California Department of Education
2014 California Distinguished Schools Program

Elementary School Application: Part A

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

Exemplary Education Programs ~ *[Optional—additional application(s) enclosed]*

Arts Education Application ☐ Yes / Physical Activity & Nutrition Education Application ☐ Yes

37 73569 6109995
County-District-School (CDS) Code—14 Digits

San Diego County
County Name

Oceanside Unified School District
District Name

Ivey Ranch Elementary School
School Name (*If your school is selected for honors, this school name will be engraved on the award plaque.*)

4275 Via Rancho Road
Mailing Address

Oceanside, 92057
City and Zip Code

760-967-9720
Area Code and Phone Number Ext.

760-967-4077
Area Code and Fax Number

duane.legg@oside.us
Principal's E-mail Address

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

I certify that I have reviewed the information contained in this application and, to the best of my knowledge, it is complete and accurate. I further certify that:

- *The Office for Civil Rights does not have any outstanding findings of civil rights statute violations by the school or district that may affect the school;*
- *There are no pending lawsuits by the Department of Justice against the district alleging that the school, or the district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clauses; and*
- *The school or district is addressing or has addressed any identified areas of noncompliance under federal or state laws and regulations.*

Duane Legg
Principal's Name

Principal's Signature 12/16/13
Date

Larry Perondi
District Superintendent's Name

District Superintendent's Signature (or authorized designee) 12/16/13
Date

School Information

1. Current school enrollment: 767

2. Which category best describes where your school is located?

☐ Urban ☑ Suburban ☐ Rural

3. Does your school receive Title I funding? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If yes, indicate type of services: ☐ School-wide ☐ Targeted Assistance

4. What is your school calendar? ☑ Traditional ☐ Year-round ☐ Modified

5. Is your school a charter school? ☐ Yes ☑ No

6. Number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Full-time Staff	Part-time Staff
Administrators	1	0
Classroom teachers	27	2
Counselors	0	0
Credentialed librarians	0	0
Nurses	0	0
Psychologists	1	1
Technology/media specialists or technicians	0	0
Paraprofessionals	0	10
Campus resource officers	0	0
Other staff *(specify)* *School* Base Resource Teacher, Education Specialist, Speech Therapist, Physical Education, Music, Health Clerk, Custodians, Cafeteria, Office Personnel, Playground Supervisors)	7	14
Total staff	36	27

Directions to Your School

If your school is selected as a statewide nominee, the site visit team members will need directions to your school.

San Diego
County

Oceanside Unified School District
District

Ivey Ranch Elementary School
School

4275 Via Rancho Road
Street Address

Oceanside, 92057
City and Zip Code

Duane Legg
Principal

760-967-9720
Area Code and Phone Number Ext.

San Diego International Airport
Name and Location of the Nearest Airport

Interstate 5
Major Freeway Access

Provide detailed travel directions indicating the surface streets that lead to your school. Please do not submit directions or a map generated by an Internet Web site.

From The San Diego International Airport, start out going west on North Harbor Drive towards McCain Road. Turn right onto Nimitz Boulevard. Turn right again onto Rosecrans Street/CA-209 North. Continue to follow CA-209 North. CA 209 North becomes Camino Del Rio West. Merge onto Interstate 5 North toward Los Angeles to Highway 78 west.

From Highway 78, exit on College Dr. and turn north (left). Continue on College Dr. to Mesa Dr. Turn west (left) onto Mesa Dr. Follow Mesa Dr. to Via Rancho Rd. and turn north (right). Ivey Ranch Elementary School is on the northwest corner of Mesa Dr. and Via Rancho Rd. Entrance is the second drive way. Drive around the car loop to park in the lot in front of the school.

School Overview

The most special and outstanding quality of Ivey Ranch is our sense of community. At Ivey Ranch, we consider ourselves to be family, and we are both literally and figuratively. Our strong sense of close relationship leads us to always putting children and their needs for learning first. We can be best described as a school built on instructional excellence, collaboration, and a passion for kids first.

Our parents at Ivey Ranch are strong partners in our collaboration. Our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) is vital to our success as they support the school, staff, and various programs. Our PTO raises funds to ensure that every child can join in every school-wide activity from our Reading Counts license fees and prizes to our 5th grade camp experience to our academic field trips. We all participate or no one participates is the sentiment behind the many and varied fund raising efforts that our creative PTO supports. Our PTO's largest fundraiser, the Fun Run, supports technology at our school. In the last few years, their tireless efforts have enabled us to purchase a classroom set of laptops and carts for each grade level 2nd through 5th grade, as well as two designated computer labs. That technological access has been a boon to our academic efforts. The PTO is a phenomenal part of our successful school family.

Parent and community support goes beyond the PTO. We regularly have teams of parents and grandparents helping classroom teachers by reading and doing math with students, making copies, filing and organizing, sending in supplies, and chaperoning. Volunteers have been critical in implementing some of our most successful interventions. We simply could not do it without their commitment in our push toward excellence. Parents run many of our incentive programs, such as Best Kids, Coyote Lunch Bunch, and Stars of the Week. Former students return to help their "old" teachers or in the library. We have a budding cross-generational partnership with the retirement community across the street. We are blessed with a community that cares, works hard, and celebrates achievement and effort. Our kids live into this model and give to us what we give to them. We are a family. In fact, many of our staffs' own children attend the school. Parents and staff attend the same birthday parties, sport practices and events, and are truly friends. There is genuine camaraderie at Ivey Ranch that is rare and precious.

Collaboration, striving for excellence, and putting kids first is a priority among the Ivey staff also. We share ideas, successes, and failures. We support each other in all ways and focus on putting "Kids First". We discuss challenges and solutions. We try not to see the obstacles, but the paths around the obstacles. We partner with parents to support children. We work in various teams to achieve specific goals, and everyone feels they have a respected voice. We help each other, not only because we are professionals, but because we are an Ivey Ranch family.

Through this collaboration, we are able to move mountains and make amazing things happen. We were **"First to 900!"** in our district and we have kept that standard for three consecutive years. Last year we pursued becoming a school of **"910 & Beyond"** and we grew by 16 point on our API to become a school of 918. We are proud of our achievements because they reflect our collective hard work, and yet we keep striving to improve and to continue to be a school of instructional excellence, collaboration, and a passion for kids first.

2012-13 Accountability Progress Reporting (APR)

School Report - API Growth and Targets Met
2013 Growth
Academic Performance Index (API) Report

California Department of Education
Analysis, Measurement, &
Accountability Reporting Division
9/19/2013

School: Ivey Ranch Elementary
LEA: Oceanside Unified
County: San Diego
CDS Code: 37-73569-6109995
School Type: Elementary

2013 Growth API Links:
- School Chart
- School Demographic Characteristics
- School Content Area Weights
- LEA List of Schools
- County List of Schools

(An LEA is a school district, county office of education, or statewide benefit charter.)

Direct Funded Charter School: No

2012-13 APR		2012-13 State API			2013 Federal AYP and PI		
Summary	**Glossary**	**Base**	**Guide**	**Growth**	**AYP**	**PI**	**Guide**

Met Growth Targets
Schoolwide: Yes
All Student Groups: Yes
All Targets: Yes

Groups

	Number of Students Included in 2013 API	Numerically Significant in Both Years	2013 Growth	2012 Base	2012-13 Growth Target	2012-13 Growth	Met Growth Target
Schoolwide	510		919	902	A	17	Yes
Black or African American	33	No	863	802			
American Indian or Alaska Native	4	No					
Asian	28	No	953	937			
Filipino	21	No	931	944			
Hispanic or Latino	138	Yes	866	846	A	20	Yes
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	11	No	926	948			
White	259	Yes	949	930	A	19	Yes
Two or More Races	11	No	909				
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	166	Yes	864	843	A	21	Yes
English Learners	54	No	807	827			
Students with Disabilities	60	No	799	766			

Signature Practices

Ivey Ranch Elementary School

Signature Practice 1 Summary

1. Name of Practice:
   Targeted Instruction in Mathematics

2. How long has this practice been in place?
   ☐ Less than 2 years ☐ 2–4 years ☑ 5–8 years ☐ 8+ years

3. What is the Target Area? (*Choose at least one area.*)

   Target Areas:
   - ☐ Career Technical Education
   - ☐ Chronic Absenteeism and Dropout Prevention
   - ☐ Civic Education Awareness
   - ☑ Closing the Achievement Gap
   - ☑ Education Supports
   - ☐ Nutrition and Physical Activity/Education
   - ☐ Parent and Community Involvement
   - ☑ Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics
   - ☐ Use of Technology
   - ☐ Visual and Performing Arts

4. What are the target populations? *(Check all that apply.)*

   Race/Ethnicity Subgroups:
   - ☑ American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - ☑ Asian
   - ☑ Black or African American
   - ☑ Filipino
   - ☑ Hispanic or Latino

(Continued on next page)

- ☑ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- ☑ White
- ☑ Two or More Races

Other Student Groups:

- ☑ Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
- ☑ English Learners
- ☑ Students with Disabilities
- ☑ At-Risk Students (Academic, Social, Emotional, Behavioral, or Health)
- ☐ English-Language Arts—Students Not Yet Proficient
- ☐ English-Language Arts—Advanced Learners
- ☑ Mathematics—Students Not Yet Proficient
- ☑ Mathematics—Advanced Learners
- ☐ Other Core Subject Areas—Students Not Yet Proficient
- ☐ Other Core Subject Areas—Advanced Learners
- ☐ Other *(specify)*

5. What strategies are used to implement the practice? (*Check all that apply.*)

Strategies:

- ☐ School Climate
- ☐ Small Learning Communities
- ☐ Parent Involvement
- ☑ Data-Driven Decision Making
- ☐ Health Support
- ☐ Social/Emotional/Behavioral Support
- ☑ Professional Development
- ☑ Other *(specify)* Questioning Strategies, Targeted Instruction

6. Is this practice initiated by your district and implemented districtwide?

Brief answer: No

Signature Practice 1 Narrative

1. Rationale/Basis of the Practice

Learning an algorithm does not make one a mathematician. Students who are able to solve equations, but are unable to solve mathematical problems do not truly understand math. Many years ago, most of our students could remember how to solve a familiar problem or memorize facts, but they struggled unsuccessfully with how to solve an unfamiliar problem. We needed to teach the kids to solve problems.

While the scores from our California Standards Test (CST), district-wide math assessments, curriculum evaluations, and teacher made tests were favorable with most of our kids, our teachers noticed in class and in student work that mathematical thinking and reasoning skills needed to be developed. Students struggled to verbalize their thinking and look for their own solutions. We discussed these concerns at our school-wide Professional Learning Community (PLC) and decided to work as grade levels to establish monthly prompts and evaluate student work on problem solving. We committed to focusing on strategically creating opportunities for problem solving, using questioning techniques to guide students, and developing students' abilities to explain their thinking.

We targeted all students in their heterogeneous classroom setting, differentiating for students who struggled, as well as for those who were ready for more complexity. Targeted instruction challenged all students and developed problem solving skills by selecting number choices that push certain mathematical concepts and skills, asking questions that guide rather than lead students to understanding, and asking students to explain, listen, and engage with each others' ideas and thinking.

Our goal was to improve our students' abilities to solve problems and use critical thinking, as well as to be able to communicate their thinking.

2. Description of the Practice

We used our PLC as vehicle for improving our math instruction. Grade level teams met to develop problems and number choices that advanced our district's scope and sequence. We presented those problems to the students with little direct instruction and provided guiding questions as needed. Math manipulatives were made available for use in representing the problems. A variety of number choices were also given within the problems to differentiate among student ability level. Students were strategically asked to share their strategies for finding their solutions for the purposes of demonstrating multiple strategies, common errors, or other mathematical elements. Students were encouraged to question, compare, and clarify each others' ideas.

We revisited student work at our bi-monthly PLC meetings and assessed the development of various student strategies. We looked for common errors or misconceptions. We evaluated our problems and number choices. We discussed challenges that students had

in approaching the problems and in sharing their strategies in solving them. We made decisions on our next steps based on the results of the current student work. We recorded how many students were successful on assignments and assessments, and determined our next steps based on the outcome of our evidence and discussions. This process was repeated month after month for eight years.

Additionally, we began instituting Math Wall and Math Journals. These routines included practice with numbers of the day, number talks, incredible equations, estimation jar, and count bys, which all develop mathematical concepts such as adjusting a given number according to a rule or pattern, representing numbers multiple ways, and developing a strong foundation of number sense. These routines are easily adjusted for complexity by the choice of numbers and are therefore able to cross grade and ability levels to support our targeted math instruction. They also build expression of students' mathematical understanding in words and writing.

Over time, we began to internalize our understanding of problem types and developmental stages. Our questioning became more natural and fluid and better targeted to the development of each child. We began to amass banks of successful problems and number choices. Periodically, at school-wide PLCs, we would discuss our progress, successes and challenges, and train each other from articles, books, and our own discoveries. We would also have substitutes cover our classes so we could observe each other individually or in groups. We were often our own best resources.

Toward the end of the 2011-12 school year, we also purchased and began to use a web-based program called Spatial-Temporal Math (ST Math). It is game-based instructional software for grades K-5 designed to increase math comprehension and proficiency through visual learning. Grade 3-5 complete 45 minutes two times a week and grades K-2 complete 30 minutes two times a week. Because it is non-linguistic and built on problem solving, our English Language Learners, students with disabilities, and others who struggle with language are able to access the program and experience success with problem solving.

Students began to feel comfortable with the struggle of solving a problem and in verbalizing their thinking. Over the years, students became comfortable with the idea that there are many strategies that can be used to solve any given problem. They learned to justify their thinking and explain their ides. Most recently, we have determined that students need to be able to record their ideas in writing as well. So we are focusing our next steps on helping students record on paper what they have been expressing out loud.

3. Results of the Practice

We monitored progress toward our PLC mathematics goals through grade level assessments and teacher made tests. We consistently made our goal of 80% of students passing with 75% accuracy or better. These scores were reported to our principal through our meeting accountability logs. When on occasion goals were not made, students were provided with additional practice and then reassessed.

Our overall Academic Performance Index (API) has increased 103 points in the past eight years. Our percentage of students who were proficient or advanced in mathematics on the CST increased 14% over the same period (see table below).

Year	API	% proficient or advanced
2004-5	816	n/a
2005-6	838	76
2006-7	848	77
2007-8	846	80
2008-9	880	85
2009-10	894	86
2010-11	903	86
2011-12	902	84
2012-13	919	90

Our students are much more able to express their ideas about mathematical concepts. They have more than one strategy to try on any given problem and can express their thought processes. Their understanding of mathematics is clear in their manipulation of numbers and communication.

We have seen a trend of student improvement overall. Below is a table that shows the percentage of students at each performance level on the Mathematics section of the CST in grades 2-5 over the past three years. This trend continues across most subgroups. Performance levels are indicated by Advanced (A), Proficient (P), Basic (B), Below Basic (BB), and Far Below Basic (FBB).

Grade	2010-2011				2011-2012				2012-2013			
	% P or A	% B	% BB	% FBB	% P or A	% B	% BB	% FBB	% P or A	% B	% BB	% FBB
2	86	10	3	1	81	12	6	0	93	6	0	1
3	87	11	2	1	84	13	2	1	86	10	4	0
4	85	11	2	2	88	10	2	0	93	7	1	0
5	85	9	4	2	84	11	5	0	90	8	2	0

Many times when a new student begins at Ivey Ranch, we are able to reflect on how far we have come over the years. New students show the same struggle with problem solving that we saw frequently eight years ago. However, after a few months of experiencing the routines of math practice, our new students begin to learn how to begin problem solving, how to represent their thinking, and how to convey their mathematical understandings.

Ivey Ranch Elementary School

Signature Practice 2 Summary

7. Name of Practice:
   Targeted Support and Intervention in English-Language Arts

8. How long has this practice been in place?
   ☐ Less than 2 years ☑ 2–4 years ☐ 5–8 years ☐ 8+ years

9. What is the Target Area? (*Choose at least one area.*)

   Target Areas:
   - ☐ Career Technical Education
   - ☐ Chronic Absenteeism and Dropout Prevention
   - ☐ Civic Education Awareness
   - ☑ Closing the Achievement Gap
   - ☑ Education Supports
   - ☐ Nutrition and Physical Activity/Education
   - ☑ Parent and Community Involvement
   - ☐ Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics
   - ☑ Use of Technology
   - ☐ Visual and Performing Arts

10. What are the target populations? *(Check all that apply.)*

    Race/Ethnicity Subgroups:
    - ☑ American Indian or Alaskan Native
    - ☑ Asian
    - ☑ Black or African American
    - ☑ Filipino
    - ☑ Hispanic or Latino
    - ☑ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
    - ☑ White
    - ☑ Two or More Races

(Continued on next page)

Other Student Groups:

- ☑ Socioeconomically Disadvantaged
- ☑ English Learners
- ☑ Students with Disabilities
- ☑ At-Risk Students (Academic, Social, Emotional, Behavioral, or Health)
- ☑ English-Language Arts—Students Not Yet Proficient
- ☐ English-Language Arts—Advanced Learners
- ☐ Mathematics—Students Not Yet Proficient
- ☐ Mathematics—Advanced Learners
- ☐ Other Core Subject Areas—Students Not Yet Proficient
- ☐ Other Core Subject Areas—Advanced Learners
- ☐ Other *(specify)*

11. What strategies are used to implement the practice? *(Check all that apply.)*

Strategies:

- ☐ School Climate
- ☑ Small Learning Communities
- ☑ Parent Involvement
- ☑ Data-Driven Decision Making
- ☐ Health Support
- ☐ Social/Emotional/Behavioral Support
- ☑ Professional Development
- ☐ Other *(specify)*

12. Is this practice initiated by your district and implemented districtwide?

Brief answer: No

Signature Practice 2 Narrative

4. Rationale/Basis of the Practice

In 2010 with the beginning of a new school year and the arrival of our new principal, Duane Legg, we began the process that most schools do of reviewing our previous year's California Standards Test (CST) assessment data. Our Academic Performance Index (API) was 893 in 2009-10. As we had in previous years, we noticed a school-wide difference between the number of students proficient or above in Math (86%) and the number of students proficient or above in English-Language Arts (70%). This trend and pattern crossed grade levels and demographics. It was a clear opportunity for growth.

As a staff, we determined that we needed were earlier interventions and supports for students that occurred in addition to core instruction. Ivey's Leadership Team took over this task and visited a sister school in our own district which had had amazing double digit gains on their API the prior year. We observed practices, programs, procedures, schedules, implementations, outcomes, and costs. We took what we saw and learned back to our site. With minimal funding at our disposal, our team decided that we would maximize the resources we already had on campus (people, technology, and programs) to develop a series of targeted interventions at each grade level. We decided that we would start by evaluating the fluency of every student in 1^{st} – 5^{th} grader using DIBELS. We identified many students at each grade level who were struggling with fluency. Eventually we also used Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Measure of Academic Progress (MAP), and grade level assessments to identify and track invention and support participants. The targeted population included students of all races, both genders, all socio-economic groups, and students with special needs.

Our goal at the time was simply to help kids read better, and increase the number of students who scored proficient and above on our CST for English-Language Arts.

5. Description of the Practice

Our interventions and supports varied according to grade level and need.

- At Kindergarten, we sent first grade sight word DVDs home with children who were below grade level to practice over the summer.
- At first grade, we had 10 of our lowest students attend Voyager Passport support with a trained paraprofessional at a 5:1 ratio two times a week for 30 minutes a day. Additionally, we trained volunteers to read with 20 first graders who were approaching grade level. This happened four times a week at 1:1 ratio with for 15-20 minutes a day in what we called "Lend an EAR". Those students also worked on reading sight words. These programs ran year long.
- In second grade, we had a paraprofessional work with our five lowest readers with Voyager Passport four times a week for 30 minutes a day. Another 20 students with low fluency participated in a computer-based fluency intervention program called Read

Naturally four times a week for 30 minutes a day with our Intervention teacher and volunteers trained to assist. These programs ran year long.

- Twenty 3rd grade students, received 30 minutes a day of three computer-based programs: Read Naturally, System 44, and Read 180. We determined that those struggling with phonics and decoding would use System 44, students struggling with fluency would use Read Naturally, and those with comprehension struggles would use Read 180. These intervention supports took place four times a week. These programs ran year long.
- Our before school program that was run by trained and vetted volunteers, and supervised by the Intervention Teacher provided opportunities to 20 students in grades 2-5 to do computer-based programs of Read Naturally, System 44, and Read 180 at a rate of four times a week for 30 minutes a day. Students in 3rd grade who could not participate during the school day due to scheduling conflict were given priority. Fourth and 5th grade students also invited before school due to scheduling needs. Any available remaining seats were offered to 2nd graders who needed extra support or other students in an attempt to maximize our capacity. These programs ran year long.
- Two additional writing supports were provided before school by two paraprofessionals who also have teaching credentials. One support was targeted for 3rd grade which had 15 far below grade level students two times a week for one hour a day and the other support was for 17 students in 4th and 5th grade, which were approaching grade level, two times a week for one hour a day. Students focused on writing paragraphs and summarizing main ideas and supporting details from texts. Each of these interventions ran 12 weeks.

Our first year (2010-11) began with gathering data and information, identifying students, and developing a plan. Our second year (2011-12) included implementing our Lend an Ear, Voyager Passport, and computer-based programs. We trained volunteers and paraprofessionals, coordinated grade level schedules, and began collecting data for evaluation of results. Our third year (2012-13) brought the addition of DVDs for Kindergarteners and targeted writing supports for grades 3-5. We also, began to build writing fluency by instituting school-wide timed writing that we call "blazing pencils". We also developed common grade level writing prompts.

Providing targeted interventions according to student need has improved achievement because it specifically addresses the student's specific challenge. It does not replace core instruction, but instead provides an additional opportunity to gain more time to work in an area of difficulty.

6. Results of the Practice

Data was collected and reviewed by our Intervention Teacher every trimester though a variety of multiple measures depending on the grade level. First grade used running records and sight word inventories. Second grade through 5th grade used SRI and MAP scores. We also had our API scores to determine annual outcomes. Each trimester's scores were shared with grade level teams and our Leadership Team. Changes in participants were made by teacher recommendation and assessment data. We supported

144 students the first year and 140 students the second year totaling about 18% student population.

In the two year span of our programs, our API scores have improved by 15 points and the number of our students in grades 2-5 who were proficient or advanced in English-Language Arts (ELA) on the CST increased by 7% (see table below).

School Year	API	% proficient or advanced ELA
2009-10	893	70
2010-11	904	75
2011-12	902	76
2012-13	918	77

We have seen a trend of student improvement overall. Below is a table that shows the percentage of students at each performance level on the English-Language Arts section of the CST in grades 2-5 over the past three years. This trend continues across most subgroups. Performance levels are indicated by Advanced (A), Proficient (P), Basic (B), Below Basic (BB), and Far Below Basic (FBB).

Grade	2010-2011				2011-2012				2012-2013			
	% P or A	% B	% BB	% FBB	% P or A	% B	% BB	% FBB	% P or A	% B	% BB	% FBB
2	75	16	6	4	73	16	4	7	78	15	6	2
3	63	24	12	2	65	27	8	0	66	26	4	4
4	79	17	3	1	84	12	4	0	86	13	1	0
5	77	15	5	2	82	17	1	1	80	17	3	0

Our 54 first graders increased their sight words by an average of 57 words the first year, and 34 first graders increased their sight words by an average of 35 words the second year. MAP and SRI increases for grades 2-5 is shown in the table below.

Grade	Number of students	2011-12 MAP increase	2011-12 SRI increase	Number of students	2012-13 MAP increase	2012-13 SRI increase
2nd	37	17	206	35	15	101
3rd	28	7	154	34	9	133
4th & 5th	25	7	102	37	5	132

In reviewing the data, it confirms the idea the staff had initially, early intervention yields greater results. We discovered that Lend an EAR was effective with our first grade students. We found Voyager Passport to yield limited results in both 1st and 2nd grades and have since replaced this intervention. We found Read Naturally to be an excellent tool for fluency support, especially in 2nd grade. We also learned that System 44 helped some students, but not others and when those students were switched to Read 180, their outcomes improved.

We also found that a very small number of students did not respond to computer-based interventions at all.

One of the unintended outcomes of our interventions and supports is that our Special Education Team has noticed that our process for identifying students for Special Education services has become more targeted and efficient. We are not evaluating as many students who are simply low academically, but do not have a disability. Exclusive of parent requested evaluations, our team qualified 90% of the students who were evaluated. Early interventions have made it easier to identify who needs to be evaluated for specialized and individual support.

The outcome of our three year effort to improve our English-Language Arts CST scores has yielded positive results. We have already identified changes in our supports that we will make and we have determined which programs and strategies we will continue because they work well.