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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 2007-2008 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have 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 2002 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. Throughout the document, round numbers to the nearest whole number to avoid decimals, except for numbers below 1, which should be rounded to the nearest tenth.

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

1. Number of schools in the district:

| 3 | Elementary schools |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1 | Middle schools |
| $\square$ | Junior High Schools |
| $\square$ | High schools |
| 5 | Other |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 7771

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: $\qquad$ 7466

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)
3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located
[ ] Urban or large central city
[X] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban are
[ ] Suburban
[ ] Small city or town in a rural are
[ ] Rural
4. $\qquad$ Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
$\qquad$ 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 <br> Males | \# of <br> Females | Grade <br> Total | Grade | \# of <br> Males | \# of <br> Females | Grade <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre K |  |  | 0 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 96 | 100 | 196 |
| K |  |  | 0 | $\mathbf{8}$ | 88 | 110 | 198 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ |  |  | 0 | $\mathbf{9}$ |  |  | 0 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ |  |  | 0 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  |  | 0 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ |  |  | 0 | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |  |  | 0 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  | 0 | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |  |  | 0 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 109 | 97 | $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | Other |  |  | 0 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 83 | 99 | 182 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

| 1 | \% American Indian or Alaska Native |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | \% Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 49 | \% Black or African American |
| 2 | \% Hispanic or Latino |
| 47 | \% White |
| 100 | \% TOTAL |

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.
7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past yea
22 \%

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

| (1) | Number of students who <br> transferred to the school after <br> October 1 until the end of the year | 87 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| ( 2 ) | Number of students who <br> transferred from the school after <br> October 1 until the end of the year | 86 |
| ( 3 ) | Total of all transferred students <br> [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 173 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the <br> school as of October 1 | 782 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row <br> (3) divided by total students in row | 0.22 |
| A ) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 22 |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: $\qquad$ \% 2 Total Number Limited English Proficient
Number of languages represented 1

Specify languages: Spanish
9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals $69 \%$

Total number students who qualify: 530

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.
$\qquad$ \%

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

| 6 | Autism | 2 | Orthopedic Impairment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | Deafness | 26 | Other Health Impairment |
| 0 | Deaf-Blindnes | 95 | Specific Learning Disabilit |
| 7 | Emotional Disturbanc | 1 | Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 | Hearing Impairment | 1 | Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 15 | Mental Retardation | 0 | Visual Impairment Including |
| 0 | Multiple Disabilities |  | Blind |

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) | 5 | 0 |
| Classroom teachers | 50 | 0 |
| Special resource teachers/specialist | 9 | 0 |
| Paraprofessionals | 8 | 0 |
| Support Staff | 3 | 0 |
| Total number | 75 | 0 |

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
13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Please explain a high teacher turnover rate. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student dropoff 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 in attendance, dropout or the drop-off rates. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates, and only high schools need to supply drop-off

|  | $2006-2007$ | $2005-2006$ | $2004-2005$ | $2003-2004$ | $2002-2003$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daily student attendance | 96 | $\%$ | 96 | $\%$ | 95 | $\%$ | 95 | $\%$ | 96 | $\%$ |
| Daily teacher attendance | 93 | $\%$ | 94 | $\%$ | 94 | $\%$ | 94 | $\%$ | 93 | $\%$ |
| Teacher turnover rate | 17 | $\%$ | 19 | $\%$ | 17 | $\%$ | 12 | $\%$ | 19 | $\%$ |
| Student drop out rate (middle/high | 0 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ |
| Student drop-off rate (high school | 0 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ |

## Please provide all explanations below

Attendance for students and teachers has stayed relatively consistent over the last five years. The teacher turnover rate fell in 2003-2004 but rose again from 2004-2007. This was in part due to the leadership change in 2004. Several instructional changes were

## PART III - SUMMARY

At Liberty-Eylau Middle School, we believe that quality teaching is the foundation for learning. Our mission is to provide students with an atmosphere built on respect and high expectations. Success begins with everyone joining together to ensure that each and every student has an opportunity to reach their highest potential. With an economically disadvantaged population of $70 \%$, we are faced with many challenges to continue to close the achievement gap and help students believe in themselves and their capabilities. We believe in 100\% engagement, $100 \%$ of the time and our staff continues on a journey toward excellence. Our students are expected to learn, be respectful and believe that a positive attitude can make all the difference.

We began our journey together in 2004-2005 with a foundation of discipline, teaching, and respect was established based on what research has determined as critical components of an exemplary campus: high academic and behavioral expectations, school-wide classroom discipline, firm and fair administrative discipline plan, consistency, strong academic focus, data driven instruction, visible administration, structure and organization, staff commitment, positive relationships, and an atmosphere of respect.

What began to happen over time was a transformation where students began to feel successful, teachers began to feel confident and supported, and the campus as a whole began a paradigm shift into the thought process of 'I can' and 'I believe.' As this thought process began to take hold, we adopted the 'power of I' as our campus motto. Students and teachers all created their own 'I statements' that reflect their thoughts and beliefs. Here are a couple of examples of what our students believe, 'I can start small to make a big difference,' and 'I can't give up now because I have come too far from where I started from.' A couple of favorites from our teachers include, 'I am inspired by the creativity of my students,' and 'I want to motivate you to be confident in your beliefs, focus on your goals, and find direction in your life.'

Teachers began working together more as teams, planning together, sharing ideas, working together vertically to ensure alignment across grade levels. We continue today to plan as grade levels across the curriculum as well as by department. At Liberty-Eylau Middle School, we have an open door policy where during instructional times all our doors are open and you can see teachers teaching and students learning. As we have progressed academically, our students are more involved in projects and research based assignments, and teachers are beginning to incorporate technology as an integral part of instruction with the benefits of class sets of wireless laptops that can be brought into the classroom.

A group of teachers and support staff form a leadership team that meets periodically. Currently we are reading and discussing the book, 'The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership' by John Maxwell. Involving staff members in leadership activities creates a depth within the campus that begins to empower them to make decisions regarding teaching and learning.

Our students all have choices to make and are encouraged to participate in a variety of extra-curriculuar activities that provide them with a well rounded middle school experience. Teachers go to extracurriculuar events to cheer our teams and students on; participate in pep rallies; and come to our students' dances. Some staff members even mentor students and make sure that they have whatever is necessary so that they can participate in positive school activities. We believe in our own power to make positive things happen for students.

## 1. Assessment Results:

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is the state agency for all public schools in Texas. TEA has four basic performance levels that all schools are assigned following the state assessments each year. The performance levels are Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable. All information regarding state accountability can be found at www.tea.state.tx.us.

In order for a school to receive an Exemplary Rating, all student groups and subgroups in all subject areas must score $90 \%$ or higher on all tests taken. A recognized rating requires $75 \%$ or higher on all tests taken. All tests are given a standard passing score and a commended performance score as levels of achievement. It is not only our desire for students to pass, but we strive to have more students reach commended performance levels.

Our documented subgroups include all students, African American, Hispanic, white, and economically disadvantaged children. One of the largest discrepancies was the passing rate between our white population and the African American subgroup. Another area of concern was our economically disadvantaged population. With 70\% of our students eligible for free/reduced lunches, these scores presented one of our largest gaps in achievement levels.

Reading scores in 2002-2003 were 63\% for all students, $51 \%$ for African Americans, $62 \%$ for Hispanics, $73 \%$ for white students, and $55 \%$ for economically disadvantaged students. In the complete data table, you can see the growth by year that we have made beginning with the 2004-2005 school year. Over a three year period, the campus has shown growth in all content areas. Reading scores in 2006-2007 were 93\% for all students, $88 \%$ for African Americans, $99 \%$ for Hispanics, $96 \%$ for white students, and $91 \%$ for economically disadvantaged students.

Mathematics scores in 2002-2003 were 37\% for all students, $27 \%$ for African American students, $23 \%$ for Hispanic students, $47 \%$ for white students, and $30 \%$ for economically disadvantaged students. Mathematics scores in 2006-2007 were 88\% for all students, $83 \%$ for African American students, $86 \%$ for Hispanic students, $93 \%$ for White students, and $85 \%$ for economically disadvantaged students. Our growth has been consistent beginning with the 2004-2005 school year.

The dedication and commitment to our students by our staff members is one of the defining reasons our students are exceeding expectations in all areas. We have successfully lowered the achievement gaps between subgroups year by year. Our students are no longer 'barely' getting by, they are beginning to reach commended levels of performance at a much higher rate. In 2003, only $63 \%$ of all students were successful on the state reading assessment where in 2007, $93 \%$ of our students not only passed the state assessment $39 \%$ of them scored commended performance with only $11 \%$ reaching that level in reading in 2003.

In mathematics, with only $37 \%$ of all students passing and less than $4 \%$ reaching commended performance in 2003, our 2007 scores showed $88 \%$ of all students passing with $24 \%$ receiving commended performance. An even more impressive accomplishment for our students and teachers is that in 2005, 2006 and 2007 we exceeded the state passing percentage each year for all students performing at or above the state standard. As our students continue to grow, we continue to challenge them in new and different ways to push them to higher levels of achievement.

## 2. Using Assessment Results:

Assessment results are used in a variety of ways to provide our staff with relevant information that can raise student achievement. We use the state's released assessment tests as practice exams. Materials are also purchased that are closely aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) test to supplement those released tests. With the combination of informal and formal assessments, teachers can get a clear picture and plan instruction that meets the needs of every student.

Teachers informally assess students through daily classroom observations, instant feedback using individual dry erase boards, and question/inquiry on individual students along with group responses in classroom activities. Formal assessments are done by project rubrics, written examinations, and checkpoint assessments with the summative assessment being the TAKS test. Three formal practice asser farsare given prior to the actual TAKS test. Data templates are completed following each Page of 19
checkpoint that provide teachers with an overall score for each child, a percent correct for each objective, along with an item analysis of each question for every student.

Using this formal data, teachers are able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each and every student so that instruction can be individualized to better meet their needs. Following each checkpoint, core departments are provided with a planning day to analyze the data and plan instructional objectives and activities. The student's growth is monitored closely throughout the year by teachers, support staff, and administration.

## 3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Student Success Initiative (SSI), we periodically send updates home to the parents for students in fifth and eighth grades regarding their progress, grades, and assessment data. Teachers consistently report student progress to parents through phone calls, progress reports, report cards, email, and/or letters for all students enrolled. Newsletters are periodically sent home with students along with being placed on our website for review. Those newsletters may be accessed at www.leisd.net.

Assessment data is also communicated to parents via phone or written letters when students are identified to be in need of additional assistance in order to reach their level of potential. Each year following the state assessment, we receive individual student reports that go home with each child detailing their score and how well they did broken down by objective. Informational letters on how to read the reports are sent home with the results as well. A school report card from the Texas Education Agency that outlines our performance in regard to the state assessment system is sent home once a year to all parents. The district periodically sends out an insert in the local newspaper highlighting campus successes and activities.

Each year at the beginning of the year, our journalism teacher starts saving pictures of all campus activities. From those pictures and the spring TAKS results, we then create a DVD that highlights the year. We complete the DVD the night scores are received and the following morning an assembly is held to show the DVD to students and faculty. This year we plan to include our parents and community members in an open house celebration.

## 4. Sharing Success:

The first level of sharing begins internally with a staff committed to collaboration and team work to help each other grow professionally. We utilize team teaching and peer observations to share ideas and successful teaching strategies. Staff members participate as mentor teachers to university student teachers and new teachers providing them with valuable ideas and resources.

The next level of sharing comes from letting parents know of our successes. Everyone is invited to open houses, student performances, and many other extracurricular activities that showcase our students and teachers. Student work is displayed in our hallways and it is evident that the work they produce is valuable to all of us. We have a Principal's Wall of Excellence that displays exemplary student work in all content areas. We hold Realtor's Luncheons at the middle school campus, plus a Veteran's Day celebration to honor soldiers, and an annual community breakfast where students and teachers are commended for their hard work.

Our social studies teachers were invited to present at the Texas Social Studies Teachers Conference. Science teachers present at the local collaborative and share ideas with other science teachers. Our Spanish teacher was invited by TEA to review the Linguistic Simplification Guide to analyze test items. One of our math teachers has been asked to write a sixth grade math journal of problems accompanied by a teacher edition.

Future plans include expanding our presentations to other districts and state workshops. The math teachers already have a proposal ready requesting to present at the mathematics teachers conference this summer. As a Texas Business and Education Coalition 2007 Honor Roll School and a 2008 Blue Ribbon Nominee, we hope to be able to continue to learn from and help others as presenters and observers.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

## 1. Curriculum:

The middle school offers instruction in all content areas with additional elective choices designed to give students many opportunities to explore their interests. They are able to explore options in theater arts, choir, art, sculpting, band, and journalism. Spanish is offered to 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students and allows students to complete one year of Spanish for high school credit. Our Spanish teacher also has an English/language arts course so those classes are closely tied to our English/language arts classes. The teachers at LEMS continue to strengthen each year as a team that supports one another and works collaboratively together. All fine arts and elective teachers work with our core content teachers reinforcing basic vocabulary as well as higher level thinking skills.

In mathematics, teachers plan horizontally and vertically to align the curriculum. They team teach and utilize flexible grouping to better differentiate instruction. Grade level teams collaborate to write grants that provide students with additional resources for learning activities. Students are immersed in hands on mathematics and real world activities as well as consistent teaching that provides them with a strong mathematical foundation. The mathematics department utilizes a variety of instructional resources including TAKS Master, TAKS Coach, Step Up to TAKS, the state adopted textbook, and released TAKS materials. We have also participated in the Dallas, Texas based stock market game. The fifth grade math team collaborates to make a fifth grade math handbook that each student takes home. It includes such items as the TEKS, TAKS objectives, sample problems and strategies, vocabulary and student expectations in the classroom and includes a student/parent contract.

The reading/English language arts department works together to provide consistent reading instructional strategies to ensure fluency across grade levels. Accelerated Reader is a part of the curriculum as a motivational reading tool to encourage students to read for enjoyment. Students diagnosed with dyslexia are provided specialized instruction in addition to their regular reading instruction. We have also utilized a very prescriptive reading program for struggling readers to increase decoding strategies and reading fluency to ultimately increase their reading comprehension.

Science, mathematics and social studies content is used to provide interdisciplinary teaching opportunities. Social studies classes provide students with opportunities to participate in role playing activities by reenacting elements of history such as the Boston Tea Party. The department uses Elmo's to provide students with the ability to view maps in full color, historical documents, and texts that they have been unable to use as a teaching tool in the past. They also have projection systems in all classrooms that enhance instruction with the use of streaming videos from www.unitedstreaming.com and www.enchantedlearning.com which enables students to experience and visit places first hand.

Our science teachers focus on multiple instructional methods to increase student learning. They also plan together as a department and participate in a science collaborative with numerous other teachers. As a supplemental resource, we use Measuring Up student workbooks and the Measuring Up E-Path online program to provide students and teachers with instant feedback. With this resource, the teachers are able to individually plan instruction for each student based on their strengths and weaknesses. The program analyzes student performance and gives the teachers prescriptive data on a weekly basis.

The campus is moving toward a more differentiated learning environment that focuses on each specific child's needs. For example, our special needs students visit a ranch and are given the opportunity to therapeutically ride horses. More research based projects are utilized and hands-on activities supplement a strong instructional foundation.

## 2b. (Secondary Schools) English:

The curriculum for the reading/English language arts department also provides teachers with a variety of resources to enhance students' overall reading capabilities. First, they utilize grade level planning time as well as departmental planning days to compare and share instructional reading strategies that are followed consistently be each grade level. Teachers work with students not only on basic reading fluency but comprehension skills as well. We use curriculum materials from a variety of sources including instructional material from Region XIII and Region VIII service centers. The teachers are also provided with novels and
supplemental TAKS materials that provide application of the skills learned in the context that students will be assessed.

We have utilized a very prescriptive reading program for struggling readers that was teacher directed and focused on decoding skills for reading fluency. As students moved through the program and reading improved, more comprehension activities were included. This instruction was provided as additional reading instruction combined with their regular reading/English language arts classes. Students diagnosed with dyslexia are provided specialized instruction in addition to their regular reading classes by a teacher specifically trained to teach students with dyslexia.

Accelerated Reader is a part of the curriculum as a motivational reading program that encourages students to enjoy reading. The best way to read better is to read more and appreciate literature. Teachers use novels to provide specific instruction on skills along with helping the students find a love for reading. Vocabulary has become a campus wide initiative where all disciplines are working with students on vocabulary. More and more teachers are using word walls within the classrooms and even our building hallways are filled with vocabulary words and their meanings as well as pictures that represent the word and provide a visual image for students.

## 3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Improving the science curriculum is a continuous and ongoing effort to find ways to help students increase their knowledge and become more comfortable in laboratory settings. We have found that for students to be truly successful with science it takes a multi-level approach. Students need the concepts taught independently through discussion, questioning, and visuals, but more importantly, they need to be able to experience that concept in a laboratory or hands-on environment to make connections and transfer what was taught in the classroom environment. The final piece comes in teaching students to apply what they have learned in the classroom and through experiments back to how they will be assessed.

The teachers utilize a variety of resources including video streaming clips from www.thefutureschannel.com and www.unitedstreaming.com where they can see things such as the effects of weathering and volcanoes. Our science department is committed to aligning the science curriculum across all four grades and creating vocabulary rich environments that focus on each student's needs. As a supplemental resource, we use the Measuring Up E-Path online diagnostic program along with the student workbook. The online program provides teachers and students with information about each individual child and immediate feedback to assessment.

Science has become a campus initiative where everyone is working together for the students. In reading/English language arts, science vocabulary and content are used while teaching comprehension strategies. Math and science work closely together in teaching measurement, charts and graphs. All elective teachers are incorporating science content and vocabulary into their daily routine. As a team, our staff is finding ways to help every student succeed.

## 4. Instructional Methods:

Instructional methods just as curriculum evolve over time as the campus grows and changes. We have used several instructional delivery methods including direct instruction with questioning and inquiry. More recently the teachers have been providing students with opportunities for discovery learning, cooperative groups, and research based instruction where the students are more independent thinkers and learners.

In order to provide a well rounded education for all students, the teachers use flexible grouping arrangements, visual aides, video streaming, hands-on experiements, and project based learning. With the addition of over 130 laptops and one cart with 25 computers per grade level, a fully wireless campus, and three additional computer labs, our students and teachers are beginning to look at learning in very different ways. The ability to provide every student in a classroom with a computer to do independent research, create charts and graphs, utilize online testing that provides immediate feedback and reteaching is a valuable commodity that we are proud to provide our staff and student body.

In order to provide a more focused and calm learning environment, we implemented a completely bell free environment. This feature of our daily routine provides for smooth transitions between classes where students and teachers are not rushing to and from classrooms. Although everyone does follow a precise schedule, it allows for some freedoms when teachers work together instructionally. It can allow for flexible scheduling when certain teachers or departments are working on project based assignments or if a particular lesson needs additional time. We use every resource available to provide additional methods of instruction that give every learner the opportunity to be successful. It is critical to allow the auditory learner to hearibtis kieddal learner to see, and the kinesthetic learner to move.

## 5. Professional Development:

Over the course of the last 4 years, staff development was first implemented to help the teachers understand data and its impact on instruction. We held some extensive training in deconstructing the state's released tests. Training was also provided in closing the achievement gap and working with students of poverty. This was followed up with training on data analysis and how to use the test deconstruction to provide students with the best instruction. We use data consistently on our campus to monitor students' strengths and how to address their areas of weakness.

Over the last year, we have begun to look at different areas of staff development. A core group of leaders on the campus including department heads, grade level leaders, curriculum officers, and principals got together for a year of meetings and planning. We elected to begin training on how to differentiate instruction in the classroom to focus on the specific needs of each student. At first, we had one of our own teachers who has extensive training on differentiating instruction complete an initial two day training on what differentiated instruction is and looks like. We have followed with additional training on differentiating instruction in the classroom.

We believe that there is one thing that makes all the difference in the world. It's essentially what happens when that teacher walks in the classroom and begins teaching. Their natural ability coupled with training and their desire to make students successful is the key to all our success. We look for teachers to hire with those capabilities. Our staff is open to learn new things and they learn from one another and sometimes that is the best form of staff development.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Subject Reading (LA) | Grade 5 |  | Test Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Edition/Publication Year |  | $2003-2007$ |  | Publisher Texas Education Agency |
|  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | Feb/April | Feb/April | Feb/April | Feb/April | Feb/April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 85 | 92 | 82 | 59 | 60 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 21 | 15 | 20 | 16 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 173 | 146 | 156 | 172 | 159 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 99 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 26 | 33 | 31 | 30 | 34 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 13 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 17 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ African American |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 76 | 87 | 75 | 46 | 55 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Perfromance | 18 | 13 | 14 | 5 | 4 |
| Number of students tested | 81 | 79 | 73 | 64 | 78 |
| $2 . \quad$ White |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 93 | 98 | 87 | 67 | 65 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 24 | 18 | 25 | 23 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 85 | 62 | 81 | 107 | 77 |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 83 | 91 | 77 | 43 | 55 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 21 | 11 | 15 | 9 | 6 |
| Number of students tested | 121 | 110 | 98 | 99 | 85 |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 6
Test Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)
Edition/Publication Year 2003-2007
Publisher Texas Education Agency

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 94 | 95 | 89 | 82 | 71 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 53 | 44 | 35 | 18 | 12 |
| Number of students tested | 150 | 145 | 158 | 163 | 149 |
| Percent of total students tested | 98 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 99 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 27 | 36 | 34 | 32 | 29 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 17 | 20 | 18 | 16 | 16 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ African American |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 92 | 95 | 84 | 78 | 66 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 44 | 37 | 18 | 15 | 9 |
| Number of students tested | 81 | 65 | 67 | 80 | 66 |
| $2 . \quad$ White |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 97 | 96 | 93 | 88 | 75 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 65 | 49 | 48 | 22 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | 63 | 78 | 90 | 79 | 80 |
| $3 . \quad$ Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 94 | 94 | 86 | 75 | 68 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 50 | 39 | 26 | 10 | 9 |
| Number of students tested | 108 | 93 | 85 | 86 | 92 |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 7 $\qquad$ Test Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)
Edition/Publication Year 2003-2007
Publisher Texas Education Agency

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 96 | 88 | 86 | 67 | 75 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 28 | 26 | 27 | 10 | 6 |
| Number of students tested | 138 | 165 | 169 | 159 | 178 |
| Percent of total students tested | 98 | 99 | 98 | 98 | 99 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 41 | 35 | 37 | 30 | 30 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 22 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 14 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ African American |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 94 | 82 | 83 | 56 | 66 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 17 | 18 | 20 | 6 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 66 | 71 | 86 | 69 | 86 |
| $2 . \quad$ White |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 97 | 94 | 90 | 75 | 85 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 38 | 34 | 36 | 13 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 69 | 88 | 78 | 85 | 88 |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 94 | 82 | 82 | 65 | 70 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 21 | 19 | 23 | 5 | 4 |
| Number of students tested | 86 | 96 | 77 | 87 | 103 |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 8 $\qquad$ Test Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)
Edition/Publication Year 2003-2007
Publisher Texas Education Agency

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 97 | 94 | 86 | 85 | 78 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 49 | 41 | 34 | 21 | 19 |
| Number of students tested | 165 | 164 | 155 | 164 | 155 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 98 | 100 | 98 | 98 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 38 | 33 | 29 | 36 | 40 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 19 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ African American |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 93 | 92 | 83 | 77 | 69 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 42 | 33 | 24 | 10 | 11 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 85 | 67 | 80 | 72 |
| 2. White |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 99 | 97 | 88 | 92 | 87 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 56 | 51 | 41 | 32 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 85 | 73 | 83 | 82 | 79 |
| $3 . \quad$ Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 94 | 93 | 86 | 76 | 71 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards Commended Performance | 39 | 32 | 30 | 16 | 17 |
| Number of students tested | 94 | 79 | 77 | 79 | 84 |
| $4 .$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 90 | 93 | 92 | 54 | 54 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 36 | 28 | 32 | 9 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 172 | 146 | 148 | 172 | 159 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 99 | 99 | 98 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 24 | 40 | 40 | 30 | 34 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 12 | 22 | 21 | 15 | 17 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ African American |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 84 | 93 | 89 | 38 | 50 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 30 | 18 | 16 | 5 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 81 | 78 | 69 | 64 | 77 |
| $2 . \quad$ White |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 96 | 95 | 94 | 65 | 59 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 43 | 43 | 47 | 11 | 10 |
| Number of students tested | 85 | 63 | 77 | 107 | 79 |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 90 | 93 | 90 | 42 | 46 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 33 | 23 | 24 | 4 | 1 |
| Number of students tested | 125 | 111 | 90 | 100 | 86 |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 83 | 89 | 75 | 52 | 52 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 26 | 29 | 22 | 9 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 152 | 147 | 157 | 163 | 149 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 99 | 98 | 99 | 99 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 27 | 36 | 33 | 32 | 30 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 15 | 20 | 17 | 16 | 17 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ African American |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 78 | 83 | 70 | 38 | 48 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 20 | 17 | 15 | 3 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 82 | 65 | 68 | 80 | 65 |
| $2 . \quad$ White |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 88 | 93 | 80 | 68 | 55 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 34 | 39 | 28 | 15 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 64 | 80 | 88 | 79 | 79 |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 80 | 86 | 69 | 43 | 48 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 22 | 27 | 26 | 3 | 3 |
| Number of students tested | 110 | 94 | 84 | 87 | 94 |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 88 | 71 | 75 | 31 | 38 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 15 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of students tested | 141 | 164 | 165 | 159 | 175 |
| Percent of total students tested | 98 | 98 | 96 | 98 | 98 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 38 | 34 | 37 | 30 | 31 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 21 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 15 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ African American |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 82 | 62 | 67 | 22 | 22 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 67 | 70 | 83 | 68 | 85 |
| $2 . \quad$ White |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 94 | 79 | 86 | 37 | 55 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 21 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 2 |
| Number of students tested | 71 | 88 | 77 | 86 | 86 |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 84 | 60 | 66 | 24 | 28 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of students tested | 88 | 96 | 62 | 87 | 101 |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 89 | 75 | 62 | 40 | 50 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 17 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of students tested | 163 | 162 | 153 | 165 | 153 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 98 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 38 | 33 | 29 | 36 | 40 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 20 | 17 | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ African American |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 87 | 73 | 56 | 25 | 33 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 14 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Number of students tested | 72 | 83 | 67 | 80 | 71 |
| $2 . \quad$ White |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 94 | 78 | 67 | 55 | 64 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 20 | 19 | 12 | 7 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 84 | 73 | 81 | 83 | 78 |
| 3. Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard <br> Met Standard plus Commended Performance | 87 | 66 | 57 | 33 | 45 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Commended Performance | 9 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Number of students tested | 94 | 79 | 77 | 80 | 82 |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

