	25	30	32	32
% Below Basic	15	10	19	20
% Far Below Basic	3	2	7	6
Students with Disabilities				
Students Tested	42	27	48636	38044
% of Enrollment	11	7	10	8
% Advanced	2	0	1	1
% Proficient	12	4	5	5
% Basic	17	22	14	15
% Below Basic	48	48	38	44
% Far Below Basic	21	26	43	36

Students with No Reported				
Disability				
Students Tested	354	329	442216	407894
% of Enrollment	89	88	88	84
% Advanced	18	17	8	6
% Proficient	40	42	25	25
% Basic	29	32	34	32
% Below Basic	13	9	25	27
% Far Below Basic	1	1	8	9
White Students				
Students Tested	273	267	170962	N/A
% of Enrollment	68	72	34	N/A
% Advanced	16	14	11	N/A
% Proficient	39	42	33	N/A
% Basic	27	29	33	N/A
% Below Basic	13	11	17	N/A
% Far Below Basic	2	1	6	N/A
Hispanic Students				
Students Tested	71	53	215852	N/A
% of Enrollment	18	14	43	N/A
% Advanced	4	1	2	N/A
% Proficient	19	20	14	N/A
% Basic	33	45	33	N/A
% Below Basic	35	20	35	N/A
% Far Below Basic	7	11	16	N/A

	School		State	wide
	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April		
All Students	•	•		
Students Tested	123	109	286054	285663
% of Enrollment	31	28	60	61
% Advanced	0	0	3	2
% Proficient	18	7	21	18
% Basic	50	46	32	34
% Below Basic	26	42	28	33
% Far Below Basic	7	5	16	13
Economically Disadvantaged				
Students				
Students Tested	32	16	142395	136058
% of Enrollment	8	4	30	29
% Advanced	0	0	1	1
% Proficient	3	13	13	11
% Basic	39	25	31	30
% Below Basic	39	50	33	41
% Far Below Basic	19	13	21	18
Non Economically Disadvantaged				
Students				
Students Tested	91	93	142683	148635
% of Enrollment	23	24	30	32
% Advanced	0	0	5	3
% Proficient	23	6	29	26
% Basic	53	49	34	37
% Below Basic	21	41	22	27
% Far Below Basic	2	3	11	8
Students with Disabilities				
Students Tested	37	22	35186	30350
% of Enrollment	9	6	7	7
% Advanced	0	0	1	0
% Proficient	9	0	6	4
% Basic	31	45	16	17
% Below Basic	40	41	33	45
% Far Below Basic	20	14	45	33

Students with No Reported				
Disability				
Students Tested	84	87	249802	254104
% of Enrollment	21	23	52	55
% Advanced	0	0	3	2
% Proficient	23	9	23	20
% Basic	57	46	35	36
% Below Basic	19	43	27	32
% Far Below Basic	1	2	12	10
White Students				
Students Tested	79	N/A	93399	N/A
% of Enrollment	20	N/A	20	N/A
% Advanced	0	N/A	5	N/A
% Proficient	27	N/A	32	N/A
% Basic	63	N/A	34	N/A
% Below Basic	8	N/A	19	N/A
% Far Below Basic	0	N/A	9	N/A
Hispanic Students				
Students Tested	35	N/A	135585	N/A
% of Enrollment	9	N/A	28	N/A
% Advanced	0	N/A	1	N/A
% Proficient	13	N/A	13	N/A
% Basic	53	N/A	32	N/A
% Below Basic	33	N/A	34	N/A
% Far Below Basic	0	N/A	20	N/A

Los Cerritos Middle School

California Standards Test Results Math – Algebra 1 Grade 8

	School		State	wide
	2002-03	2001-02	2002-03	2001-02
Testing Month	April	April		
All Students				
Students Tested	265	259	151714	133270
% of Enrollment	67	67	32	29
% Advanced	26	22	10	11
% Proficient	34	29	29	28
% Basic	34	37	28	30
% Below Basic	6	10	24	22
% Far Below Basic	0	2	9	10
Economically Disadvantaged				
Students				
Students Tested	12	6	53320	45607
% of Enrollment	3	2	11	10
% Advanced	0	*	4	4
% Proficient	33	*	18	16
% Basic	50	*	29	29
% Below Basic	17	*	35	34
% Far Below Basic	0	*	15	18
Non Economically Disadvantaged				
Students				
Students Tested	252	253	98175	87404
% of Enrollment	64	66	21	19
% Advanced	27	22	13	14
% Proficient	34	29	34	34
% Basic	33	38	28	30
% Below Basic	6	10	19	16
% Far Below Basic	0	2	5	6
Students with Disabilities				
Students Tested	3	8	4214	3500
% of Enrollment	1	2	1	1
% Advanced	0	*	4	3
% Proficient	33	*	12	10
% Basic	67	*	16	15
% Below Basic	0	*	37	39
% Far Below Basic	0	*	32	33

Students with No Reported				
Disability				
Students Tested	262	251	147220	129363
% of Enrollment	66	65	31	28
% Advanced	26	22	10	11
% Proficient	34	29	29	28
% Basic	34	37	29	30
% Below Basic	6	10	24	22
% Far Below Basic	0	2	8	9
White Students				
Students Tested	206	N/A	62878	N/A
% of Enrollment	52	N/A	13	N/A
% Advanced	23	N/A	12	N/A
% Proficient	37	N/A	37	N/A
% Basic	35	N/A	30	N/A
% Below Basic	5	N/A	17	N/A
% Far Below Basic	0	N/A	4	N/A
Hispanic Students				
Students Tested	22	N/A	51178	N/A
% of Enrollment	6	N/A	11	N/A
% Advanced	19	N/A	3	N/A
% Proficient	25	N/A	17	N/A
% Basic	31	N/A	29	N/A
% Below Basic	25	N/A	36	N/A
% Far Below Basic	0	N/A	15	N/A

^{*} State of California does not publish proficiency level for 10 or less students for this school year.

Los Cerritos Stanford 9 Test Results Mathematics

Grade <u>6</u> Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Edition / Publication Year: 9th Edition, first published 1996
Publisher: Harcourt Brace, Inc.
Groups excluded from testing? None

Scores below are reported as mean National Percentile Rankings (NPR)

	2000-01	1999-00	1998-99
All Students			
Enrollment	289	284	211
Number of students tested	278	282	205
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	87	79	81
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	71	55	55
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	90	78	84
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	96	93	96
Economically Disadvantaged Students			
Number of students tested	12	23	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	75	59	n/a
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	58	22	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	75	57	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	83	87	n/a
Not Economically Disadvantaged			
Students			
Number of students tested	261	258	205
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	87	81	81
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	71	58	55
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	90	80	84
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	97	93	96
Students Receiving Special			
Education Services			
Number of students tested	23	19	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	80	30	n/a
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	52	5	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	70	21	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	83	58	n/a
Students Not Receiving Special			
Education Services			
Number of students tested	255	262	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	87	82	n/a
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	72	59	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	91	82	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	98	95	n/a

Los Cerritos Stanford 9 Test Results Mathematics

Grade __7___ Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Edition / Publication Year: 9th Edition, first published 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Brace, Inc. Groups excluded from testing? None

Scores below are reported as mean National Percentile Rankings (NPR)

	2000-01	1999-00	1998-99
All Students			
Enrollment	380	343	349
Number of students tested	368	342	348
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	77	70	71
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	54	45	44
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	77	71	68
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	89	86	86
Economically Disadvantaged Students			
Number of students tested	34	49	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	40	42	n/a
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	12	20	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	38	47	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	62	57	n/a
Not Economically Disadvantaged			
Students			
Number of students tested	330	293	348
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	81	74	71
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	59	49	44
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	82	75	68
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	93	91	86
Students Receiving Special			
Education Services			
Number of students tested	62	40	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	49	28	n/a
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	19	3	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	45	20	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	61	53	n/a
Students Not Receiving Special			
Education Services			
Number of students tested	306	302	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	82	75	n/a
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	61	51	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	84	78	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	95	90	n/a

Los Cerritos Stanford 9 Test Results Mathematics

Grade <u>8</u> Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Edition / Publication Year: 9th Edition, first published 1996 Publisher: Harcourt Brace, Inc. Groups excluded from testing? None

Scores below are reported as mean National Percentile Rankings (NPR)

	2000-01	1999-00	1998-99
All Students			
Enrollment	361	369	363
Number of students tested	347	364	353
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	74	68	72
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	49	40	45
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	77	72	76
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	91	89	90
Economically Disadvantaged Students			
Number of students tested	35	36	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	54	37	n/a
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	31	11	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	46	36	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	71	58	n/a
Not Economically Disadvantaged			
Students			
Number of students tested	307	327	353
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	77	71	72
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	52	43	45
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	81	76	76
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	93	92	90
Students Receiving Special			
Education Services			
Number of students tested	62	38	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	47	31	na/
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	24	11	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	45	21	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	68	53	n/a
Students Not Receiving Special			
Education Services			
Number of students tested	285	325	n/a
NPR for "Avg." Student Score	79	72	n/a
% Scoring Above 75 th NPR	55	43	n/a
% Scoring At or Above 50 th NPR	84	78	n/a
% Scoring Above 25 th NPR	96	93	n/a

2004 NCLB BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS PROGRAM DATA REQUIREMENTS

	GRADE 8 MATH ONLY				
Row	Year: 2002	General Math	Algebra	Geometry	Totals
a	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced	7	51	0	38
b	Number of Students Tested (from STAR website)	109	259	0	368
С	Number of Students Proficient and Above (a x b)	8	132	0	140
d	Percentage of student Proficient and Advanced (Calculate by dividing the sum of row 'c' by sum of row 'b')				38%

	GRADE 8 MATH ONLY				
Row	Year: 2003	General Math	Algebra	Geometry	Totals
a	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced	18	60	100	47
b	Number of Students Tested (from STAR website)	123	265	1	389
С	Number of Students Proficient and Above (a x b)	22	159	1	182
d	Percentage of student Proficient and Advanced (Calculate by dividing the sum of row 'c' by sum of row 'b')				47%