

Perry and Associates, Inc.

1. What evidence demonstrates your organization's successful experience in working with school, staff, site planning teams, administrators, and district staff in underperforming schools to reach consensus and take action to: assess, refine and revise school action plans; and make recommendations to maximize the use of fiscal and human resources in achieving the goals of the plan?

Perry and Associates, Inc. (P&A) is a national educational consulting firm that helps districts and schools meet the demands of standards-based reform and No Child Left Behind. Our approach is simple: We attack problems at the district and school levels by showing leaders how to deliver research-based practices that are driven by data and the experiences of others. Our techniques build district capacity to support school improvement and sustain the ability of schools to improve themselves. Currently, we are supporting school and district improvement efforts in Flint (MI), on behalf of the Panasonic Foundation in Atlanta (GA) and Norfolk (VA) public schools, and the National Staff Development Council's "12 Under 12" school network. We have worked with IIUSP/High Priority schools in Long Beach and San Diego California since 2000. Each of the schools we have supported has made continuous and significant growth in improving student achievement as measured by California Standards Tests and/or California High School Exit Exam.

Our approaches that assist low-performing schools develop their capacity to improve teaching and learning are consistent with the California State Board of Education criteria for improving low-performing schools and have been recognized nationally. Our approaches include the following:

- We believe that school reform is situational; that is each high school has conditions that contribute to its success and challenges and the approaches must be tailored to the school's conditions. For example, schools with veteran faculty who know and are part of the history of the school require different approaches to improve teaching and learning than schools that have inexperienced or highly mobile staff. Interventions are more likely to be successful if they are tailored to the culture, climate and history of the school.
- Further, we believe that faculty and staff improvement best occurs through structured activities that engage adults in learning through experiences. Therefore, after an initial period of investigating the school's performance, history, culture and relationships, we help create opportunities for leaders to improve and change their practices through action.
- One of the ways that we help diverse groups create consensus around improving student achievement is by assisting each high school create a leadership team that uses data (CST and CAHSEE, attendance, and Grade Point Average) to identify areas in student achievement in need of improvement, gaps among the academic achievement of ethnic subgroups, and strategies for improving the school culture and climate in

support of student achievement. The leadership team includes the elected or designated leaders of the school such as: principals, assistant principals, head counselors, attendance officers, department heads, lead teachers of small learning communities, and representatives of teacher unions and other school groups. The leadership team meets once a month, including semi-annual retreats. We plan and facilitate the meetings with the school's principal and other leaders so that school leaders are seen as "owning the improvement agenda" and we gradually release responsibility to them.

- Each meeting has a dual purpose of deepening knowledge about an aspect of improving student achievement, and accomplishing tasks related to the school-wide action plan. We draw on a wide array of articles on research and emerging best practices to build the leadership team's knowledge and stimulate discussion about strategies and activities to improve student achievement and eliminate the achievement gap. We have found that the adults are better able to make critical and demanding changes as they broaden and deepen their knowledge base.
- The leadership team has responsibility for developing, reaching consensus on, and executing an action plan each year. The action plan is organized around three goals – improving the achievement of students in each content area, eliminating gaps in achievement among ethnic subgroups of students, and improving the school's culture and climate in support of student achievement. An outreach plan for engaging parents and the community to support improving student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps, and for seeking the opinions of students in improvement strategies are included in the action plans.
- Each action plan includes (1) clearly-stated measurable, annual objectives for improvements in student achievement and/or culture/climate; (2) strategies for meeting the objectives; (3) activities for each strategy; (4) resources needed to accomplish the activities; (5) the learning adults will need to gain in order to implement the strategies; and (6) evidence of progress that will be collected during the year. The development of the first plan can take up-to-six months depending on the leadership team's familiarity with data-based decision making, using action plans to focus and drive improvement efforts, and the receptivity and experience of the school's faculty and staff in shared decision making.
- In addition to developing the school-wide action plan, the leadership team members join cross-school work groups that assume responsibility for designing and implementing strategies and activities in the school-wide plan. Examples of these include developing a CAHSEE intervention program for 11th graders who did not pass the math or English portion of the CAHSEE on their first attempt, or developing a plan to increase outreach and involvement of parents into strategies to improve student achievement.
- We believe that plans to improve student academic achievement are best made by those responsible for implementing the plans. In high schools,

the academic departments, with administrative and external consultant support, have responsibility for improving student achievement within their content areas. Each academic department (core departments of math, English and English Language Development as well as non-core departments) create action plans aligned with the school-wide action plan and based on CST and CAHSEE performance data. Department heads and academic coaches meet with the administrator responsible for supervising the department and a consultant each month to review the progress made in accomplishing the department's plan, and to reach consensus on next steps. Often, a next step is to meet with departments during release time and conference periods to discuss aspects of the action plan that appear not to meet expectations.

- We also believe that student achievement depends on everyone taking responsibility for improving performance, holding each other accountable for progress, and operating within scope of their responsibility and roles. One way that consensus emerges and action is taken is through a multi-step process of (1) clarifying roles and responsibilities, (2) building the expertise of administrators, faculty and staff to exercise their roles well, and (3) meeting regularly to discuss and monitor progress and resolve issues. For example, principals alone cannot bear the burden of improving student achievement in large high schools. They need to create systems of “distributive leadership” in which responsibility and authority is shared with others based upon their formal roles within the organization. We assist principals clarify the responsibilities of assistant principals to supervise individual academic departments as principals focus their attention on assuming responsibility for English and math departments. We help principals and assistant principals refine their role and responsibilities so that they can make time for supporting departments in improving student achievement, learn how to collaborate with department leaders, engage teachers in conversations about improving teaching and learning, and manage the demands on their time.
- We assist leadership teams, academic departments and groups of adults act as “professional learning communities.” We have developed with Long Beach USD a continuum for measuring progress on becoming a community in which adults learn through collegiality, inquiry and consensus building. We introduce the continuum to the leadership and administrative teams at appropriate times to help them reflect on how well they are working to build consensus as they collaborate toward improving student achievement.
- In some of the schools, building the knowledge and skills of the leadership and other teams within the schools leads to exploration of creating small learning communities as a structure that supports the goals of improving student achievement and building a positive climate.

2. What evidence, including student achievement data, does your organization have that it can send a team with demonstrated successful experience in each of the 13 SBE-adopted criteria?

Our nine-person team consists of two leads, five Long Beach USD high school principals working with low-performing schools – two who are responsible for supervising ELA and ELD departments, one who has responsibility for supervising a math department, one who has experience in language acquisition, and one who has designed discipline and security policies and practices in several schools - and an assistant principal and an academic coach (lead teacher) who has lead the design math interventions in low-performing schools. They know the processes and practical considerations that must be addressed if student achievement in English and math are to be improved. Our team members have received training in California SBE-adopted criteria and have implemented these criteria in their schools. Specific examples and data follow:

- Criteria A and B – implementing, supporting and supervising instruction using content standards and state-adopted materials: State-adopted materials and intervention programs (Holt, Language!, and FastTrack in English; and state-adopted text algebra and geometry) are used in our team members’ schools. Our team members have assisted department chairs, academic coaches (full-time content area teachers who provide continuous group and individual professional development in use of materials, standards-based instruction, and curriculum planning) and teachers in use of the texts, assessments and supplemental materials. In addition, our team members have assisted teachers to redesign their curriculum maps, units of study and lessons to scaffold activities so that students may access grade level text and algebra and geometry content and standards.
- Criteria C - Implementing an organized program to help ELL students acquire linguistic and academic proficiency: Our team has provided support for teachers in implementing Highpoint text, curriculum and supplemental materials for ELD I-IV students, and integrating SDAIE strategies for ELL students into lessons in English and math curriculum. Our team members have experience helping schools design systems to assure students are CELDT tested receive continuous support to enroll and be successful in rigorous academic courses. For example, one of the schools we work with made significant progress in improving the number of students meeting the criterion for English proficiency on the CELDT.

Grade	9th		10th		11th		12th	
Year	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005
# students	149	179	114	193	126	163	92	166
% Students	40%	52%	33%	60%	40%	58%	43%	61%
# Tested	372	341	346	322	315	279	213	273

- Criteria D – Using assessment data from multiple sources: As mentioned in response to question 1, we build the whole school’s ability, through Baldrige and other strategies to use data to improve teaching and by facilitating the leadership team’s action planning process and the action planning process for the individual academic department’s action plan. In all cases, each department is assisted in reviewing CST and CAHSEE data and to identify students in need of support and interventions. Using data, we help schools place students in double-block algebra and English courses to enable them to maintain pace in a rigorous course of study that would qualify them for post-secondary education. Student progress in math and English classes are monitored, reports are sent to parents, and students are provided with opportunities for tutoring. If progress is not made, reassignment into other intervention classes occurs.
- Criteria E – Providing accelerated and successful academic intervention programs: Our team has experience in implementing the Language! and Linda Mood Bell reading interventions and instructional strategies embedded into language arts courses including reduced class-size, instructional strategies that use multiple approaches to learning (differentiated instruction), and research-based instructional strategies that include note taking and summarization techniques. We have also worked with high school counselors to encourage students to utilize tutoring available on “zero periods” or after school. We have made steady progress in increasing the number of students successful in reading interventions, particularly moving students from Far Below Basic to Basic and from Basic to Proficient in ELA CST (see, for example, Cabrillo H.S. CST data in response to question 4 on page 15).
- Criteria F – Providing professional development: As mentioned in our response to question 1, professional learning is at the heart of all of our efforts so that the work and progress continues long after we leave. Each of the school-wide and department action plans identify professional learning needed for administrators, faculty and staff to implement the strategies and activities that will lead to improved teaching and learning. Our monthly support for administrators helps build their capacity to support and supervise department heads and teachers. Our monthly coaching and support for department heads assists them in organizing their departments so that all teachers are aware of data on student performance, and the content standards that are not being taught or learned. Our monthly support and coaching for site-based academic coaches who, in turn, are able to coach teachers on improving instruction to meet the needs of all students, and can organize and deliver workshops to groups of teachers within their academic departments assure that all teachers can be supported. Our team has participated in AB 466 and AB 75 training, and use the knowledge gained from those sessions to design and deliver school-wide training for administrators, teachers and staff.
- Criteria G – Human resources to support the effective implementation of corrective actions: All of our team members have worked in or with

- schools that have been identified as low-performing. Our team of seasoned, practicing administrators brings practical experience and personal knowledge of responding to corrective actions/changes – including changes in classroom instruction, coaching teachers through site-based staff development, and administrative leadership. Further, P&A has access to associates throughout the country that can be called upon to provide support for specific areas.
- Criteria H – Analyzing fiscal and human resource allocations: Making improvements in teaching and learning requires making decisions from tough choices. Our team members who are high school principals are well versed in designing and aligning budgets to address challenges and needs, particularly in the last two years. Further, our system of action planning enables the school leadership teams the opportunity to identify priorities for improving teaching and learning and aligning resources to the priorities. We have been able to coach administrators and leadership teams to “be brutally honest” about their student performance data; develop ambitious goals and objectives for increasing student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps; and designing accountability systems in which responsibilities are identified and timelines are created, and there are consequences for not meeting expectations.
 - Criteria I – Selecting research-based reform strategies that address the learning needs of all students: Three of the research-based strategies that teachers selected with our assistance are: (a) developing standards-based assessments and assessing student progress in meeting high expectations through “looking at student work” once a month; (b) differentiated instructional strategies to group and regroup students around performance tasks during classroom instruction; and (c) the implementation of SDAIE strategies for English language learners. We have coached teachers at Cabrillo and Jordan high schools to (1) gather data (results from CAHSEE, CST, common assessments, unit assessments, multiple Ds and Fs) to define group and individual student needs, (2) determine group and individual learning objectives based on the assessment data (for example, building vocabulary for low-level readers in order to improve reading comprehension), (3) gather information about research-based approaches (i.e. Marzano, Pickering and Pollock’s *Classroom instruction that works*), (4) select and implement the strategies and (5) assess the results. These strategies contributed to the gains in ELA performance as indicated in our response to question 4.
 - Criteria J – Develop and successfully implement school-wide discipline: The five principals on our team each have at least seven years experience as building administrators. They have extensive experience leading large high schools (more than 4,000 each) and designing and implementing effective discipline systems that contribute to safe and orderly schools. Two of the team members who are principals have experience with a school-wide data collection and consensus building process for improving discipline, Safe and Civil Schools, which includes clarifying and modeling

expected behaviors. In one of the high schools we work with, the school leadership team created a subcommittee to collect and study data on attendance and discipline, and use the data to identify patterns of behavior and teachers in need of additional support in classroom management and to design policies and practices, such as weekly grade checks, that have reduced severe discipline infractions.

- Criteria K – Helping to turn around low-performing schools: Our lead consultants have applied the approaches and strategies mentioned in this application to assist two Long Beach USD high schools meet their API/AYP requirements, raise student achievement as measured by the CAHSEE and CST, and eliminate the achievement gaps among groups of students. Each school has made progress, and is poised for future growth. One school, which is the district’s traditionally lowest-performing school, has made gains in their state ranking, moving from a ranking of 1-5 in 2003 to 2-5 in 2004, increasing its API from 505 in 2002 to 528 in 2003, and 562 in 2004, increasing the number of students enrolled in more rigorous math programs and raising student performance in CAHSEE pass rates. The second school, a newly created school experiencing dramatic growth in student population each year, has made dramatic growth in API from 424 in 2002 to 465 in 2003 to 502 in 2004. Its CST growth is shown below (percentage of students). Efforts to reduce students in the far below basic category is especially noteworthy.

ELA	9 th 2002	9 th 2003	9 th 2004	10 th 2002	10 th 2003	10 th 2004	11 th 2002	11 th 2003	11 th 2004
Adv & Profic.	9	13	13	9	9	13	7	8	10
Basic	21	34	38	25	36	38	31	34	35
Below Basic	27	34	31	30	31	33	27	29	36
Far B Basic	43	19	18	36	23	16	35	28	29
Algebra									
Adv. & Profic.	4	6	7	3	4	1	0	0	1
Basic	36	27	25	18	17	9	14	8	8
Below Basic	36	45	53	47	48	60	48	47	61
Far B Basic	24	22	15	32	31	30	39	45	31

- Criteria L/M – Communicating to inform all stakeholders of demanding changes: Improving communications is critical to improving teaching and learning. Our process of helping schools improves communications about school improvement efforts throughout the school and to parents and community members is described in detail in our response to question 1. In addition, we have assisted schools create newsletters, marketing plans, and web-sites.

3. What evidence demonstrates your organization's successful experience in providing intensive support to help schools implement a focused standards-aligned academic program in reading/language arts and mathematics?

As mentioned, we believe improvement efforts should be connected to the existing successful work of teachers and administrators if the innovations are to be accepted, and maintained beyond the SAIT's time with the school. Our intensive approach to assessing and embedding a focused standards-based system has five steps.

- Among the conditions that need to be considered is the district's capacity to support the high school's academic program. As part of our investigation of the schools, we determine the district level of support, in terms of personnel and resources, support for academic programs that are in place, and the on-going efforts to align a standards-based system. Almost all district curriculums, instruction and assessment units have made some progress in designing standards-based pacing charts and some periodic common assessments. Further, we determine the awareness level of school administrators and teachers about the pacing charts and common assessments and their level of use. We enlist the support of district staff in further development and support.
- Discussions about the department action plans mentioned in our response to question 1 begin with an analysis of the implementation of standards-based units of instruction and pacing charts. Our work with department chairs and grade level/course teams (e.g. Algebra 1) focus on their implementation of standards-based units with assessments that demonstrate student proficiency of the grade level standards, and then instructional strategies to assure that all students meet expectations. We have helped department teams design and conduct standards-based curriculum planning sessions during a series of release days, Saturday workshops, and/or summer curriculum institutes. These activities have yielded (1) curriculum maps, (2) consensus on units of instruction for teaching "chunks" of standards; (3) common unit assessments, rubrics and scoring guides; and (4) a schedule for meeting regularly to measure student progress through sharing data and looking at student work sessions to inform instruction.
- Changes in teaching practices, and the need for additional professional development, are examined through monthly department walkthroughs. The walkthroughs have three parts: a pre-walk conversation so that all team members share an understanding of the walkthrough's purpose; three-to-five minute visits to multiple classrooms; debriefing conversation to identify next steps. Our consultants participate in monthly walkthroughs, with administrators, department heads and teachers, to gather data about a guiding question (such as, what is the evidence of instruction that instruction is standards-based, rigorous, and reaches all

students?) that is drawn from the department's action plan. As a result of the walkthroughs, teachers are comfortable with "visitors" to their classes and making their teaching "public" which leads to more collegial conversations among teachers. In addition, teachers organize and conduct collegial walkthroughs within the department to gather data on their own. Walkthroughs, once established as practices and shown to be non-evaluative, serve to focus conversation on instructional improvement and build a collegiality.

- We also assist administrators in conducting a system of administrative walkthroughs. Administrative walkthroughs differ from department and collegial walkthroughs in that the administrative walkthroughs can be evaluative and result in one-on-one conversations with teachers about improving practice. Our coaching focuses on helping the administrator better assess standards-based teaching and learning and craft follow-up conversations with teachers to talk about ways the teacher could address areas of concern, including accessing the services provided by the academic coach.
- The final step brings the process full-circle. We facilitate a series of regular (three times a year) district walkthroughs at each school. The district walkthrough teams include senior district leaders who have supervisory responsibility for the school, as well as the central office staff in the curriculum, instruction and assessment office that provides support to the schools. The school is responsible for coordinating the district walkthrough. The guiding question is one that the school has chosen based on its student performance data and action plan, such as what is the evidence of academic rigor in classes across the school? Preferably, the question is gathering information about an area that the district is providing support so that district and school staff can measure the impact of their joint efforts. Discussions during the debriefing session identify next steps for schools and district staff before the next district walkthrough.

This process provides evidence of the ways we work that address each of the five items on the SIAT application rubric. Specifically,

- Knowing and building upon existing district efforts in creating standards-based curriculum maps, pacing charts, assessments that measure student performance in meeting standards, and units of study secures agreement with all teachers about the purpose, content and implementation of the standards-based curriculum. While we have examples of California standards-based curriculum, assessments and units of study for grade 9 through twelve reading/language arts and math courses to share with schools, we believe that real improvement in teaching and learning will come from the process of developing their own. Regular administrative and collegial walkthroughs assures that difficulties in keeping with the pacing chart are identified and address through additional support for the teacher. Our experience is that once the system is implemented, all

- reading/language arts and math teachers stay within one or two days of their colleagues on the pacing chart.
- Successfully designing and implementing unit and periodic assessments (at the end of the quarter, semester and course) that are aligned with the state standards at each grade level in reading/language arts and math. Some of the assessments have been selected from the state-adopted text and supplemental materials. Others have been created by teacher/administrator/consultant teams based upon unpacking standards. In schools where we have worked that do not have common assessments, a system of common assessments for math and reading/language arts has been developed within three years. State-adopted materials are accelerating the development.
 - In all of the schools where we work, master schedules have been modified to establish common planning periods for teachers teaching the same courses to discuss the results on common assessments. We have developed protocols for looking-at-student-work that has been completed and work that is in progress to assist teachers in modifying their instruction to meet the needs of all students. Our consultants assist department head, academic coaches, and administrators in the use of the protocols, and in assisting teachers to implement the changes in instruction that result from analyzing what students can and can not do.
 - We have assisted math and English departments in developing a system for assessing and placing students in the appropriate level courses. For 9th graders, placement is based on middle-school CST scores, teacher recommendations, and assessments conducted in September of the 9th grade. In math, intervention courses include algebra 1, double-block algebra (twice the in class time while completing algebra 1 in a year), a mid-year algebra intervention for students who need more time to master standards and concepts, more opportunities for upper level classes, increase the number of under-represented minorities in upper level classes, and more opportunities to meet A-G graduation requirements. Reading/language arts interventions include Linda Mood Bell and Language! for students identified as intensive, and combination of grade level English and Reading/Writing Workshop block for students identified as strategic. We have seen progress in moving students from far below basic levels on the CST, as the data presented in our response to question 2 shows. Further, academic coaches and department heads monitor student progress and administer diagnostic assessments to students identified as intensive in order to assure that they are making progress, and continue to be placed appropriately.
 - We have mentioned the several ways that teaching toward grade level standards is monitored through various forms of regular walkthroughs for all teachers. Weekly administrative walkthroughs are often followed by weekly administrative team meetings to discuss progress and to reinforce and realign support for teachers. We provide protocols to walkthrough teams for their use in collecting and reporting evidence of progress.

4. Identify any individuals whom you plan to send as a “Lead”. Provide a synopsis of his/her qualifications including: (a) experience working with the specific grade spans; (b) data to demonstrate specific expertise in improving reading/language arts and math achievement in low-performing schools; and the amount of each individual’s time that will be committed to SAIT work.

Our SAIT team will have two leads: Dr. George S. Perry, Jr, Director, and Jennifer McDermott, Senior Associate, of Perry and Associates, Inc. Dr. Perry and Ms. McDermott have been the leads of the high school reform work in Long Beach USD and for the intervention efforts in two high priority high schools, Jordan and Cabrillo, in Long Beach from June 2002 – June 2005. During the three years of consulting with Jordan and Cabrillo, Dr. Perry and Ms. McDermott each have spent an average of three-days per month in each school supporting administrators, department heads and academic coaches, as described our responses to questions 1-3. We anticipate devoting 20% of their efforts to SAIT, and to fully integrate the remaining seven team members in the SAIT investigations and in providing support to the school regularly.

Dr. Perry has nearly 30 years of helping districts and schools analyze current practices and design systemic strategies that lead to improvements in teaching and learning. His experience in standards-based reform include developing standards and assessments, designing and leading change processes, coaching district and school leaders in the implementation of standards-based curriculum and instruction and leading reforms and initiatives, and developing district-level strategies that support school-level leadership. He has worked with high schools and middle schools in Long Beach USD, middle schools in San Diego City Schools, high schools in Flint, Michigan and schools at all three grade levels in Corpus Christi (TX) ISD.

Ms. McDermott is recognized nationally as an expert in secondary literacy and as a coach of site-based staff developers. Her experience includes teaching in urban high schools, working with teachers as a site-based staff developer in New York City District 15. She has provided training for site-based staff developers for middle schools in San Diego City Schools, high schools in the Long Beach USD and elementary schools in Chicago Public Schools for the Center for School Improvement at the University of Chicago.

Jordan and Cabrillo high schools each had a state rank of 1, and a comparable school rank of 5, when we began working with them in June of 2002. Both schools had and have difficulty attracting qualified math teachers. The similarities end there. Jordan has been the lowest-performing high school in Long Beach USD for many years. Its student population is mobile although the size of the student population does not vary considerably, and its staff, until recently has been stable and veteran.

As the data indicate, Jordan has made significant progress in improving its API during the three years we have been supporting their efforts to improve student achievement in math and reading. Jordan has increased its state rank to a 2 and its comparable school ranking to a 5. The increase in state ranking is attributed to increases in CAHSEE pass rates, increases in the number of students in higher-level classes, and more students taking the CST.

Jordan API	All	Black	Hispanic	Asian	P. Islander	SES
2002 API	505	477	502	593	489	
2003 API	528	518	520	618	492	526
2004 API	562	539	557	652	555	564

Percent passing CAHSEE 2003/04	All		White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		Filipino		Pacific Isl	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Jordan														
CAHSEE ELA	48	57	44	62	53	56	44	54	60	71	52	73	52	57
CAHSEE Math	21	51	22	57	17	44	20	52	40	73	38	60	19	48

Percent passing CAHSEE 2003/04	Am. Indian		Els		SES		Special Ed	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Jordan								
CAHSEE ELA	NA	NA	32	32	43	55	13	15
CAHSEE Math		NA	12	37	21	52	5	6

Jordan ELA CST 2003/04	9th Grade		10th Grade		11th Grade	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Reported Enrollment	1169	1126	1029	1104	810	894
Students Tested	1148	1115	949	1065	731	843
% Advanced Proficient	3%	2%	1%	4%	2%	1%
% Proficient	13%	16%	9%	10%	12%	9%
% Basic	43%	36%	38%	35%	34%	33%
% Below Basic	28%	27%	35%	29%	27%	29%
% Far Below Basic	13%	18%	17%	22%	25%	28%

Jordan High School Data continued

Jordan Algebra 1 CST 2003/04	9th Grade		10th Grade		11th Grade	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Reported Enrollment	1169	1126	1029	1104	810	894
Students Tested	328	653	384	718	242	361
% Advanced Proficient	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% Proficient	6%	2%	3%	2%	4%	0%
% Basic	31%	22%	16%	10%	21%	13%
% Below Basic	49%	62%	56%	65%	53%	62%
% Far Below Basic	14%	14%	25%	23%	21%	20%

Cabrillo High School opened as a fully operational campus in 2002, and its total student population has increased dramatically each year. Its teaching staff is inexperienced and there has been considerable turnover before stabilizing in 2004-05. Cabrillo has not increased its API state ranking, however it can boast significant (80 point) gains in API of student subgroups, CAHSEE pass rates, and moving students from far below basic on CSTs in math and ELA.

Cabrillo API	All	Black	Hispanic	Filipino	P. Islander	SES
2002 API	424	457	422	N/A	N/A	431
2003 API	465	533	485	613	N/A	496
2004 API	502	538	509	670	N/A	514

Percent passing CAHSEE 2004/05	All		White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		Filipino		FEP	
	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005
Cabrillo														
CAHSEE ELA	54	61	62	79	53	64	49	56	67	77	83	77	90	76
CAHSEE Math	47	55	48	70	40	52	44	52	66	68	81	78	78	67

Percent passing CAHSEE 2004/05	Am. Indian		Els		SES		Special Ed	
	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005	2004	2005
Cabrillo								
CAHSEE ELA	NA	NA	34	22	48	61	13	26
CAHSEE Math		NA	33	22	43	54	9	12

Cabrillo High School data continued

ELA CST percentages	9 th 2002	9 th 2003	9 th 2004	10 th 2002	10 th 2003	10 th 2004	11 th 2002	11 th 2003	11 th 2004
Adv & Profic.	9	13	13	9	9	13	7	8	10
Basic	21	34	38	25	36	38	31	34	35
Below Basic	27	34	31	30	31	33	27	29	36
Far B Basic	43	19	18	36	23	16	35	28	29
Algebra CST percentages									
Adv. & Profic.	4	6	7	3	4	1	0	0	1
Basic	36	27	25	18	17	9	14	8	8
Below Basic	36	45	53	47	48	60	48	47	61
Far B Basic	24	22	15	32	31	30	39	45	31

Jordan and Cabrillo have made progress, and have created a strong foundation in improving teaching and learning, which will serve as a springboard to future growth in student achievement.