

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

## U.S. Department of Education

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

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

Official School Name Franklin Northeast Elementary  
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 7042 E. Adobe Road  
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

Mesa Arizona 85207-4600  
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Maricopa State School Code Number\* 4963

Telephone ( 480 ) 472-9331 Fax ( 480 ) 472-9339

Web site/URL www.mpsaz.org/franke/ E-mail mgheiden@mpsaz.org

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

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

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

District Name Mesa Unified School District #4 Tel. ( 480 ) 472-0223

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

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

Name of School Board  
President/Chairperson Mr. Lynn Burnham

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

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

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2006-2007 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2001 and has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

---

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district:       57   Elementary schools  
                                                        0   Middle schools  
                                                      13   Junior high schools  
                                                        7   High schools  
                                                        9   Other  
  
                                                      86   TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:       \$8395  
  
     Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$6864

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

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city  
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area  
 Suburban  
 Small city or town in a rural area  
 Rural
4.   4   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.  
           If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0	7			
K	52	35	87	8			
1	39	35	74	9			
2	32	44	76	10			
3	36	32	68	11			
4	33	24	57	12			
5	23	33	56	Other			
6	18	33	51				
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →</b>							<b>469</b>

**[Throughout the document, round numbers 1 or higher to the nearest whole number. Use decimals to one place only if the number is below 1.]**

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- |                   |                                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>80</u>         | % White                          |
| <u>1</u>          | % Black or African American      |
| <u>14</u>         | % Hispanic or Latino             |
| <u>0</u>          | % Asian/Pacific Islander         |
| <u>5</u>          | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| <b>100% Total</b> |                                  |

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 3 %

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

<b>(1)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year	3
<b>(2)</b>	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year	10
<b>(3)</b>	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	13
<b>(4)</b>	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	469
<b>(5)</b>	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	.0277
<b>(6)</b>	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	3

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 1 %  
7 Total Number Limited English Proficient  
 Number of languages represented: 1  
 Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 19 %  
 Total number students who qualify: 87

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the federally supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services:  $\frac{5}{26}$  % 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.

___ Autism	___ Orthopedic Impairment
___ Deafness	___ Other Health Impaired
___ Deaf-Blindness	<u>9</u> Specific Learning Disability
___ Emotional Disturbance	<u>17</u> Speech or Language Impairment
___ Hearing Impairment	___ Traumatic Brain Injury
___ Mental Retardation	___ Visual Impairment Including Blindness
___ Multiple Disabilities	

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

**Number of Staff**

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	_____
Classroom teachers	<u>18</u>	<u>1</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	_____	<u>7</u>
Paraprofessionals	_____	_____
Support staff	_____	<u>14</u>
Total number	<u>19</u>	<u>22</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 25:1

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

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Daily student attendance	4 %	4 %	4 %	5 %	5 %
Daily teacher attendance	91 %	91 %	91 %	90 %	89 %
Teacher turnover rate	16 %	5 %	11 %	5 %	0 %
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	%	%	%	%	%
Student drop-off rate (high school)	%	%	%	%	%

## **PART III - SUMMARY**

---

Franklin Northeast Elementary School, established in 1997, is one of four Franklin School campuses within the Mesa Public School system. The Mesa district is the largest in Arizona, and educates more than 72,000 students. All parents have the opportunity to place their children in Franklin Northeast, and they elect to enroll their children in this advanced, fast-paced program on the basis of educational philosophy and practices. A parental agreement of support is signed at registration. Franklin Northeast educates approximately 475 K-6 students using an academic model created in 1978 as the Franklin Back-to-Basics alternative program within the Mesa Public Schools. It was originally designed to reflect parental expectations of a highly structured, safe learning environment focused on teaching basic skills. Interested parents met on committees as they planned and refined their educational preferences.

The Franklin academic program uses a phonics based approach to decoding entitled The Writing Road to Reading by Ramalda Spalding. The Spalding method is a complete Language Arts approach providing explicit integrated instruction in spelling, writing, listening and reading comprehension. Our reading curriculum further utilizes high quality literature. Each literature set provides students with the opportunity to enjoy exciting stories while developing their skills in oral and silent reading and comprehension. Our year long accelerated math program uses week-by-week, concept-by-concept overviews that build in reviews, guide the pace of instruction for teachers, and take into account the maturational and intellectual differences of students. In addition, these overviews provide consistency and continuity across the school and allow teachers to use the best possible instructional materials and strategies for each concept. The Language program is based on principles of grammar, and language analysis with the opportunity to develop precise, clearly understood written thought. Franklin Northeast students learn traditional understandings of history, geography and patriotism. In Science, foundational concepts of earth, biological, chemical and physical science enrich the students' understanding of their world. Research skills, using technology, are developed starting in kindergarten. Student learning is further enhanced in art, art masterpiece, music, music masterpiece, PE, health, safety, character development, conflict resolution, student government, band, orchestra, and sports opportunities. The Franklin academic program is rounded out by a very specific, nightly homework program that includes minimum and maximum amounts of time spent on homework, delineated by grade level.

Further characteristics of Franklin Northeast center on firm and fair behavioral expectations, extensive teacher in-service training, and whole group instruction with small group and individual tutorial support by the classroom teachers. Parental involvement in planning and organizing curricular and extracurricular activities is designed to allow teachers and the principal to concentrate on academics and focus on student achievement. The program continually monitors foundational skills and utilizes specifically designed instructional strategies developed to accommodate a diverse range of student abilities. Teachers at each grade level work together closely in instructional planning using detailed curriculum overviews to maintain the highest levels of instructional continuity and consistency across the campus.

In a caring atmosphere with a positive focus on academic achievement and progression, respect for others, pride in self and country, Franklin Northeast strives to fulfill its mission to train the intellect while complimenting parental efforts and responsibilities. Furthermore our goal is to guide children toward independence as we endeavor to surpass district, state, and national standards. Our program prepares children to be successful learners in future academic pursuits in a manner that reflects personal responsibility and strength of character as well as academic confidence and competence. Children thrive at Franklin Northeast. Parents have confidence in our program. Faculty and staff find professional and personal satisfaction in their roles as educators. And finally, Franklin Northeast does all that it can to be an educational asset to the Mesa Public Schools and the City of Mesa, a great place to live and learn.

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

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

Franklin Northeast Elementary has met the state criteria to be designated as an “Excelling” school for the past two years, and has improved from a “Highly Performing” status three years ago. During this time period we have met the federal Adequate Yearly Progress requirements in reading and math.

Third through sixth graders are required to take Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards Dual Purpose Assessment (AIMS DPA) which contains standards based and TerraNova norm referenced questions. Students who score in the categories of “Exceeds the Standard” or “Meets the Standard” are considered having passed the subject on the AIMS test. Second graders take only the TerraNova test. The Stanford 9 norm referenced test was used until the 2003-2004 school year. Further information on the AIMS DPA and TerraNova can be found on the Arizona Department of Education website at [www.ade.az.gov/standards/](http://www.ade.az.gov/standards/).

In 2005-2006, on the TerraNova test, our second and sixth grades tied for third in the state in math, and sixth grade tied for fourth in the state in Reading. Second grade scored in the 92<sup>nd</sup> percentile in math. On the AIMS test, 94% of the third grade met or exceeded the standard in math, and 89% met or exceeded the standard in reading. This same year 97% or more of fourth grade students met or exceeded the state standards in reading and math. Ninety-three percent of the fifth grade met or exceeded the standard in math, and 85% met or exceeded the standard in reading. The previous year 100% met or exceeded the state standard in reading. In 2005-2006 and 2004-2005, at least 94% of the sixth grade students met or exceeded the state standards in math and reading.

Economically disadvantaged and Hispanic are the only statistically significant subgroups. If less than ten students are in the group, no data is listed. In 2005-2006 on the TerraNova math assessment, second graders in the economically disadvantaged subgroup scored in the 91<sup>st</sup> percentile. Third graders tested within 1 percentile of the class average, and sixth graders achieved at the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile. In reading, fourth and sixth graders in this subgroup outperformed the class average the last year that there were enough students for a subgroup. Fifth grader’s lower scores are discussed in the next paragraph.

On the AIMS in 2005-2006, third graders in the economically disadvantaged subgroup achieved at a higher level than the class as a whole by 100% meeting or exceeding the standards in reading and math, while 90% of fourth grade students achieved at this level. The previous year 100% of students reached this mark. Fifth graders performed lower than the class as a whole. In fifth grade during the three previous years in reading, this subgroup performed at the same level or outperformed the class while scoring 100% two of the three years. In math the previous year, students achieved 92% passing. We believe a teacher being on maternity leave several weeks prior to and during testing contributed to lower scores.

The Hispanic subgroup at all grades met or exceeded the standard at 80% or higher in both subject areas. Ninety-one percent of fourth graders achieved this level. While surpassing the percentage of the overall class, 100% of the sixth graders in this subgroup met or exceeded the standard in reading. On the TerraNova sixth graders scored at the 88<sup>th</sup> percentile. Fourth graders in the subgroup scored within 2 percentiles of the class average in reading.

Being new to our program may be a factor for lower scores in either subgroup. Due to the small number of students, each student’s score carried a stronger weighting when computing the subgroup’s average. Lower performing students in both subgroups are being carefully monitored. Teachers are providing tutoring, one-to-one instruction, and working closely with parents.

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

Assessment data provide our staff with valuable information that helps provide optimal instruction at the classroom level, and more importantly, the individual student level. Teachers are given analysis sheets to list concepts and performance objectives from the state standards that show a need for improvement. From this information, strategies that will help improve instruction are developed. At the beginning of the school year, the district's research and evaluation department provides reconfigured data sheets listing the AIMS scores for the teacher's current students. The data is detailed by concept. Teachers especially focus on students who score in the falls far below or approaches categories. These students receive one-on-one assistance during the day for short periods of time, and tutoring before or after school. Weekly assessments are given on items that include state performance objectives. Re-teaching is provided for students who do not master the given objective. Teachers plan together weekly and share ideas for better meeting the instructional needs of their grade level and individual students. Additionally, topics for in-services come from the Franklin Principals' Council sessions that discuss state assessment data.

The principal receives monthly scores in the foundational areas of phonics, spelling, reading comprehension, and mathematics from each classroom. These scores become part of each student's academic profile. Teachers and the principal use monthly and weekly assessment data to determine areas of emphasis and instructional strategies to address individual needs. Plans for providing students with tutorial or small group assistance are developed, and if necessary, accompanying assistance from parents is detailed.

## **3. Communicating Assessment Results:**

Students' individual state assessment data is provided to parents at the beginning of the school year with a cover letter from the district superintendent. These reports show how each child performed in comparison to district and state norms. A summary of results by grade level is published in the school newsletter. Prior to the publishing of the newsletter and in keeping with the deep involvement of parents in the Franklin program, the data is discussed with the Franklin Northeast Parent Council at their monthly meeting. For all schools, the Arizona Department of Education helps convey test data by compiling a state report card that contains very detailed assessment results. Each member of the parent council receives a hard copy of this document, and parents can access this online at the ADE website. The test data from the Franklin schools is shared with the Spalding Foundation who uses the results to compare schools with similar programs. The local newspaper also publishes grade level results by school along with district and state averages. These public results are motivating to teachers to perfect their instructional skills and to do everything within their power to assist children in improving their abilities.

Student performance is also communicated to students and parents using weekly folders containing assignments and assessments. Grades are given every six weeks on a report card. Parent-teacher conferences are held after the first and fourth, six-week sessions. Progress is conveyed every three weeks prior to the issuing of report cards. Parents are kept better informed of student achievement, and students have more opportunities to improve grades. A daily homework note is sent home which parents are required to sign. Teachers communicate progress to parents with a personal call when necessary to work together for the student's benefit.

## **4. Sharing Success:**

Franklin Northeast has shared its approach with many schools throughout the Phoenix metropolitan area through conferences and by allowing on-sight visitations. As a member of the Spalding International educational organization, the opportunity to provide administrative and instructional strategies associated with our language arts program to others occurs regularly. Each year the Spalding Foundation hosts a conference in Phoenix. At this conference we share and gather ideas with administrators and teachers



from school districts in Arizona. Other participants are from schools in any of the fifty states or nine countries that use the Spalding method.

On the national level, a curriculum similar to the Franklin program has been developed for a charter school in Logan, Utah. Several teachers and their administrator visited our site as they were establishing their traditional program. This current year an administrator and a teacher from Boise, Idaho visited our campus to observe our Spalding program. On the state level many charter, private, and public schools have used Franklin Northeast and its sister campuses as a model for bringing educational excellence to their students.

Franklin Northeast works very closely with three other traditional schools within Mesa Public Schools. Our teachers communicate regularly between sites sharing information, ideas and curriculum in order to develop instructional remedies for educational concerns. At monthly meetings, we share our ideas with other administrators within our district.

Future sharing will occur as we further interact with The Spalding Foundation, enhance our school's website, and work with the district community relations department to communicate our successful approaches to educating children.

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

### **1. Curriculum:**

Phonics or Decoding, Spelling and Handwriting are combined subjects taught in all grade levels as one subject with three components using Ramalda Spalding's The Writing Road to Reading. Students are assessed with monthly phonogram tests that evaluate mastery of the 70 foundational phonemes, monthly tests that measure a student's ability to apply the rules that govern the use of the phonograms as they spell words, and a writing rubric for determining the quality of penmanship.

Reading or Literature is taught primarily using literature sets with varying vocabulary and content. In kindergarten and first grade, teachers choose from over 180 titles for children to read at the rate of one book each day. Books are grouped according to difficulty, and all titles are used as children's reading ability progresses. In fourth through sixth grade, students read two books concurrently during literature time. One book is read orally, and the class, under the direction of the teacher constructs a written summary of the book by significant event. That summary serves as an instructional tool to teach summarizing and comprehension skills. The second book is read silently, and each child composes their own summary that the teacher evaluates for the child's degree of comprehension. Children are tested monthly to measure reading comprehension gains using the McCall-Crabbs Tests for Reading Comprehension, and their score is recorded on their student profile sheet.

The Franklin Northeast mathematics program uses a four pronged weekly overview to guide the pacing of instruction. Utilizing HBJ Mathematics Today as a primary source for concept development, teachers allocate time each day for foundational skill development, review of previously learned concepts, numeration concepts and computational instruction and practice. The overviews contain a built-in system of review insuring the number of instructional repetitions meets the learning needs of average and slightly below average students. Instruction occurs in a whole group setting with tutorial assistance provided by the teacher for students needing additional help. In sixth grade, students are separated into ability groups to accommodate the disparity among student abilities. The accelerated nature of the over-all program insures that higher performing students are well prepared to progress on an advanced learning track in junior high.

English, Writing, and Spelling are three subjects that are taught as one using the McMillan English program. Grammar, punctuation, and usage skills are presented using traditional methods in a whole group setting. Beginning with kindergarten all students develop a writing portfolio that shows their individual growth for each grade. Easy Grammar and Six Trait Writing programs supplement the textbook.

History, Geography, and Science instruction occur in a whole group setting using textbooks. Science kits and computer software supplement these subjects. Exposure to US and world history, earth, chemical, biological and physical science concepts prepare students for further study.

Library and Computers are separate classes taught by specialists using concepts in science, health, safety, history, geography and literature to help children develop research skills. Basic skills in math and language are also reinforced. Separate specialists provide instruction in PE and Music for 50 minutes each week. PE follows the Pangrazzi elementary PE developmental program. In Music, general music skills including rhythm, note reading, pitch, instrument identification and masterpiece recognition are sequentially provided. Various age appropriate Health topics are presented by the school nurse.

Students are given exposure to Spanish by their classroom teacher. The district has developed curriculum

and materials for this subject. Art is taught for 60 minutes each week by the classroom teacher and by parents who have been trained in the district Art Masterpiece program.

Each week teachers present all subject areas for a specified number of instructional minutes. Using math as an example, the time allocation for kindergarten is 100 minutes and increases to 325 minutes for sixth grade.

## **2. Reading**

Students learn to decode words using The Writing Road to Reading by Ramalda Spalding. Opportunities to develop fluency in oral and silent reading come from the daily reading of parent-approved literature sets and classical selections found in the Open Court texts. Each student has their own copy of the literature set. Reading comprehension is developed through an analysis of selections that focus on the comprehension components of main idea, detail, cause-effect, author's purpose, sequencing and inference skills, using the McCall-Crabbs Test Lessons in Comprehension and other supplemental materials. Students in fourth through sixth grade learn to summarize events from the literature sets. Decoding skills are monitored by monthly assessments that reveal the students' knowledge of the 70 phonograms. Assessing students' ability to apply the rules of spelling, which help students decode in reading, occurs through the use of the Morrison-McCall Spelling Scale. In grades two through six, a pre and post test using Skills Mastery exams provide further insight into each child's ability to read for understanding, and determine areas of emphasis during the instructional year.

This multisensory approach to reading is used in the Franklin schools because it is systematic and allows the skills developed each year to be consistently reinforced in succeeding years. The program is simple, straightforward, and cost effective. It was chosen and partially developed by parents, thereby increasing parental shareholding in the school. The selection of 375 literature sets with a variety of authors increases student vocabulary. Students are motivated by the complete story lines of good literature, further creating a desire to read. This program exposes children to different types of writing and writing styles, and assists in leading students to become proficient, creative writers. Success is evident by the students' performance on all assessment tools and is motivational to teachers and children alike.

## **3. Math:**

The mathematics program at Franklin Northeast reflects our mission to train the intellect of children in such a way that they will have greater choice, be competitive, and be well prepared for success when they enter junior high school programs. The curriculum is foundational in nature. The HBJ Mathematics Today is the primary instruction text and is complemented with a teacher compiled, grade level binder. Using these resources teachers draw from the best materials available by concept to assure student success. Yearly overviews outline week-by-week instructional concept expectations at each grade level, kindergarten through sixth. In addition to detailing what to teach and how much time should be spent teaching it, overviews insure that teachers will include instructional time each day for foundational practice, systematic review, numeration skills, and computational skill development. These curriculum guides also provide continuity and consistency from grade level to grade level creating a secure learning system that benefits the average and below average student. The rigorous content keeps the above average student challenged. Whole group instruction with a tutorial component allows teachers to maximize the use of time allocated to mathematics. The program has a system of foundational monitoring. Teachers track their students' progress with monthly multiplication and subtraction timed tests. Pre and post testing on the Skills Mastery exams help teachers identify specific areas of need. These assessments allow teachers to build on students' successes each year as well as providing valuable data. This curriculum was also chosen by parents because of its simple, straightforward approach. The program reflects a strong logic development and application component. The 29 year history of this program has

produced a myriad of successful mathematicians, teachers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, engineers, accountants, researchers and scientists that attribute their love of mathematics to their elementary experience.

#### **4. Instructional Methods:**

The overall instructional plan at Franklin Northeast is a Pre-teach / Teach / Re-teach strategy. A whole group instructional approach is the primary instructional method. However, students requiring additional instruction receive tutorial and small group assistance. Our staff tutors students twice a week for thirty minutes before or after school. Direct instruction is accomplished through The Seven Steps of Instruction. These seven steps include: Teacher Introduction, Teacher Explanation, Teacher Demonstration, Student Explanation with Teacher Demonstration, Student Explanation with other Student Demonstration, Student Independent Practice with Teacher Check, and Homework. The Essential Elements of Instruction are incorporated into the seven steps. Teachers are able to easily determine if students understand the objective before they begin completing their independent practice. Grade level and subject matter specific, instructional strategies are used and monitored to achieve maximum student growth. Towards the end of each school year teachers rank each child in their classroom based on their perception of the student's overall academic strength. These rankings are used to create academically balanced classrooms at each grade level. This balancing approach allows the principal to compare classroom academic performances in meaningful ways, and provide instructional assistance where it is most needed. Yearly overviews guide the teachers at each grade level in each subject. These instructional overviews help make sure that the instruction of each identified concept is given adequate time, and that the number of instructional repetitions is appropriate for the majority of the students. Overviews simplify and reduce planning time, as well as provide for increased continuity and consistency for students in all grade levels and in all classrooms of each grade level. While homework, with specific minimum and maximum times, is a major characteristic of Franklin Northeast, the primary benefit for students is the development of lifelong time management and personal responsibility skills.

#### **5. Professional Development:**

Teacher prior to teaching at Franklin Northeast are required to be trained in The Spalding Integrated Language Arts program. This 45 hour in-service class is a condition of employment. During the summer between the first and second year of teaching, staff member repeats the initial Spalding course to solidify their understanding of the program. New teachers are assigned a mentor who assists them in understanding all aspects of the Franklin program. Between the second and third year of employment teachers attend the Spalding II course. This 45 hour class provides training in reading comprehension strategies and writing while continuing to reinforce the Spalding method. Each year Franklin teachers receive in-service instruction on our required instructional strategies, the use of the curriculum overviews, writing, and other topics. Consistency and continuity of instruction are also key areas of focus. Throughout the school year, the principal and basic skills teacher provide training at faculty meetings on in-service topics. The principal and veteran staff present new teachers with more detailed training in instructional methods. Additional in-service efforts occur through the use of our Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC). The FCC meetings allow the principal to address grade level specific instructional needs and areas of emphasis. Mesa Public Schools Professional Development department provides training for many areas of education such as curriculum, instructional delivery, and current cognitive research. Seminars such as "21 Keys for High Performance Teaching and Learning" are made available. The majority of teachers at our site have taken courses on Six Trait writing and Positive or Conscious Discipline. Our district also provides detailed training for the use of science kits. Franklin faculty have recently completed or are in the process of completing two courses in Structured English Immersion required by the state of Arizona.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading Grade 2 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	70	75
Number of students tested	77	74
Percent of total students tested	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged	61	65
Number of students tested	17	21
2. Hispanic	56	
Number of students tested	10	*
<b>DISTRICT SCORES</b> (state scores not published)		
Total Score	50	51

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Reading Grade 2 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	80	70	80
Number of students tested	76	76	76
Percent of total students tested	100	97	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	68	60	67
Number of students tested	21	19	12
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	58	50	44

2003–2004 was the last year Arizona used the Stanford 9 assessment

Subject Math Grade 2 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	92	86
Number of students tested	78	74
Percent of total students tested	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged	91	83
Number of students tested	17	21
2. Hispanic	83	
Number of students tested	10	*
<b>DISTRICT SCORES (state scores not published)</b>		
Total Score	55	55

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Math Grade 2 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	93	83	88
Number of students tested	76	76	76
Percent of total students tested	100	97	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	91	72	85
Number of students tested	21	19	12
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	64	57	52

Subject Reading Grade 3 Test Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)  
 Edition/Publication Year Revised Yearly Publisher AZ Dept. of Education / CTB McGraw – Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	89	89	91	91	97
% "Exceeding" State Standards	28	24	42	35	47
Number of students tested	64	66	65	69	64
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	100	71	88	92	100
% "Exceeding" State Standards	8	8	19	33	33
Number of students tested	12	13	16	12	18
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards		82			
% "Exceeding" State Standards		18			
Number of students tested	*	11	*	*	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	67	65	64	68	69

\* less than 10 students in subgroup

Subject Reading Grade 3 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill

Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	75	70
Number of students tested	64	66
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		
Number of students tested	60	56
Number of students tested	12	13
2. Hispanic		
Number of students tested	*	11
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
Total Score	45	43

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Reading Grade 3 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	76	76	67
Number of students tested	65	69	69
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	63	78	54
Number of students tested	16	12	18
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	55	47	43

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)  
 Edition/Publication Year Revised Yearly Publisher AZ Dept. of Education / CTB McGraw – Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	94	92	91	90	91
% "Exceeding" State Standards	39	39	46	52	53
Number of students tested	64	66	65	69	64
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	100	85	88	92	83
% "Exceeding" State Standards	25	15	25	42	50
Number of students tested	12	13	16	12	18
2. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards		82			
% "Exceeding" State Standards		18			
Number of students tested	*	11	*	*	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	72	71	58	60	59

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup



Subject Math Grade 3 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	78	73
Number of students tested	64	66
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged	79	56
Number of students tested	12	13
2. Hispanic		57
Number of students tested	*	11
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
Total Score	50	52

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	85	76	78
Number of students tested	65	69	69
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	75	70	71
Number of students tested	16	12	18
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	61	54	50

Subject Reading Grade 4 Test Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)  
 Edition/Publication Year Revised Yearly Publisher AZ Dept. of Education / CTB McGraw – Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	97	87
% "Exceeding" State Standards	17	18
Number of students tested	60	61
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	90	71
% "Exceeding" State Standards	20	0
Number of students tested	10	14
2. Hispanic		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	91	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	9	
Number of students tested	11	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	65	64

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

2004-2005 was the first year fourth graders were assessed on the AIMS

Subject Reading Grade 4 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	72	72
Number of students tested	60	61
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		
Number of students tested	73	62
2. Hispanic		
Number of students tested	10	14
Number of students tested	70	
Number of students tested	11	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
Total Score	50	49

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Reading Grade 4 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	85	76	68
Number of students tested	61	60	59
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	82	70	67
Number of students tested	13	14	13
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	56	52	47

Subject Math Grade 4 Test Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)  
 Edition/Publication Year Revised Yearly Publisher AZ Dept. of Education / CTB McGraw – Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	98	95
% "Exceeding" State Standards	43	31
Number of students tested	60	61
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	90	79
% "Exceeding" State Standards	30	14
Number of students tested	10	14
2. Hispanic		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	91	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	27	
Number of students tested	11	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	73	70

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

2004-2005 was the first year fourth graders were assessed on the AIMS

Subject Math Grade 4 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	82	79
Number of students tested	60	61
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged	72	72
Number of students tested	10	14
2. Hispanic	65	
Number of students tested	11	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
Total Score	56	56

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Math Grade 4 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	88	80	76
Number of students tested	61	60	59
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	86	78	69
Number of students tested	13	14	13
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	61	57	52

Subject Reading Grade 5 Test Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)  
 Edition/Publication Year Revised Yearly Publisher AZ Dept. of Education / CTB McGraw – Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	85	100	77	88	87
% "Exceeding" State Standards	13	44	26	23	39
Number of students tested	53	54	57	57	46
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	98	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	50	100	87	100	78
% "Exceeding" State Standards	8	17	13	27	44
Number of students tested	12	12	15	11	19
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	67	67	48	53	55

Subject Reading Grade 5 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	75	87
Number of students tested	53	54
Percent of total students tested	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		
Number of students tested	12	12
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
Total Score	54	52

Subject Reading Grade 5 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	76	79	78
Number of students tested	57	58	46
Percent of total students tested	98	100	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	65	82	
Number of students tested	15	11	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	55	50	46

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Math Grade 5 Test Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)  
 Edition/Publication Year Revised Yearly Publisher AZ Dept. of Education / CTB McGraw – Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	93	96	86	77	83
% "Exceeding" State Standards	23	67	68	58	70
Number of students tested	53	54	57	57	46
Percent of total students tested	100	98	98	98	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	67	92	80	82	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	17	42	60	55	
Number of students tested	12	12	15	11	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>					
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	68	68	55	46	73

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Math Grade 5 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	65	85
Number of students tested	53	54
Percent of total students tested	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged	44	79
Number of students tested	12	12
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
Total Score	50	51

Subject Math Grade 5 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	87	82	65
Number of students tested	52	58	46
Percent of total students tested	98	100	96
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	86	85	
Number of students tested	15	11	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	63	57	54

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Reading Grade 6 Test Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)  
 Edition/Publication Year Revised Yearly Publisher AZ Dept. of Education / CTB McGraw – Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	96	96
% "Exceeding" State Standards	19	6
Number of students tested	48	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	100	100
% "Exceeding" State Standards		0
Number of students tested	*	11
2. Hispanic		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	100	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	10	
Number of students tested	10	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	64	64

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

2004-2005 was the first year sixth graders were assessed on the AIMS

Subject Reading Grade 6 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	86	75
Number of students tested	48	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		79
Number of students tested	*	11
2. Hispanic	88	
Number of students tested	10	
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
Total Score	55	53

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup



Subject Reading Grade 6 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	80	86	79
Number of students tested	56	41	38
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	76		65
Number of students tested	16	*	10
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	56	53	49

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Math Grade 6 Test Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)  
 Edition/Publication Year Revised Yearly Publisher AZ Dept. of Education / CTB McGraw – Hill

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	94	100
% "Exceeding" State Standards	54	42
Number of students tested	48	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards		100
% "Exceeding" State Standards		36
Number of students tested	*	11
2. Hispanic		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	80	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	50	
Number of students tested	10	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
% "Meeting" plus "Exceeding" State Standards	62	62

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

2004-2005 was the first year sixth graders were assessed on the AIMS

Subject Math Grade 6 Test TerraNova  
 Edition/Publication Year 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition / 2001 Publisher CTB McGraw – Hill  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing month	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>		
Total Score	89	86
Number of students tested	48	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>		
1. Economically Disadvantaged		85
Number of students tested	*	11
2. Hispanic	88	
Number of students tested	10	*
<b>STATE SCORES</b>		
Total Score	55	55

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup

Subject Math Grade 6 Test Stanford 9  
 Edition/Publication Year 1996 Publisher Harcourt Brace  
 Scores are reported here as Percentiles

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002
Testing month	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>			
Total Score	87	92	88
Number of students tested	56	41	38
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>			
1. Economically Disadvantaged	88		86
Number of students tested	16	*	10
<b>STATE SCORES</b>			
Total Score	66	62	58

\* less than 10 students in the subgroup