

APPENDIX

References

Glossary

Student Focus Committee Members

Reading First Committee Members

District SAT9 Test Scores

REFERENCES

Standards and Assessment:

Guskey, T.R. (1996). Reporting on student learning: Lessons from the past - Prescriptions for the future. In T.R. Guskey (Ed.), *Communicating student learning: 1996 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development* (pp.13-24). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Guskey, T.R. (1999). Making standards work. *The School Administrator*, 56(9), 44.

Kendall, J.S., & Marzano, R.J. (1995). *The systematic identification and articulation of content standards and benchmarks: Update*. Aurora, CO: McREL.

Marzano, R.J. (1999). Building curriculum and assessment around standards. *The High School Magazine*, 6(5), 14-19.

Schmoker, Michael J. (2001). *The Results Fieldbook: Practical Results from Dramatically Improved Schools*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Va.

Stiggins, R.J. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Tomlinson, T. (1992). *Hard work and high expectations: Motivating students to learn*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Personnel Quality and Accountability:

Academy for Educational Development - Enhanced Computerization and Financial Management Systems: A Strategic Plan. Department of Education, Government of Guam. June, 1991.

Ashton, P., & Crocker, L. (1987). Systematic study of planned variations: The essential focus of teacher education reform. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 38, 2-8.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. Press Conference Speech, National Commission Teaching and America's Future (September 12, 1996).

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78 (3), 193-200.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence*. Retrieved from Internet.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational Leadership*, 58 (8), 12-17.

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B. & Thoreson, A. (2001). Does teacher certification matter? Evaluating the evidence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23, 1, 57-77.

Debolt, Gary P. (1992). *Teacher induction and mentoring: School-based collaborative programs*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Ferguson, P., & Womack, S.T. (1993). The impact of subject matter and education coursework on teaching performance. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44 (1), 55-63.

Guam Education GOALS 2000 - Comprehensive Education Improvement Plan. August, 1997.

Haselkorn, David. *Attracting, Preparing and Supporting Teaching's Next Generation* (Discussion paper prepared for the U.S. Department of Education(April 1997).

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. *What teachers should know and be able to do*. Retrieved from Internet.

Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. (RNT). *The Essential Profession* (Belmont, MA: November 19, 1998.)

Rodgers, Carol R. (2002). Voices inside schools. Seeing student learning: Teacher change and the role of reflection. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, 230-252

Touche, Ross & Co., Department of Education Management Audit. June, 1988.

Home-School Connection:

Anne Henderson and Nancy Berla: (1981); (1987); and (1995).

Ascher, Carol. "Improving the School-Home Connection for Poor and Minority Urban Students." New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, December 1987. 21 pages. ED 300 484.

Davies, D. (1991, January). Schools reaching out: Family, school, and community partnerships for student success. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(5), 376-380, 3822.

Epstein, J. (1994). Theory to practice: School and family partnerships lead to school improvement and student success. In C.L. Fagnano & B.Z. Werber (Eds.), *School, family, and community interaction: A view from the firing lines*. Boulder: Westview.

Parent Involvement in the Educational Process. ERIC Digest Series Number EA 43.

System-Wide Needs/Changes:

Janey, Clifford. (April 2002). Must high schools last four years? *Educational Leadership*, 59, 64-66.

Morrison, William F., Amper and Legters, Nettie E., Ph.D. Creating a ninth grade success academy: Guidebook for the talent development high school.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1996). *Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution*. Reston, Va.

Pearlman, Bob. (April 2002). Reinventing the high school experience. *Educational Leadership*, 59, 72-75.

South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment Website: Teacher Cadet Program; Pro Team Program; Teaching Assistant Program.

South Regional Education Board; *High Schools That Work, Making Middle Grades Work. 2002 Outstanding Practices*. Atlanta, Georgia.

Teddle, C., & Stringfield, S. (1993). *Schools make a difference: Lessons learned from a ten-year study of school effects*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reading First/Direct Instruction Program:

Adams, G. L., & Engelmann, S. (1996). *Research on Direct Instruction: 25 years beyond DISTAR*. Seattle, WA: Educational Achievement Systems.

American Federation of Teachers: K-12/Educational Issues Department: Seven Promising Programs for Reading and English Language Arts: Direct Instruction – Results, Case Study, Considerations; AFT Website

Anderson, R.C., Hiebert, E., Scott, J., & Wilkinson, I. (1985). *Becoming a Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading*. Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Ashworth, D. (1999). Effects of Direct Instruction and basal reading instruction programs on the reading achievement of second graders. *Reading Improvement*, 36, 150–156.

Briggs, K., & Clark, C. (1997). Reading programs for students in the lower elementary grades: What does the research say? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 420046).

Byrne, B., & Fielding-Barnsley, R. (1991). Evaluation of program to teach phonemic awareness to young children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 451–455.

Cawelti, G. (Ed.). (1999a). *Handbook of research on improving student achievement* (2nd ed.). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Cawelti, G. (1999b). *Portraits of six benchmark schools: Diverse approaches to improving student achievement*. Arlington, VA: Education Research Service.

Dowdell, T. (1996). The effectiveness of Direct Instruction on the reading achievement of sixth graders. (Report No. CS 012 513). Chicago, IL: Evaluative/feasibility report (142). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 396 268).

Engelmann, S. (2000). About reading – A comparison of *Reading Mastery* and *Horizons*. *Effective School Practices*, 18(3), 15–26.

Foorman, B. (1995). Research on the “Great Debate”: Code-oriented versus whole language approaches to reading instruction. *School Psychology Review*, 24, 376–392.

Foorman, B., Francis, D., Fletcher, J., Schatschneider, C., & Mehta, P. (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at risk children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 37–55.

Hall, S. L., & Moats, L. C. (1999). *Straight Talk About Reading*. Chicago, IL: Contemporary Books.

Learning First Alliance. (1998, Spring/Summer). Every child reading: An action plan

of the Learning First Alliance. *American Federation of Teachers*, 52–63.

Marzano, R.J., Pickering, D., & McTighe, J. (1993). *Assessing student outcomes: Performance assessment using the dimensions of learning model*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (2001). The nation's report card: Fourth-grade reading 2000[Online]. Available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/help/sitemap.asp>.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (1996). Thirty years of NICHD research: What we now know about how children learn to read. *Effective School Practices*.

National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction [Online].

Olson, L. (1999). Researchers rate whole-school reform models. *Education Week*, 18 (23), 1, 14–16.

Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.) (1998). *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Glossary of Acronyms

ACT/SAT	Aptitude for College Test/Standard Achievement Test	PDN	Pacific Daily News
ACYF	Administration for Children, Youth & Families	PTEP	Professional Teacher Evaluation Program
CCEOP	Center for Continuing Education & Outreach Programs	SAP	School Action Plan
C&I	Curriculum & Instruction	SAT 9	Stanford Achievement Test 9 th Edition
CEDDERS	Center for Excellence In Development Disabilities Education, Research, & Services	SIC	Secondary Improvement Committee
CRT	Consulting Resource Teacher	SES	Socio-Economic-Status
CSPD	Comprehensive Systems of Professional Development	SFA	Success For All
DAC	Discipline Advisory Council	SPC	School Program Consultant
DAP	District Action Plan	SRA	Science Research Associates
DE-1	Department of Education Request for Personnel Action Form	SREB	Southern Regional Education Board
DEED	Department of Education Extended Day Program	SY	School Year
DIAL-3	Development Indicator for the Assessment of Learning, 3 rd Edition	UOG	University of Guam
GED	Graduate Equivalency Diploma	WRR	Western Regional Resource Center
GETEP	Guam Educators' Test of English Proficiency		
GWHS	George Washington High School		
HSTW	High Schools That Work		
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act		
IEP	Individual Education Plan		
INTASC	Interstate New Teacher Assessment & Support Consortium		
IQ	Intelligence Quotient		
ISLLC	Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium		
LARM	Language Arts, Reading & Math Team		
LOTE	Language Other Than English Program		
NCLB	No Child Left Behind		
NGA	Ninth Grade Academy		
NBPTS	National Board of Professional Teaching Standards		
NSDC	National Staff Development Council		
NWREL	Northwest Regional Educational Laboratories		
PACE	Planned Alternative Center for Education		

STUDENT FOCUS COMMITTEE

Chair: Rosie R. Tainatongo, Superintendent of Education

Vice Chair: Ernestina A. Cruz, Federal Programs Administrator & Lead Planner

Jeffrey Burgos, Principal, John F. Kennedy High School

Ken Chargualaf, Associate Superintendent, Secondary Education

Vince Leon Guerrero, Associate Superintendent, Special Education

Arlina Potts, Principal, P. C. Lujan Elementary School

Luis Reyes, Personnel Services Administrator

Evelyn Salas, Certification Officer

Lou San Nicolas, Principal, Simon Sanchez High School

Eloise Sanchez, Associate Superintendent, Curriculum & Instruction

Nerissa Shafer, Research, Planning & Evaluation Administrator

Jan Yamashita, Associate Superintendent, Elementary Education


READING FIRST COMMITTEE

- 1. Vangie Chang, Principal, AsTumbo Elementary School**
- 2. Ernestina Cruz, Federal Programs Administrator**
- 3. Terry Cruz, Principal, Upi Elementary School**
- 4. Janet Duenas, Asst. Principal, Maria A. Ulloa Elementary School**
- 5. Rebecca Duenas, School Program Consultant, Curriculum & Instruction**
- 6. Mary Esteban, LOTE Teacher, Maria A. Ulloa Elementary**
- 7. Eleanor LeBrun, LOTE Teacher, Maria A. Ulloa Elementary**
- 8. Aurora Lowe, Principal, Harry S. Truman Elementary School**
- 9. Mary Mafnas, Principal, J. Q. San Miguel Elementary School**
- 10. Peter Pangelinan, Asst. Principal, D.L. Perez Elementary School**
- 11. Terry Pereira, Local Certified DI Trainer, Special Education Division**
- 12. Marjorie Raess, Principal, Agana Heights Elementary School**
- 13. Rose Rios, Principal, Inarajan Elementary School**
- 14. Maria P. Roberto, Principal, Marcial Sablan Elementary School**
- 15. Millie Rosario, Local Certified DI Trainer, Special Education Division**
- 16. Eloise Sanchez, Associate Superintendent, Curriculum & Instruction**
- 17. Norma Tabayoyong, Principal, Maria A. Ulloa Elementary School**
- 18. Bernie Tenorio, Principal, Carbullido Elementary School**
- 19. Jeanette Yamashita, Associate Superintendent, Elementary Education**

**Guam Department of
Education SAT9 2002 Results**
Percentile Scores

September 4, 2002

What is a Percentile Score?



A percentile score indicates the percentage of students likely to score below a certain point on a score distribution.

District SAT9 Percentile Scores: Grade 1

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Read	33	41	39	47	54	43	44
Math	27	34	33	41	48	35	36
Lang.	26	25	23	30	36	23	24
Envir.	24	31	30	37	44	21	27
Listen	20	27	25	33	39	26	26
Battery	23	37	35	42	49	35	37

District SAT9 Percentile Scores: Grade 3

	1999	2000	2001	2002
Reading	27	28	22	27
Math	26	27	26	30
Language	31	33	32	38
Science	29	30	25	33
Social Science	23	27	21	25
Battery	28	30	25	30

District SAT9 Percentile Scores: Grade 5

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Reading	17	26	25	25	27	24	27
Math	33	30	26	27	27	28	31
Language	28	28	27	25	27	23	26
Science	24	28	26	26	27	22	28
Soc. Sci.	24	26	25	25	29	27	28
Battery	22	28	27	26	28	25	27

District SAT9 Percentile Scores: Grade 7

	1999	2000	2001	2002
Reading	24	27	26	26
Math	26	27	26	28
Language	25	29	31	34
Science	30	32	39	43
Social Science	30	32	31	34
Battery	28	29	30	32

District SAT9 Percentile Scores: Grade 9

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Reading	21	24	23	22	21	22	23
Math	24	24	24	25	25	24	26
Language	27	22	21	17	17	17	18
Science	32	25	24	23	23	24	30
Soc. Sci.	26	21	21	21	21	22	31
Battery	25	25	25	24	24	24	27

District SAT9 Percentile Scores: Grade 10

	1999	2000	2001	2002
Reading	27	28	25	19
Math	28	28	27	30
Language	23	23	21	23
Science	33	34	32	34
Social Science	29	33	29	28
Battery	30	30	28	28


District SAT9 Percentile Scores: Grade 11

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Reading	28	35	35	32	33	32	25
Math	34	31	31	30	31	30	35
Language	26	34	34	27	27	26	30
Science	34	33	32	32	33	34	35
Soc. Sci.	35	33	33	29	33	32	42
Battery	31	35	35	32	33	32	34


District SAT9 Percentile Scores: 2002

	Gr 1	Gr 3	Gr 5	Gr 7	Gr 9	Gr 10	Gr 11
Reading	44	27	27	26	23	19	25
Math	36	30	31	28	26	30	35
Language	24	38	26	34	18	23	30
Science	27	33	28	43	30	34	35
Soc. Sci.	-	25	28	34	31	28	42
Battery	37	30	27	32	27	28	34


District SAT9 Scores: Grade 1 (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Scores: Grade 3 (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Scores: Grade 5 (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Scores: Grade 7 (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Scores: Grade 9 (2000 - 2002)



District SAT9 Scores: Grade 10 (2000 - 2002)



District SAT9 Scores: Grade 11 (2000 - 2002)



**Guam Department of
Education SAT9 2002 Results**
Performance Levels

September 4, 2002

SAT9 Performance Standards

- ☞ Performance Standards are content-referenced scores that reflect what students know and should be able to do in given subject areas.
- ☞ The Standards were determined by expert panels of educators who judged each test question on the basis on what students at different levels of achievement should perform.

SAT9 Performance Standards


- ☞ **Level 1**--indicates **little or no mastery** of fundamental knowledge and skills.
- ☞ **Level 2**--indicates **partial mastery** of the knowledge and skills that are fundamental for satisfactory work. At the high school level, this is higher than minimum competency skills.

SAT9 Performance Standards


☞ **Level 3**--represents **solid academic performance**, indicating that students are prepared for the next grade.

☞ **Level 4**--signifies **superior performance** beyond grade-level mastery.


District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 1 Reading (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 1 Math (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 3 Reading (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 3 Math (2000 - 2002)



District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 5 (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 5 (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels

Grade 7 (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels

Grade 7 (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels

Grade 9 Reading (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels


Grade 9 Math (2000 - 2002)




District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 10 Reading (2000 -2002)



District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 10 Math (2000 - 2002)



District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 11 Reading (2000 - 2002)



District SAT9 Performance Levels Grade 11 Math (2000 - 2002)

