



**Results of the Spring 2005 Administration
of the Grade 2 TerraNova
Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills**

Department of Shared Accountability

May 2005

Jose W. Stevenson, Ph.D.



Montgomery County Public Schools

DEPARTMENT OF SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY

Faith Connolly, Acting Director
850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20850
301-279-3925

Jerry D. Weast
Superintendent of Schools

John Q. Porter
*Deputy Superintendent
for Strategic Technologies
and Accountability*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Background	1
Methodology	2
Results	3
CTBS Overall Performance	3
CTBS Results by Racial/Ethnic Student Groups	4
CTBS Results of Students Receiving Special Services	5
CTBS Results of Nonstandard Administrations	5
CTBS Results for Schools	6
Results for the CTBS Battery Index	7
CTBS Results for Focus Schools	8
Conclusion and Discussion	9
Appendix A: Median National Percentile Ranks by School	10
Appendix B: CTBS Battery Index by School	41

List of Tables

Table 1	Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks for MCPS for 2001 through 2005	iii
Table 2	Number of Grade 2 Students Tested by Race/Ethnicity and Special Services for 2001 through 2005	iii
Table 3	Number of Grade 2 Students Tested for 2001 through 2005	1
Table 4	Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks for MCPS from 2001 through 2005.....	3
Table 5	Number of Grade 2 Students Tested by Race/Ethnicity and Services for 2001 through 2005	3
Table 6	Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks by Race/Ethnicity for 2001 through 2005	4
Table 7	Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks by Special Services for 2001 through 2005	5
Table 8	Number and Percentage of MCPS Schools Scoring at the 50 th Median National Percentile Rank and Above for 2001 through 2005	6
Table 9	Number and Percentage of MCPS Schools Scoring at the 75 th Median National Percentile Rank and Above for 2001 through 2005	7
Table 10	CTBS Battery Index Change from 2001 to 2005.....	7
Table 11	Median National Percentile Ranks for the 14 Focus Elementary Schools from 2001 to 2005.....	8

Executive Summary

Over the past five years, the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) has made closing the gap between White and Asian American students and other minority students its highest priority. Results from the March 2005 administration of the nationally normed TerraNova Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) indicate that this effort continues to have an impact on student performance at the primary level. While maintaining last year's high levels of performance in most categories, MCPS Grade 2 students improved their mathematics computation scores to a new high. They outperformed 73% of students nationally in reading, 68% in language, 79% in mathematics, 87% in language mechanics, and 90% in mathematics computation, the highest ever performance on the CTBS (Table 1). A total of 9,618 Grade 2 students participated in the 2005 administration of the CTBS.

Table 1
Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks for MCPS for 2001 through 2005

Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks for MCPS for 2001 through 2005						
Subtest	Nation	Percentile Ranks by Year				
		MCPS				
		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Reading	50	64	64	64	73	73
Language	50	68	68	68	68	68
Mathematics	50	70	70	70	79	79
Language Mechanics	50	77	77	77	87	87
Mathematics Computation	50	68	76	83	83	90

This most recent performance builds on the significant achievement progress made over past years. This year's CTBS results are 9 to 22 percentile ranks higher than they were in 2001. This strong performance is taking place as the demographics of the Grade 2 student population continues to shift toward increased diversity along with a steady growth in the number of students who speak languages other than English. Proportionally, fewer White students were tested in Grade 2 this year than five years ago, while the share of second graders tested who receive Limited English Proficiency (LEP) services increased by 16% (Table 2).

Table 2
Number of Grade 2 Students Tested by Race/Ethnicity and
Special Services for 2001 through 2005

Race/Ethnicity and Services	Number of Students by Year					Change	
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	<i>N</i>	%
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>							
African American	2,141	2,063	2,143	2,124	2,151	+10	0
Asian American	1,228	1,362	1,409	1,498	1,491	+263	+21
Hispanic	1,651	1,752	1,919	2,008	1,977	+326	+20
White	4,800	4,602	4,570	4,300	3,963	-837	-17
<i>Services</i>							
FARMS	2,615	2,608	2,771	2,757	2,816	+201	+8
Special Education	878	924	1,027	999	953	+75	+9
LEP	832	911	1,277	911	968	+136	+16

African American and Hispanic students continue to outscore more than half of their peers nationally in every CTBS subtest, with the highest performance in mathematics computation. African American and Hispanic students now have performances in mathematics computation at the 76th percentile, the highest ever for African American students. As they did last year, White and Asian American students scored above the 80th percentile in every subject, with Asian American students showing improvement in reading.

Within the 2005 results there are both gains for students receiving support services and some declines. Students receiving LEP services, while experiencing a drop in this year's results in mathematics computation, improved on last year's results in reading. Since 2001, second-language learners' improvement has jumped from the 21st percentile rank in reading to the 40th percentile this year, and from the 31st to 68th percentile in mathematics computation. Scores dropped for students in special education in reading, mathematics, and language mechanics, while remaining steady in language and mathematics computation. Students receiving Free and Reduced-priced Meals System (FARMS) services showed gains in language and mathematics, and remaining the same as last year in the other three areas.

One striking result is the number of elementary schools scoring a median national percentile rank of 75 and above. This performance places students in these schools at the top 24% in the nation. Ninety-three percent of MCPS schools achieved this level of excellence in mathematics computation in 2005. Over time, the percentage of schools performing at this level has doubled or nearly doubled in three of the five CTBS subtests.

Analysis of the CTBS Battery Index, the number of students and the percentage of their scores at the 50th national percentile rank and above provides evidence that the school reforms are helping to reduce the achievement gap and are making a sustained difference in academic achievement for all children. On average, the Battery Index has moved up by 12 percentage points since 2001. Significantly, the greatest increase by group was among African American, Hispanic, and students receiving FARMS services (from 17 to 20 percentage points) and students for whom English is not their first language (about 16 percentage points). Although students receiving special education services saw a drop of 1% from last year, they have gained approximately 9 percentage points since 2001.

Five years ago, MCPS focused its attention on 14 underperforming schools. In 2005, all 14 schools performed as a group above the national average in every area for the first time ever. Although there was a drop in mathematics in 2005 from the 70th to the 60th percentile, after previous improvements, Grade 2 students in these schools held steady this year in language, language mechanics, and mathematics computation, and gained in reading from the 47th to the 55th percentile.

While there is variance in student achievement by race/ethnicity and students receiving special services, this year's CTBS results continue to reflect the positive impact of the structural and content reforms that MCPS has been implementing over the past several years.

Results of the Spring 2005 Administration of the Grade 2 TerraNova Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills

Jose Stevenson

Background

Since 2001 the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) has administered the TerraNova Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) to students in Grade 2 on a yearly basis in order to provide comprehensive measurement of basic skills achievement in five areas: reading, language, mathematics, language mechanics, and mathematics computation. These skill areas are considered crucial in educational development because they help determine the extent to which students can profit from further instruction.

The number of Grade 2 students participating in the March 2005 administration of the CTBS was 9,618. Table 1 shows the number of Grade 2 students tested since 2001, the baseline year (Table 3).

Table 3
Number of Grade 2 Students Tested for 2001 through 2005

Number of Students by Year					2001–2005 Change	
2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	<i>N</i>	%
9,851	9,812	10,076	9,965	9,618	-232	-2

MCPS administers the CTBS to provide data to compare MCPS students with all students nationally. Other testing programs such as the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) also provide comparisons with national results or norms. However, the main purpose of this test is to provide state, district, and school proficiency scores in reading and mathematics to serve as the basis for calculations of adequate yearly progress under the *No Child Left Behind* federal education law.

The CTBS is a nationally norm-referenced test. This means the test publisher (CTB/McGraw-Hill) administered the CTBS to a representative group of students nationwide prior to its availability to the schools. This initial group of test-takers is referred to as the norm group. The scores of students who take the CTBS after publication are then compared (i.e., referenced back) with those of the norm group. There is a wide variety of other nationally normed tests. Among these are the Metropolitan Achievement Test, the Stanford Achievement Test, the California Achievement Test, and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

Methodology

This report provides information about student performance on the spring 2005 administration of the Grade 2 CTBS. It addresses the following seven questions:

1. What was the performance of MCPS students?
2. How do results look by racial/ethnic student group?
3. How did MCPS students who receive special education services do?
4. How did MCPS students who had a nonstandard administration do?
5. What was the performance of MCPS schools?
6. How did MCPS perform on the Battery Index?
7. What are the results for the focus schools?

Results from CTBS administrations are analyzed within the context of district, school, and individual student data to ascertain how well students have learned basic skills, particularly at schools most affected by poverty, as well as strengths or needs in curriculum and instructional procedures. CTBS results also provide a first step in the accountability and improvement of student performance embodied in the MCPS Strategic Plan, *Our Call to Action: Pursuit of Excellence* (MCPS, 2004), by supplying comparable data on student performance that can document success for every student to schools, parents, and the general public.

Interpretation of the performance of individual students is through *percentile ranks*. These scores report how a student's performance compares with that of others in a given reference group (e.g., district, state, nation) and indicate the percentage of students scoring lower on the test. Because the CTBS is a nationally normed test, CTBS percentile ranks are national percentile ranks. For example, if a student earns a national percentile rank of 40 on the CTBS reading subtest this means that 40% of students in the national norm group had a lower score on this subtest. The national norm or average score for all CTBS subtests is the 50th percentile.

The overall performance of the district and individual schools is interpreted through a *median percentile rank*. The median is the middle score in a group, in other words, half the scores are above it and half are below. Thus, if the median national percentile rank for a group of students in a given school is 78 on the CTBS reading subtest, then half of these students outperformed 78% of students in the national reference group on this subtest.

Because of the small number of American Indian students enrolled in MCPS, the interpretation of their performance is not included in this report. Their scores can fluctuate widely from year to year due to their small number. However, individual scores are reported to schools and parents.

Results

CTBS Overall Performance

For about five years now, MCPS has made an unprecedented investment of resources in the primary grades as the key to improving the achievement of all students and particularly low-income and minority students. Overall results of the March 2005 administration of the TerraNova CTBS offer evidence that this effort keeps on paying off for MCPS students. Grade 2 students continue to perform well above the national average, or 50th percentile, on all five CTBS subtests. While this year's performance matched last year's in nearly all subject areas, overall scores for mathematics computation improved to the 90th percentile. This is the first time that any systemwide score in Montgomery County in Grade 2 has reached this level on the CTBS (Table 4).

Table 4
Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks for MCPS for 2001 through 2005

Subtest	Percentile Rank by Year					
	Nation	MCPS				
		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Reading	50	64	64	64	73	73
Language	50	68	68	68	68	68
Mathematics	50	70	70	70	79	79
Language Mechanics	50	77	77	77	87	87
Mathematics Computation	50	68	76	83	83	90

This most recent performance builds on the significant achievement progress made over past years. This year's CTBS results are 9 to 22 percentile ranks higher than they were in 2001. This strong performance is taking place as the demographics of the Grade 2 student population continues to shift toward increased diversity along with a steady growth in the number of students who speak languages other than English. Proportionally, fewer White second graders were tested this year than five years ago, while the share of second graders tested who receive LEP services increased by 16 % (Table 5).

Table 5
Number of Grade 2 Students Tested by Race/Ethnicity and Services for 2001 through 2005

	Number of Students by Year					Change	
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	<u>N</u>	%
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>							
African American	2,141	2,063	2,143	2,124	2,151	+10	0
Asian American	1,228	1,362	1,409	1,498	1,491	+263	+21
Hispanic	1,651	1,752	1,919	2,008	1,977	+326	+20
White	4,800	4,602	4,570	4,300	3,963	-837	-17
<i>Services</i>							
FARMS	2,615	2,608	2,771	2,757	2,816	+201	+8
Special Education	878	924	1,027	999	953	+75	+9
LEP	832	911	1,277	911	968	+136	+16

CTBS Results by Racial/Ethnic Student Groups

Since 2001 African American and Hispanic students have made measurable progress toward the level of performances of their Asian American and White peers. Relative to last year, this spring MCPS Grade 2 African American, Asian American, Hispanic, and White students maintained their performance above the national average in every area and near the national average in reading among Hispanic students. There was one noticeable jump in mathematics computation for African American students from the 68th to the 76th percentile, and in reading for Asian American students from the 73rd to the 82nd percentile (Table 6).

African American and Hispanic students now have performances in mathematics computation at the 76th percentile, the highest ever for African American students. Asian American and White students have performances in mathematics computation at or above the 90th percentile.

Table 6
Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks by Race/Ethnicity for 2001 through 2005

		Percentile Rank by Year				
	Subtest	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
African American	Reading	47	40	47	55	55
	Language	43	43	43	55	55
	Mathematics	43	43	43	60	60
	Language Mechanics	65	55	65	65	65
	Mathematics Comp.	49	49	68	68	76
Asian American	Reading	73	73	73	73	82
	Language	68	68	82	82	82
	Mathematics	79	87	79	87	87
	Language Mechanics	87	79	87	94	94
	Mathematics Comp.	90	90	94	94	94
Hispanic	Reading	34	34	40	47	47
	Language	43	43	43	55	55
	Mathematics	43	43	52	60	60
	Language Mechanics	55	55	65	65	65
	Mathematics Comp.	49	49	68	76	76
White	Reading	82	82	82	82	82
	Language	68	82	82	82	82
	Mathematics	79	79	79	87	87
	Language Mechanics	87	87	87	87	87
	Mathematics Comp.	76	83	90	90	90

CTBS Results of Students Receiving Special Services

Within the 2005 results there are some gains for students receiving special services as well as some losses (Table 7). Students receiving FARMS services showed gains in language and mathematics, while staying the same as last year in the other three areas. Scores dropped for students in special education in reading, mathematics, and language mechanics, and showed no change for language and mathematics computation.

Scores of students receiving LEP services have dropped in mathematics computation, while improving over last year's results in reading and maintaining in language, mathematics, and language mechanics. Since 2001 improvement among second-language learners has jumped from the 21st to the 40th percentile rank in reading this year and from the 31st to 68th percentile rank in mathematics computation. The progress of students receiving LEP services, in particular, is notable because of the growing number of students receiving LEP services tested—from 832 in 2001 to 968 in 2005, a 16% increase.

Table 7

Grade 2 Median National Percentile Ranks by Special Services for 2001 through 2005

Service Group	Subtest	Median National Percentile Rank				
		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
FARMS	Reading	34	34	40	47	47
	Language	35	35	43	43	55
	Mathematics	35	35	43	52	60
	Language Mechanics	55	55	55	65	65
	Mathematics Computation	40	49	58	76	76
Special Education	Reading	34	40	40	47	40
	Language	27	27	27	35	35
	Mathematics	29	35	35	52	43
	Language Mechanics	45	45	45	55	45
	Mathematics Computation	40	49	58	68	68
LEP	Reading	21	25	40	34	40
	Language	21	35	35	43	43
	Mathematics	29	35	43	52	52
	Language Mechanics	36	45	55	55	55
	Mathematics Computation	31	49	68	76	68

CTBS Results of Nonstandard Administrations

The national normative data are based on the performance of students who took the CTBS under standardized conditions. Students who take the CTBS mathematics computation subtest with a calculator, in accordance with their Individualized Education Program or Section 504 Plan, participate in nonstandard administrations of this subtest. A total of 108 students used this accommodation (1% of the students in Grade 2 who took the CTBS). Their median percentile rank was 94.

CTBS Results for Schools

A total of 118 elementary schools participated in Grade 2 CTBS testing in 2001, while a total of 119 schools participated in 2002 to 2005. However, three schools in 2005, did not administer the reading, language, and language mechanics subtests because they were part of a state program known as Maryland's Reading First Initiative. These schools are Highland, Rosemont, and Summit Hall elementary schools. Wheaton Woods Elementary School also was part of this initiative, although the school did give all five subtests to its Grade 2 students.

The percentage of MCPS schools scoring at the national median and above ranges from 90% in reading to 100% in language mechanics and mathematics computation (Table 8). Over the past five years, the percentage of schools scoring at and above the national median on the CTBS reading and language subtests has jumped by 14 to 16 percentage points, while the percentage of schools scoring at this level on the CTBS mathematics computation subtest has improved by 19 percentage points.

Table 8
Number and Percentage of MCPS Schools Scoring at the
50th Median National Percentile Rank and Above for 2001 through 2005

	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
Subtest	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reading	90	76	90	76	93	78	106	89	104	90
Language	94	80	92	77	92	77	112	94	111	96
Mathematics	104	88	104	87	111	93	119	100	118	99
Language Mechanics	112	95	115	97	118	99	118	99	116	100
Mathematics Computation	95	81	105	88	117	98	119	100	119	100

The number of elementary schools scoring a median national percentile rank of 75 and above continues to grow. Such a performance places the average students in these schools in the top 24% in the nation. As can be seen on Table 9 below, 75% of schools reached this level of excellence in language mechanics, while 93% achieved the same performance in mathematics computation in 2005. Over time, the percentage of schools performing at this level has doubled or nearly doubled in three of the five CTBS subtests.

Table 9
Number and Percentage of MCPS Schools Scoring at the
75th Median National Percentile Rank and Above for 2001 through 2005

	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reading	24	20	31	26	37	31	44	37	46	40
Language	27	23	30	25	31	26	50	42	51	44
Mathematics	40	34	46	39	54	45	69	58	70	59
Language Mech.	65	55	78	66	77	65	95	80	87	75
Mathematics Comp.	49	42	66	55	94	79	107	90	11	93

Results for the CTBS Battery Index

The CTBS Battery Index is similar to the standards of performance required by the *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) legislation, namely, the percentage of students who performed at or above a designated cut score. For this analysis, the cut score is the CTBS 50th national percentile rank, since it is the national average and is slightly above the proficiency standards of the NCLB-mandated MSA for Grade 3. On the basis of this cut score, results can be combined across subtests to provide an overall performance indicator on the battery of CTBS tests. The resulting CTBS Battery Index is then the percentage of scores that are at or above the CTBS 50th national percentile across the five CTBS subtests.

An analysis of the number of students and the percentage of their scores at the national average and above, or CTBS Battery Index, provides evidence that the school reforms are helping to reduce the achievement gap. Seventy-six percent of the scores were above the national average this year, up from 75% last year and 64% five years ago. The CTBS Battery Index has improved by 12 percentage points since 2001. The greatest increase by group has been among African American, Hispanic, FARMS students (from 17 to 20 percentage points), and students for whom English is not their first language (about 16 percentage points). Although special education students experienced a drop of 1% in 2005 from last year, they have gained about 9 percentage points since 2001.

Table 10
CTBS Battery Index Change from 2001 to 2005

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2001–2005 Change
All Students	64.0	67.0	69.6	74.8	76.0	+12.0
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>						
African American	45.4	48.4	52.0	60.4	62.6	+17.2
Asian American	76.6	79.6	82.5	85.3	85.8	+9.2
Hispanic	41.4	45.3	52.8	60.7	61.9	+20.5
White	76.9	79.8	80.9	84.9	86.2	+9.3
<i>Service Receipt</i>						
FARMS	38.9	41.8	48.4	55.6	58.3	+19.4
Special Education	38.7	40.5	42.6	48.2	47.4	+8.7
LEP	34.2	37.8	47.7	49.6	49.9	+15.7

CTBS Results for Focus Schools

The Early Success Performance Plan, initiated five years ago, included a series of reform efforts to overcome the achievement gap of poor and minority students. Some components of the plan, such as full-day kindergarten and reduced class sizes, were implemented in stages. The first 17 schools with Grade 2 students to receive all of the components of the Early Success Performance Plan have been monitored closely as a group to gauge the impact of the reform efforts on student achievement. These 17 so-called focus schools are Broad Acres, Brookhaven, Burnt Mills, East Silver Spring, Gaithersburg, Glen Haven, Harmony Hills, Highland, Maryvale, Montgomery Knolls, New Hampshire Estates, Rolling Terrace, Rosemont, Summit Hall, Viers Mill, Weller Road, and Wheaton Woods. In 2005 Grade 2 students at Highland, Rosemont, and Summit Hall elementary schools did not take the CTBS reading and language mechanics subtests because they were part of the Maryland Reading First Initiative Program. However, Grade 2 students at Wheaton Woods Elementary School did take these two subtests even though they also were part of the Reading First Initiative.

The median national percentile ranks for the 14 focus schools in the 2001–2005 show improvement in the performance of Grade 2 students in these schools in most of the CTBS content areas. In 2005 all 14 schools are performing above the national average in every area for the first time. Although there was a drop in mathematics in 2005 from the 70th to the 60th percentile, after previous improvements, Grade 2 students in the 14 schools as a group held steady this year in language, language mechanics, and mathematics computation, and gained in reading from the 47th to the 55th percentile.

Table 11
Median National Percentile Ranks from 2001 to 2005
for the 14 Focus Elementary Schools

Subtest	National Percentile Ranks				
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Reading	40	40	47	47	55
Language	43	43	43	55	55
Mathematics	43	43	52	70	60
Language Mechanics	55	55	65	65	65
Mathematics Computation	49	58	76	83	83

Conclusion and Discussion

The most recent countywide CTBS results continue to build on a record of steady, improvements in student achievement since the early childhood initiatives for improving the teaching and learning of basic skills in reading and mathematics began five years ago. MCPS Grade 2 students have improved markedly on the nationally normed CTBS over these past five years. The 2005 results showed that these students outscored at least 68% of their peers nationwide in language and as many as 90% in mathematics computation. Overall, 76% of the most Grade 2 scores were at or above the national average, a gain of 12 percentage points over 2001, the baseline year. At the same time, the performance of students in the schools that have the highest concentrations of students who are academically disadvantaged or economically deprived, or focus schools, was above the national average in all of the CTBS subtest for the first time ever.

What makes these accomplishments notable is that they continue to occur simultaneously with a trend toward increased demographic diversity among Grade 2 students. Of the more than 9,600 Grade 2 students tested this year, the majority comprised African American students (22%), Hispanic students (21%), or Asian American students (15%). Since 2001, the number of Hispanic students tested has grown by 326 students (20%), while the number of White students tested has dropped by 837 students (17%). Against this backdrop there also has been a concurrent growth in the number of students tested whose primary language is not English from 832 in 2001 to 968 in 2005, a 16% increase. Traditionally, as a higher number of students take a test, the scores fall.

While these successes underscore the extent to which the reforms are making a significant difference in narrowing the gap on student achievement, existing variances in the CTBS performance for subgroups of students underscore the need for additional significant work to overcome the influence of race/ethnicity, poverty, English language limitations, and disability on student achievement progress.

While MCPS continues to demonstrate significant academic achievement in this fifth year of CTBS testing in Grade 2, challenges lie ahead for the system in its quest to provide all students the opportunity to achieve a high level of performance in every CTBS subtest area. The report provides schools and teachers detailed information on subtest scores and item analyses, that are essential to support effective instructional planning.

Appendix A: Median National Percentile Ranks by School

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
WOODLIN ES	2	2000	97	55	97	68	97	70	97	65	91	76
		2001	77	73	77	68	77	60	76	77	77	68
		2002	72	64	72	68	72	70	72	65	72	58
		2003	65	73	65	68	65	79	65	65	63	83
		2004	68	82	68	68	68	79	69	65	69	90
		2005	84	73	84	68	84	79	84	77	83	90
WYNGATE ES	2	2000	92	90	92	82	90	87	92	87	90	76
		2001	69	90	69	82	69	79	69	87	69	76
		2002	100	90	100	82	100	87	100	87	100	83
		2003	87	82	87	68	87	79	87	94	87	90
		2004	84	90	84	82	84	94	84	94	84	94
		2005	76	90	76	95	76	94	76	94	76	94
COUNTY OVERALL	2	2000	9986	64	9986	55	9925	70	9993	77	9700	68
		2001	9238	64	9240	68	9226	70	9201	77	9227	68
		2002	9826	64	9826	68	9801	70	9764	77	9623	76
		2003	10060	64	10061	68	10028	70	9995	77	9902	83
		2004	9953	73	9953	68	9938	79	9928	87	9846	83
		2005	9362	73	9362	68	9594	79	9285	87	9491	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
ASHBURTON ES	2	2000	85	55	85	55	85	70	85	65	84	68
		2001	61	82	61	82	61	87	61	94	61	90
		2002	80	73	80	82	80	83	80	87	79	90
		2003	83	73	83	82	83	79	83	87	83	90
		2004	98	82	98	82	97	79	98	77	97	83
		2005	85	82	85	82	85	87	85	87	84	94
BANNOCKBURN ES	2	2000	82	82	82	82	82	87	82	94	82	83
		2001	56	90	56	95	56	87	56	94	56	90
		2002	62	90	62	82	62	87	62	77	62	83
		2003	81	90	81	82	81	87	81	87	80	76
		2004	66	90	66	82	66	94	66	87	65	90
		2005	57	90	57	82	57	94	57	87	56	90
LUCY V. BARNESLEY ES	2	2000	83	73	83	55	83	70	82	77	76	76
		2001	69	73	69	68	69	79	69	77	69	76
		2002	53	73	53	68	53	70	53	65	53	58
		2003	72	73	72	68	72	79	72	77	69	83
		2004	79	64	79	68	79	79	79	87	79	83
		2005	72	60	72	68	72	75	72	82	68	83
BEALL ES	2	2000	96	73	96	68	95	70	96	77	95	76
		2001	90	64	90	68	90	60	90	87	90	58
		2002	100	64	100	55	100	70	100	77	99	76
		2003	107	73	107	68	103	79	106	87	101	83
		2004	72	69	72	82	72	79	72	94	72	87
		2005	94	73	94	82	94	79	94	87	94	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
BEL PRE ES	2	2000	142	40	142	55	142	52	142	77	142	68
		2001	123	64	123	68	123	52	123	77	123	58
		2002	170	47	170	43	170	60	170	65	169	76
		2003	153	64	153	68	153	70	153	77	153	83
		2004	134	69	134	68	134	79	133	87	133	83
		2005	128	55	128	68	128	70	128	77	128	90
BELLS MILL ES	2	2000	61	73	61	82	61	79	61	87	61	90
		2001	82	82	82	82	82	87	82	87	82	90
		2002	76	82	76	82	76	79	75	87	75	90
		2003	75	82	75	82	74	79	73	87	73	90
		2004	84	90	84	95	84	87	84	94	83	90
		2005	61	90	61	95	61	87	61	94	61	94
BELMONT ES	2	2000	54	73	54	62	51	60	51	77	51	49
		2001	85	73	85	68	85	70	85	77	85	68
		2002	62	73	62	68	62	75	62	77	62	76
		2003	79	73	79	68	79	79	79	77	79	83
		2004	70	73	70	68	70	79	70	77	70	76
		2005	65	82	65	68	65	87	65	77	65	90
BETHESDA ES	2	2000	54	69	54	68	54	79	54	55	54	83
		2001	54	82	54	68	53	79	54	77	54	90
		2002	64	82	64	82	63	87	64	87	63	90
		2003	61	90	61	82	61	87	61	94	61	94
		2004	61	90	61	82	61	87	58	91	61	94
		2005	68	90	68	82	68	94	68	87	67	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
BEVERLY FARMS ES	2	2000	103	82	103	82	104	79	103	87	101	83
		2001	78	82	78	82	79	79	78	94	79	83
		2002	78	82	78	82	77	79	78	87	74	83
		2003	89	82	89	68	89	87	89	94	86	83
		2004	85	90	85	82	85	94	85	94	85	94
		2005	97	90	97	95	97	87	97	94	94	94
BRADLEY HILLS ES	2	2000	62	82	62	68	61	79	62	77	61	83
		2001	85	90	85	82	85	94	85	87	85	83
		2002	58	86	58	68	58	87	58	87	56	83
		2003	72	90	72	82	72	94	72	94	72	83
		2004	64	90	64	82	64	94	64	94	64	90
		2005	55	96	55	95	55	98	55	98	55	94
BROAD ACRES ES	2	2000	73	34	73	35	73	29	30	36	68	49
		2001	80	29	80	27	81	22	80	36	81	24
		2002	88	34	88	43	88	35	88	55	87	49
		2003	95	47	95	55	95	52	95	65	95	49
		2004	70	55	70	55	70	65	70	77	70	94
		2005	75	47	75	68	75	70	75	65	74	90
BROOKE GROVE ES	2	2000	99	64	99	68	99	79	98	77	93	83
		2001	83	73	83	55	83	79	82	77	83	76
		2002	100	73	100	68	100	70	100	77	91	68
		2003	101	64	101	43	101	70	101	77	91	83
		2004	87	73	87	68	87	79	87	77	87	83
		2005	74	73	74	68	73	70	73	65	72	83

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
BROOKHAVEN ES	2	2000	69	40	69	55	68	43	67	65	65	40
		2001	45	47	45	43	45	43	45	77	45	40
		2002	58	51	58	55	55	60	58	55	57	58
		2003	39	55	39	55	39	60	39	65	39	76
		2004	59	64	59	55	59	70	59	87	59	83
		2005	64	40	64	55	64	56	64	55	63	68
BROWN STATION ES	2	2000	59	55	59	43	60	56	59	77	59	68
		2001	49	55	49	55	49	60	49	65	49	49
		2002	41	55	41	55	41	70	40	77	41	68
		2003	66	47	66	43	65	52	66	50	65	58
		2004	49	64	49	68	49	60	49	77	49	83
		2005	54	60	54	68	54	70	54	71	53	90
BURNING TREE ES	2	2000	85	90	85	82	85	87	83	94	77	90
		2001	75	90	75	82	75	87	75	94	75	83
		2002	78	86	78	82	78	87	78	87	73	83
		2003	88	90	88	82	88	87	88	87	82	90
		2004	83	90	83	82	83	87	83	87	75	90
		2005	84	93	84	82	84	94	84	94	81	94
BURNT MILLS ES	2	2000	78	40	78	35	78	43	78	55	78	58
		2001	90	40	90	35	90	43	90	65	90	40
		2002	87	47	87	43	87	52	87	65	81	83
		2003	99	47	99	43	99	52	99	65	96	58
		2004	66	47	66	55	66	52	66	65	66	68
		2005	87	47	87	55	86	60	87	65	87	68

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
BURTONSVILLE ES	2	2000	133	64	133	68	133	60	133	77	129	68
		2001	108	73	108	68	108	60	108	87	108	83
		2002	109	64	109	55	109	60	83	65	109	68
		2003	132	55	132	43	131	52	131	65	131	58
		2004	123	64	123	68	123	70	122	87	123	83
		2005	110	64	110	62	110	60	110	77	110	76
CANDLEWOOD ES	2	2000	64	73	64	82	64	79	64	91	63	90
		2001	61	73	61	68	61	70	61	87	61	76
		2002	71	73	71	68	71	70	71	87	71	83
		2003	55	82	55	82	55	70	55	87	55	90
		2004	61	82	61	82	61	87	61	87	61	83
		2005	63	73	63	95	62	87	63	87	63	83
CANNON ROAD ES	2	2000	65	47	65	55	64	52	64	65	59	49
		2001	45	55	45	55	45	43	45	65	45	49
		2002	70	64	70	68	70	52	70	65	64	68
		2003	67	55	67	43	67	60	67	65	64	68
		2004	53	73	53	68	53	79	53	77	53	76
		2005	57	73	57	68	57	79	57	87	57	83
CARDEROCK SPRINGS ES	2	2000	62	86	62	82	62	87	62	91	62	90
		2001	48	90	48	68	48	70	48	87	48	76
		2002	55	90	55	95	54	94	55	87	54	94
		2003	54	90	54	82	54	94	54	77	54	90
		2004	60	90	60	82	60	87	59	77	60	90
		2005	42	90	42	89	42	87	42	87	42	92

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
RACHEL CARSON ES	2	2000	110	55	110	55	110	70	110	77	103	68
		2001	117	73	117	68	117	79	117	77	117	76
		2002	113	73	113	68	113	60	113	87	113	68
		2003	121	73	121	68	121	79	121	77	115	76
		2004	110	82	110	82	110	79	110	77	108	76
		2005	112	82	112	82	112	87	112	77	105	90
CASHELL ES	2	2000	73	82	73	68	73	70	73	87	71	76
		2001	48	90	48	82	47	79	49	94	49	83
		2002	55	73	55	82	54	83	55	94	55	76
		2003	66	90	66	82	66	94	66	87	65	83
		2004	58	82	58	82	58	94	58	87	58	90
		2005	63	82	63	82	63	94	63	94	62	94
CEDAR GROVE ES	2	2000	93	64	93	55	93	70	93	55	93	68
		2001	89	73	89	55	89	70	89	87	89	68
		2002	92	60	92	68	92	70	92	77	90	68
		2003	103	73	103	68	102	87	103	77	99	90
		2004	90	82	90	82	90	87	90	94	90	90
		2005	92	73	92	82	92	87	92	77	93	94
CLARKSBURG ES	2	2000	58	55	58	55	60	60	59	65	55	49
		2001	50	64	50	68	49	70	50	77	50	83
		2002	55	64	55	68	55	79	55	87	49	83
		2003	52	40	52	55	52	60	52	65	49	68
		2004	76	90	76	82	76	94	76	94	70	94
		2005	88	90	88	82	87	87	88	87	84	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
CLEARSPRING ES	2	2000	91	55	91	55	88	52	91	65	77	58
		2001	66	40	66	43	66	43	66	65	66	40
		2002	58	60	58	68	57	70	58	77	56	72
		2003	69	64	69	68	68	79	68	77	65	83
		2004	71	73	71	55	70	70	70	87	70	83
		2005	89	73	89	55	88	70	89	77	87	83
CLOPPER MILL ES	2	2000	77	55	77	43	77	60	77	55	76	58
		2001	84	29	84	35	84	22	82	36	84	40
		2002	87	40	87	35	87	43	87	55	84	68
		2003	71	29	71	43	71	43	70	55	70	58
		2004	67	55	67	55	67	60	67	77	67	83
		2005	85	55	85	68	85	70	85	65	84	83
CLOVERLY ES	2	2000	82	82	82	82	81	87	82	87	80	87
		2001	73	82	73	82	73	87	73	87	73	90
		2002	68	73	68	82	68	83	68	87	68	90
		2003	68	82	68	82	68	87	68	94	68	90
		2004	64	82	64	95	63	87	64	94	64	94
		2005	76	90	76	82	76	79	76	94	76	92
COLD SPRING ES	2	2000	39	90	39	82	39	87	39	77	39	90
		2001	55	90	55	68	55	79	55	94	55	94
		2002	38	93	38	82	38	94	38	98	38	94
		2003	54	90	54	82	54	94	54	94	54	94
		2004	46	90	46	95	46	94	46	98	46	94
		2005	71	90	71	82	71	94	71	94	71	94

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
COLLEGE GARDENS ES	2	2000	81	64	81	55	81	60	81	55	81	58
		2001	58	73	58	68	58	87	58	77	58	90
		2002	80	64	80	68	81	70	80	77	79	90
		2003	78	73	78	68	78	87	78	77	78	94
		2004	80	82	80	82	80	87	80	87	80	94
		2005	55	82	55	82	55	87	55	87	55	94
CRESTHAVEN ES	2	2000	96	55	96	55	97	52	96	77	92	58
		2001	90	47	90	43	90	52	90	65	90	49
		2002	82	55	82	55	82	52	82	77	79	68
		2003	94	40	94	43	94	52	94	65	91	68
		2004	96	55	96	55	96	70	96	87	93	90
		2005	90	47	90	49	90	52	90	65	86	76
CAPT. JAMES DALY ES	2	2000	105	40	105	35	108	52	106	65	107	40
		2001	101	47	101	55	100	52	101	65	101	49
		2002	98	40	98	35	96	35	84	55	89	40
		2003	89	47	89	43	89	60	86	55	86	76
		2004	103	55	103	68	103	70	103	77	103	76
		2005	88	69	88	55	88	60	77	77	85	76
DAMASCUS ES	2	2000	54	64	54	55	54	70	54	65	54	68
		2001	43	73	43	82	43	70	43	77	43	49
		2002	63	55	63	55	63	52	63	77	61	68
		2003	66	64	66	55	66	65	66	55	66	80
		2004	53	82	53	68	53	79	53	77	53	90
		2005	55	73	55	68	55	79	55	77	55	83

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
DARNESTOWN ES	2	2000	61	82	61	82	61	79	61	87	57	68
		2001	64	90	64	68	64	79	64	87	64	76
		2002	64	90	64	95	64	87	63	94	63	90
		2003	76	82	76	82	76	87	76	87	75	83
		2004	76	90	76	95	75	94	76	94	75	90
		2005	61	82	61	95	60	87	61	94	60	90
DIAMOND ES	2	2000	81	73	81	68	82	79	81	87	79	76
		2001	80	64	80	43	80	70	80	87	80	76
		2002	59	82	59	68	59	87	59	87	58	83
		2003	64	73	64	68	62	79	62	87	61	83
		2004	75	73	75	82	76	87	71	87	72	90
		2005	72	73	72	82	71	87	71	65	70	94
CHARLES R. DREW ES	2	2000	63	47	63	55	63	70	63	65	63	76
		2001	50	47	50	68	50	79	50	77	50	90
		2002	52	47	52	55	52	60	52	77	47	76
		2003	53	55	53	43	53	52	53	55	49	76
		2004	73	55	73	68	72	60	73	87	73	83
		2005	53	73	53	68	53	70	53	77	52	90
DUFIEF ES	2	2000	71	90	71	82	70	87	70	87	70	90
		2001	55	82	55	82	55	79	55	77	55	94
		2002	71	82	71	68	71	87	71	87	69	90
		2003	80	90	80	82	80	94	80	94	76	94
		2004	90	82	90	95	90	94	90	94	89	94
		2005	65	82	65	82	65	94	65	87	63	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
EAST SILVER SPRING ES	2	2000	112	47	112	43	112	48	112	55	102	49
		2001	84	40	85	35	85	43	85	55	85	40
		2002	79	47	79	55	79	52	79	65	76	49
		2003	86	47	86	43	86	52	86	55	85	76
		2004	67	47	67	55	66	60	60	65	63	76
		2005	72	44	72	62	71	70	72	60	71	76
FAIRLAND ES	2	2000	88	64	88	55	87	60	87	77	86	76
		2001	80	47	80	35	80	43	81	77	81	58
		2002	84	55	84	55	83	60	84	77	84	68
		2003	73	47	74	43	74	60	74	65	73	76
		2004	79	64	79	55	79	60	79	55	79	76
		2005	80	55	80	55	80	52	80	65	80	63
FALLSMEAD ES	2	2000	85	73	85	68	85	79	85	87	84	83
		2001	81	82	81	82	81	87	81	87	81	90
		2002	93	82	93	82	92	87	92	87	92	87
		2003	99	82	99	82	96	87	99	87	99	90
		2004	82	82	82	82	82	94	82	87	82	87
		2005	78	82	78	82	77	94	77	94	77	94
FARMLAND ES	2	2000	92	90	92	82	91	94	92	87	76	94
		2001	87	82	87	82	87	87	87	94	87	90
		2002	93	90	93	82	91	87	92	94	92	94
		2003	86	82	86	95	86	87	86	94	86	94
		2004	98	90	98	82	98	87	98	94	97	90
		2005	83	82	83	82	83	94	83	87	83	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
FIELDS ROAD ES	2	2000	97	64	97	68	97	79	97	87	93	83
		2001	74	64	74	68	74	79	74	87	74	76
		2002	92	73	92	68	92	79	92	94	90	83
		2003	83	73	83	68	83	79	83	77	83	76
		2004	86	73	86	82	86	79	86	87	84	83
		2005	75	73	75	68	75	79	75	87	75	83
FLOWER HILL ES	2	2000	98	55	98	55	97	43	98	65	94	40
		2001	71	64	71	55	71	52	50	77	71	58
		2002	92	47	92	55	92	43	92	77	91	40
		2003	85	55	85	55	85	60	85	77	83	83
		2004	91	47	91	55	91	60	91	77	89	76
		2005	82	64	82	55	82	70	81	87	80	83
FLOWER VALLEY ES	2	2000	84	78	84	68	84	79	84	87	84	80
		2001	66	73	66	68	66	70	64	77	66	68
		2002	72	73	72	68	72	75	69	94	67	76
		2003	79	90	79	82	79	87	80	94	80	90
		2004	80	82	80	82	80	87	80	94	80	90
		2005	76	82	76	55	76	79	74	94	73	83
FOREST KNOLLS ES	2	2000	91	64	91	68	91	70	91	77	82	83
		2001	92	73	92	68	92	79	92	87	92	83
		2002	106	73	106	82	105	70	106	87	104	90
		2003	89	73	89	68	89	70	88	77	88	83
		2004	96	73	96	68	96	79	96	94	96	90
		2005	81	82	81	82	81	79	81	94	81	94

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
FOX CHAPEL ES	2	2000	68	47	68	27	68	52	68	65	65	49
		2001	70	47	70	43	70	52	70	65	70	49
		2002	71	47	71	43	71	52	71	55	69	40
		2003	83	64	83	55	82	60	83	65	80	58
		2004	73	55	73	68	73	70	73	77	73	90
		2005	74	47	74	68	74	65	73	65	72	83
GAITHERSBURG ES	2	2000	80	40	80	43	80	60	80	77	73	58
		2001	84	34	84	35	84	43	84	65	84	76
		2002	88	40	88	49	84	39	88	65	88	58
		2003	79	47	79	55	79	52	79	65	78	76
		2004	95	55	95	55	95	52	95	77	95	76
		2005	85	64	85	55	85	52	85	65	84	76
GALWAY ES	2	2000	126	55	126	55	126	75	126	87	126	76
		2001	103	64	103	68	103	87	103	94	103	90
		2002	109	64	109	68	109	70	109	87	106	68
		2003	120	47	120	55	120	52	120	77	120	68
		2004	100	64	100	55	100	70	98	82	99	68
		2005	106	69	106	68	106	79	105	87	104	76
GARRETT PARK ES	2	2000	62	73	62	82	63	79	62	77	58	68
		2001	66	73	66	82	66	79	66	87	66	76
		2002	95	90	95	82	95	79	95	94	95	90
		2003	78	82	78	82	78	83	78	87	78	94
		2004	68	78	68	68	68	94	68	87	68	90
		2005	70	82	70	68	70	87	70	87	69	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
=====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
GEORGIAN FOREST ES	2	2000	73	55	73	43	73	52	73	55	72	49
		2001	64	55	64	55	64	60	64	87	64	83
		2002	80	47	80	43	80	52	80	55	79	68
		2003	59	55	59	55	59	52	64	65	64	68
		2004	70	55	70	55	70	60	70	55	69	83
		2005	82	64	82	55	82	70	68	77	81	76
GERMANTOWN ES	2	2000	67	64	67	55	67	60	67	65	67	58
		2001	55	55	55	43	55	60	55	77	55	58
		2002	78	55	78	55	78	60	75	65	78	58
		2003	75	55	75	55	74	60	75	65	75	83
		2004	76	64	76	68	76	52	76	77	76	76
		2005	74	55	74	55	74	60	74	65	74	83
GLEN HAVEN ES	2	2000	74	40	74	43	74	29	73	65	70	24
		2001	69	29	69	27	68	29	69	45	69	24
		2002	77	34	77	43	77	52	78	65	74	40
		2003	86	34	86	35	85	35	86	55	83	49
		2004	77	55	77	68	77	79	77	77	76	90
		2005	79	55	79	55	79	70	79	65	78	83
GLENALLAN ES	2	2000	81	55	81	68	80	52	81	65	75	68
		2001	64	47	64	68	64	60	64	77	64	58
		2002	66	55	66	68	66	65	65	77	64	80
		2003	69	64	69	68	69	70	69	77	69	83
		2004	64	64	64	82	64	83	64	91	63	90
		2005	71	64	71	68	71	70	71	87	69	83

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
GOSHEN ES	2	2000	112	64	112	55	112	60	112	77	110	58
		2001	114	73	114	68	113	70	114	87	114	76
		2002	126	69	126	55	125	79	125	77	122	68
		2003	120	73	120	68	120	79	120	77	119	83
		2004	100	82	100	82	100	79	100	87	98	90
		2005	115	73	115	68	115	87	115	87	113	90
GREENCASTLE ES	2	2000	115	40	115	43	117	35	115	45	115	68
		2001	101	40	101	35	101	43	100	55	101	58
		2002	105	47	105	43	105	52	105	65	104	68
		2003	82	40	82	35	82	39	70	55	81	58
		2004	131	40	131	43	131	52	131	55	131	76
		2005	96	55	96	55	96	70	96	77	96	83
GREENWOOD ES	2	2000	116	73	116	55	115	52	115	77	113	58
		2001	90	82	90	82	90	87	90	87	90	76
		2002	112	82	112	82	112	87	112	94	112	83
		2003	106	82	106	82	106	87	106	94	104	90
		2004	94	82	94	82	92	87	90	94	94	90
		2005	104	82	104	82	103	87	104	94	101	90
HARMONY HILLS ES	2	2000	64	44	64	55	64	52	64	77	63	68
		2001	61	34	61	35	61	43	61	55	61	58
		2002	75	47	75	55	75	43	75	65	69	58
		2003	70	40	70	43	70	52	70	71	70	83
		2004	69	47	69	55	69	70	69	65	69	83
		2005	72	47	72	49	72	60	72	65	72	76

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
HIGHLAND ES	2	2000	109	34	109	35	109	52	109	55	99	58
		2001	88	40	88	43	88	43	89	65	89	49
		2002	118	29	118	35	117	35	118	45	114	49
		2003	98	44	98	43	98	52	97	55	97	76
		2004	122	40	122	43	122	52	122	50	122	76
		2005					101	52			101	76
HIGHLAND VIEW ES	2	2000	88	60	88	43	89	60	89	55	82	68
		2001	55	34	55	35	54	60	55	45	55	76
		2002	56	44	56	43	55	60	56	41	54	76
		2003	52	82	52	68	51	87	52	77	52	83
		2004	50	73	50	68	50	79	50	82	50	83
		2005	44	64	44	82	44	79	44	65	44	90
JACKSON ROAD ES	2	2000	60	44	60	43	61	43	60	55	61	40
		2001	64	47	64	43	64	60	64	65	64	58
		2002	76	55	76	55	76	48	76	77	74	49
		2003	72	47	72	43	72	43	72	60	71	68
		2004	68	47	68	55	68	70	68	77	68	68
		2005	64	60	64	68	64	52	64	65	64	68
JONES LANE ES	2	2000	88	82	88	82	88	87	88	87	84	76
		2001	67	82	67	82	67	87	67	94	67	90
		2002	79	82	79	82	79	87	79	94	75	90
		2003	92	73	92	82	92	75	88	87	87	90
		2004	91	82	91	82	91	79	91	87	91	83
		2005	87	82	87	82	87	87	87	87	84	90

Highland ES did not administer the reading, language, and language mechanics subtests because it was part of a state program known as Maryland's Reading First Initiative.

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
KEMP MILL ES	2	2000	112	47	112	49	111	52	112	65	110	58
		2001	102	40	102	35	102	43	102	55	102	49
		2002	100	40	100	35	100	35	100	55	100	49
		2003	102	34	102	39	101	52	102	55	102	68
		2004	100	55	100	68	99	60	100	82	100	83
		2005	95	64	95	68	95	60	96	65	96	90
KENSINGTON PARKWOOD ES	2	2000	55	73	55	82	54	79	55	77	49	76
		2001	40	90	40	82	40	79	40	87	40	83
		2002	68	82	68	82	68	87	68	82	63	83
		2003	69	82	69	82	68	87	68	87	68	83
		2004	77	82	77	82	77	87	77	77	73	90
		2005	86	90	86	82	86	87	86	87	86	94
LAKE SENECA ES	2	2000	61	64	61	68	61	60	61	65	55	76
		2001	49	64	49	55	49	70	49	77	49	83
		2002	53	55	53	55	52	70	53	65	51	68
		2003	71	55	71	55	70	52	70	65	70	72
		2004	55	55	55	43	55	70	55	55	55	68
		2005	55	55	55	55	55	60	54	65	52	72
LAKEWOOD ES	2	2000	104	78	104	82	103	87	103	94	99	90
		2001	84	82	84	82	84	87	84	94	84	83
		2002	86	82	86	82	86	87	86	94	85	90
		2003	92	82	92	82	92	87	92	87	88	94
		2004	108	82	108	82	108	87	108	87	104	94
		2005	92	82	92	82	92	94	92	94	92	94

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
LAYTONSVILLE ES	2	2000	98	73	98	68	98	70	98	65	98	58
		2001	87	73	87	68	87	70	87	87	87	58
		2002	89	73	89	68	89	70	89	87	89	58
		2003	96	73	96	68	96	87	96	87	95	83
		2004	104	78	104	68	104	87	104	94	104	94
		2005	87	82	87	68	87	87	87	87	87	83
LUXMANOR ES	2	2000	38	82	38	82	38	87	38	77	38	90
		2001	39	90	39	82	39	87	39	87	39	83
		2002	41	90	41	82	41	87	41	94	40	83
		2003	48	82	48	68	48	79	48	77	48	76
		2004	45	82	45	82	45	94	46	87	46	94
		2005	47	82	47	95	47	94	47	87	47	94
THURGOOD MARSHALL ES	2	2000	73	73	73	68	75	79	73	77	74	58
		2001	84	64	84	55	84	60	84	77	84	58
		2002	75	73	75	68	75	60	75	77	75	76
		2003	90	82	90	68	90	70	90	77	90	72
		2004	102	64	102	55	100	70	101	65	99	76
		2005	71	73	71	68	70	70	71	87	70	83
MARYVALE ES	2	2000	68	34	68	35	68	43	68	50	68	36
		2001	87	34	87	35	87	43	86	36	87	58
		2002	91	34	91	35	91	43	90	36	90	76
		2003	88	55	88	55	88	79	88	55	88	90
		2004	101	47	101	55	101	70	101	45	101	83
		2005	87	47	87	43	87	79	87	55	87	83
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA ES	2	2002	112	73	112	68	112	79	112	87	112	83
		2003	161	73	161	68	161	70	159	87	156	90
		2004	180	73	180	75	181	79	180	87	180	90
		2005	169	73	169	82	169	79	169	94	168	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
S. CHRISTA MCAULIFFE ES	2	2000	122	55	122	43	122	52	122	45	122	49
		2001	116	47	116	55	116	43	116	65	116	49
		2002	113	55	113	55	112	60	112	55	110	76
		2003	111	64	111	68	110	70	108	55	109	90
		2004	119	64	119	68	119	60	119	55	115	76
		2005	108	73	108	68	107	79	108	65	99	83
RONALD A. MCNAIR ES	2	2000	151	64	151	55	152	70	152	87	152	68
		2001	155	64	155	68	155	79	155	87	155	83
		2002	96	64	96	68	96	79	96	87	95	83
		2003	104	73	105	68	105	60	105	77	102	76
		2004	107	73	107	82	107	87	107	87	107	90
		2005	117	82	117	82	117	87	117	87	117	90
MEADOW HALL ES	2	2000	56	47	56	49	56	43	56	60	54	40
		2001	60	47	60	55	60	43	60	65	60	58
		2002	63	34	63	35	63	43	62	55	62	49
		2003	56	51	56	43	56	39	55	55	56	58
		2004	58	60	58	68	58	65	58	65	58	72
		2005	58	51	58	43	58	52	58	65	55	76
MILL CREEK TOWNE ES	2	2000	62	55	62	68	62	60	62	65	56	58
		2001	68	47	68	55	68	60	67	65	68	76
		2002	49	55	49	68	49	79	49	87	48	90
		2003	69	82	69	68	69	87	69	94	68	94
		2004	83	82	83	82	83	87	82	94	79	94
		2005	55	82	55	82	54	87	55	94	51	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
MONOCACY ES	2	2000	47	73	47	55	47	70	47	77	44	80
		2001	34	55	34	55	34	52	34	65	34	58
		2002	50	64	50	55	50	70	50	65	50	72
		2003	46	64	46	43	46	70	46	65	46	76
		2004	35	73	35	82	35	79	35	87	35	90
		2005	30	73	30	82	30	79	30	77	30	90
MONTGOMERY KNOLLS ES	2	2000	80	55	80	43	79	52	80	65	79	58
		2001	89	47	89	43	89	52	89	65	89	40
		2002	90	47	90	35	89	52	90	77	90	49
		2003	105	40	105	35	105	60	107	55	107	68
		2004	93	40	93	43	93	52	93	55	93	58
		2005	103	40	103	43	103	60	103	55	103	76
NEW HAMPSHIRE ESTATES ES	2	2000	111	34	111	35	112	29	111	55	112	31
		2001	115	29	115	35	115	29	115	45	115	31
		2002	100	34	100	43	100	52	99	45	99	49
		2003	116	47	116	49	115	52	115	65	116	58
		2004	87	40	87	68	86	70	85	65	84	87
		2005	81	47	81	68	81	70	81	77	81	90
OAKLAND TERRACE ES	2	2000	107	55	107	43	108	60	107	65	108	58
		2001	112	47	112	43	112	52	112	65	112	58
		2002	112	60	112	55	112	70	112	77	111	68
		2003	110	64	110	62	109	60	109	65	109	76
		2004	124	64	124	55	124	65	124	71	124	68
		2005	123	73	123	68	123	79	123	77	123	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
OLNEY ES	2	2000	88	64	88	55	87	70	88	65	84	63
		2001	80	55	80	55	80	60	80	55	80	68
		2002	90	64	90	62	90	70	90	65	87	76
		2003	99	82	99	68	97	79	98	77	98	76
		2004	96	73	96	55	96	70	96	77	96	68
		2005	92	73	92	68	92	70	71	87	93	83
WILLIAM TYLER PAGE ES	2	2000	51	47	51	43	51	52	51	65	45	49
		2001	64	47	64	55	64	60	64	77	64	68
		2002	52	55	52	55	52	60	52	60	52	90
		2003	52	55	52	43	52	60	52	77	52	76
		2004	62	55	62	55	62	70	62	87	56	83
		2005	64	47	64	55	64	65	64	65	64	76
POOLESVILLE ES	2	2000	80	64	80	55	80	70	80	77	79	58
		2001	69	73	69	68	69	70	69	77	69	49
		2002	65	73	65	68	65	70	65	87	65	58
		2003	77	64	77	55	76	70	75	55	77	76
		2004	91	73	91	68	90	87	90	65	91	76
		2005	64	82	64	68	64	83	64	65	64	83
POTOMAC ES	2	2000	102	73	102	82	102	79	102	87	101	76
		2001	107	82	107	82	107	87	107	94	107	83
		2002	116	82	116	82	116	94	116	94	117	83
		2003	116	82	116	82	117	87	116	94	116	87
		2004	102	90	102	82	102	94	102	98	102	90
		2005	78	82	78	95	78	94	78	94	78	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
JUDITH A. RESNIK ES	2	2000	117	47	117	43	118	52	117	65	115	58
		2001	92	55	92	55	92	52	92	77	92	68
		2002	102	55	102	55	102	70	102	77	101	76
		2003	81	55	81	55	81	70	81	77	81	83
		2004	105	55	105	68	105	79	105	77	105	83
		2005	105	55	105	68	105	70	105	87	104	83
SALLY K. RIDE ES	2	2000	119	55	119	55	119	60	120	77	113	58
		2001	117	55	117	55	118	43	117	65	118	40
		2002	109	55	109	55	109	70	109	77	104	58
		2003	110	55	110	55	110	60	110	82	109	76
		2004	84	64	85	68	85	79	85	87	84	83
		2005	94	55	94	68	94	70	94	87	91	76
RITCHIE PARK ES	2	2000	57	64	57	68	59	79	57	77	59	83
		2001	52	73	53	68	53	70	53	87	53	76
		2002	50	73	50	68	50	79	50	77	50	76
		2003	61	64	61	55	61	60	61	77	61	83
		2004	55	73	55	82	55	79	55	87	55	83
		2005	57	96	57	95	57	98	57	94	57	94
ROCK CREEK FOREST ES	2	2000	93	64	93	68	93	70	93	87	93	83
		2001	78	82	78	82	78	87	78	94	78	90
		2002	85	64	85	68	85	70	85	77	85	83
		2003	86	73	86	68	86	87	86	87	86	90
		2004	84	55	84	55	82	65	84	87	82	76
		2005	82	73	82	68	82	79	82	87	82	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
ROCK CREEK VALLEY ES	2	2000	41	47	41	43	40	56	40	45	40	49
		2001	51	55	51	68	51	60	51	77	51	58
		2002	46	51	46	68	45	52	46	77	44	58
		2003	43	47	43	55	43	43	42	77	41	76
		2004	48	60	48	49	48	60	48	71	41	90
		2005	57	73	57	82	55	70	57	77	57	76
ROCK VIEW ES	2	2000	75	47	75	55	75	43	75	65	74	45
		2001	63	55	63	55	63	43	63	65	63	49
		2002	86	40	86	55	86	48	86	65	82	58
		2003	79	55	79	55	78	52	79	77	76	80
		2004	71	64	71	68	71	60	71	77	67	83
		2005	77	47	77	55	77	60	77	65	70	68
ROCKWELL ES	2	2000	83	64	83	55	82	70	84	65	69	58
		2001	78	73	78	55	78	70	78	65	78	68
		2002	82	78	82	55	82	70	82	77	82	68
		2003	65	64	65	68	65	79	51	77	65	83
		2004	66	73	66	75	66	79	66	87	66	83
		2005	79	73	79	68	79	87	79	77	79	83
ROLLING TERRACE ES	2	2000	101	47	101	55	101	60	101	55	100	68
		2001	105	47	105	43	105	52	105	55	105	68
		2002	98	47	98	43	98	52	98	65	96	83
		2003	122	47	122	55	122	60	122	65	121	83
		2004	104	55	104	68	104	65	104	77	104	76
		2005	122	69	122	55	122	70	122	65	122	76

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
ROSEMARY HILLS ES	2	2000	177	82	177	68	176	70	177	77	175	76
		2001	171	82	171	82	172	79	170	77	172	76
		2002	167	82	167	82	167	87	167	87	167	90
		2003	169	82	168	68	169	79	169	77	169	90
		2004	155	82	155	82	156	79	156	87	155	90
		2005	161	90	161	82	161	94	162	91	162	90
ROSEMONT ES	2	2000	83	29	83	35	82	22	81	45	81	24
		2001	72	40	72	55	72	43	71	55	72	68
		2002	77	34	77	35	77	29	77	55	76	40
		2003	70	47	70	49	70	43	58	65	69	58
		2004	72	51	72	55	72	60	72	55	68	68
		2005					58	43			58	58
SEQUOYAH ES	2	2000	94	55	94	68	94	79	94	77	89	83
		2001	93	55	93	55	93	79	93	65	93	83
		2002	86	64	86	68	86	79	86	87	85	83
		2003	77	55	77	55	76	60	77	77	74	68
		2004	86	64	86	68	86	70	86	65	86	83
		2005	74	64	74	62	74	60	74	87	74	76
SEVEN LOCKS ES	2	2000	50	78	50	68	50	79	50	87	50	90
		2001	38	82	38	68	38	87	38	87	38	83
		2002	40	82	40	82	40	87	40	94	40	90
		2003	38	86	38	82	38	87	38	87	38	90
		2004	45	82	45	82	45	94	45	77	44	90
		2005	41	82	41	82	41	94	41	94	41	94

Rosemont ES did not administer the reading, language, and language mechanics subtests because it was part of a state program known as Maryland's Reading First Initiative.

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
SHERWOOD ES	2	2000	74	64	74	62	75	79	74	65	75	76
		2001	73	64	73	55	73	70	73	87	73	76
		2002	86	73	86	68	86	79	86	77	86	76
		2003	79	73	79	55	79	79	79	65	79	76
		2004	69	64	69	68	70	70	70	87	70	72
		2005	81	73	81	82	81	70	80	77	81	76
SLIGO CREEK ES	2	2000	47	64	47	55	54	70	47	65	54	76
		2001	102	73	102	55	106	70	102	65	106	76
		2002	109	64	109	43	113	70	109	65	112	68
		2003	115	73	115	55	115	70	115	65	115	90
		2004	121	64	121	55	122	79	121	55	122	90
		2005	103	73	103	68	103	87	102	65	101	90
SOMERSET ES	2	2000	75	90	75	82	74	87	74	87	73	83
		2001	72	90	72	82	72	79	72	94	72	83
		2002	66	90	66	82	66	75	66	87	66	83
		2003	78	90	78	82	77	79	77	94	77	90
		2004	58	82	58	82	58	87	58	87	58	90
		2005	63	90	63	82	63	87	63	94	63	94
SOUTH LAKE ES	2	2000	81	40	81	43	81	35	81	65	80	49
		2001	74	55	74	43	74	43	73	65	74	49
		2002	75	47	75	43	75	35	75	65	73	49
		2003	94	55	94	55	94	60	94	65	92	76
		2004	91	55	91	43	91	52	91	65	90	83
		2005	78	55	78	68	77	60	78	77	78	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
STEDWICK ES	2	2000	84	64	84	68	85	70	84	77	85	68
		2001	79	73	79	68	79	70	79	87	79	49
		2002	109	64	109	55	110	70	110	87	109	58
		2003	95	55	95	55	95	60	95	77	94	83
		2004	102	64	102	68	102	70	102	77	102	76
		2005	96	64	96	68	96	79	95	94	95	90
STONE MILL ES	2	2000	129	82	129	82	129	87	129	87	126	83
		2001	113	82	113	82	113	94	113	94	113	90
		2002	129	82	129	82	127	87	128	98	126	90
		2003	112	90	112	82	112	87	109	94	112	90
		2004	106	82	106	82	106	94	106	94	106	94
		2005	101	90	101	82	101	94	101	98	101	94
STONEGATE ES	2	2000	72	73	72	82	72	79	72	94	72	92
		2001	74	73	74	82	74	87	74	94	74	94
		2002	69	82	69	68	69	79	69	87	68	94
		2003	76	82	76	75	76	79	76	94	76	94
		2004	61	73	61	82	61	87	62	87	62	94
		2005	65	82	65	95	65	87	65	98	65	94
STRAWBERRY KNOLL ES	2	2000	83	64	83	68	86	43	82	65	86	49
		2001	81	55	81	55	81	43	81	65	81	40
		2002	87	55	87	55	87	70	87	87	86	58
		2003	94	55	94	55	94	60	94	77	94	76
		2004	96	60	96	68	95	70	96	77	94	80
		2005	70	55	70	68	70	79	70	77	69	76

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
SUMMIT HALL ES	2	2000	75	29	75	35	75	22	75	55	68	31
		2001	78	47	78	43	77	43	78	65	78	49
		2002	67	34	67	35	67	35	67	65	65	58
		2003	93	47	93	43	93	60	93	55	91	76
		2004	82	47	82	55	82	70	82	71	79	76
		2005					87	60			85	68
TAKOMA PARK ES	2	2000	163	73	163	82	166	70	163	65	165	83
		2001	135	73	135	68	135	79	135	77	135	83
		2002	121	73	121	55	121	79	121	65	121	83
		2003	102	60	102	55	102	60	102	65	102	72
		2004	118	82	118	75	118	79	118	77	117	83
		2005	119	82	119	82	119	87	119	77	118	83
TRAVILAH ES	2	2000	91	82	91	82	91	87	91	87	91	83
		2001	91	82	91	82	91	79	91	94	91	76
		2002	86	90	86	82	86	87	85	94	85	83
		2003	82	90	82	82	82	87	81	94	80	90
		2004	73	90	73	82	73	87	73	87	73	90
		2005	86	82	86	82	84	91	59	94	84	90
TWINBROOK ES	2	2000	70	55	70	43	70	70	70	65	66	68
		2001	72	55	72	43	71	60	71	65	72	76
		2002	92	44	92	43	91	52	91	55	87	76
		2003	84	51	84	68	84	60	84	77	80	83
		2004	87	55	86	68	86	70	86	87	82	87
		2005	76	55	76	68	76	70	76	87	69	83

Summit Hall ES did not administer the reading, language, and language mechanics subtests because it was part of a state program known as Maryland's Reading First Initiative.

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
VIER'S MILL ES	2	2000	110	47	110	43	110	52	110	55	106	49
		2001	110	40	110	43	110	52	110	55	110	68
		2002	87	55	87	43	87	60	86	65	86	76
		2003	103	47	103	43	102	70	103	77	103	90
		2004	103	64	103	68	103	79	103	87	103	94
		2005	111	55	111	55	112	70	111	77	112	90
WASHINGTON GROVE ES	2	2000	53	55	53	55	53	60	53	65	46	72
		2001	52	47	52	43	52	43	52	55	52	49
		2002	63	55	63	55	63	43	62	77	58	58
		2003	66	44	66	43	66	43	66	36	62	54
		2004	63	73	63	82	61	70	63	77	57	76
		2005	57	82	57	82	57	60	57	87	57	76
WATERS LANDING ES	2	2000	113	64	113	55	112	52	110	77	111	58
		2001	82	55	82	68	82	52	82	77	82	49
		2002	110	64	110	55	110	52	109	77	108	68
		2003	96	73	96	82	95	70	96	87	94	90
		2004	110	64	110	68	110	70	110	77	110	76
		2005	103	73	103	68	103	79	105	87	105	76
WATKINS MILL ES	2	2000	82	64	82	55	82	52	82	65	81	40
		2001	89	47	89	55	89	60	88	65	89	58
		2002	76	55	76	55	76	60	76	55	73	68
		2003	83	73	83	68	83	79	83	87	79	83
		2004	97	64	97	68	97	79	97	87	97	83
		2005	104	73	104	82	104	79	104	94	103	90

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005
 =====

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
WAYSIDE ES	2	2000	111	82	111	82	110	91	111	94	110	90
		2001	93	82	93	82	92	87	93	94	93	83
		2002	115	82	115	82	114	79	115	87	114	87
		2003	110	90	110	82	109	87	111	87	111	90
		2004	108	86	108	82	107	87	107	94	107	90
		2005	96	82	96	82	96	91	96	94	96	90
WELLER ROAD ES	2	2000	99	40	99	43	99	43	99	77	98	58
		2001	96	47	96	55	96	52	96	77	96	68
		2002	101	40	101	43	100	52	100	65	100	58
		2003	88	47	88	55	88	60	88	77	88	76
		2004	95	47	95	43	95	60	95	65	95	83
		2005	88	60	88	68	88	60	87	87	87	83
WESTBROOK ES	2	2000	54	78	54	68	54	83	54	65	52	76
		2001	46	90	46	82	46	87	46	87	46	76
		2002	56	86	56	82	56	87	56	87	55	76
		2003	44	90	44	82	44	87	44	87	44	90
		2004	48	90	48	82	48	87	48	87	48	90
		2005	48	90	48	82	48	94	48	94	48	94
WESTOVER ES	2	2000	63	55	63	55	63	60	62	77	60	58
		2001	37	73	37	55	37	70	37	77	37	76
		2002	43	73	43	55	43	70	43	77	41	76
		2003	54	73	54	55	54	56	54	87	52	58
		2004	43	73	43	55	43	70	43	87	43	68
		2005	41	73	41	55	41	70	41	87	41	76

TERRANOVA COMPREHENSIVE TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS: GRADE 2
 MEDIAN NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANKS BY SCHOOL
 SPRING 2000 & 2001 & 2002 & 2003 & 2004 & 2005

SCHOOL	GRADE	YEAR	READ NO. TSTED	READ MDIAN %TILE	LANG NO. TSTED	LANG MDIAN %TILE	MATH NO. TSTED	MATH MDIAN %TILE	LANG MECH NO. TSTED	LANG MECH MDIAN %TILE	MATH COMP NO. TSTED	MATH COMP MDIAN %TILE
WHEATON WOODS ES	2	2000	88	47	88	49	90	43	88	65	90	49
		2001	88	40	88	43	88	52	88	77	88	58
		2002	92	40	92	39	92	52	92	65	88	68
		2003	87	55	87	43	87	60	86	77	85	90
		2004	106	47	106	68	105	70	106	77	104	80
		2005	100	55	100	68	103	70	102	77	102	90
WHETSTONE ES	2	2000	91	47	91	55	90	60	91	65	90	76
		2001	94	55	94	68	94	60	94	77	94	76
		2002	85	47	85	43	85	52	85	77	81	76
		2003	109	64	109	55	109	79	109	77	106	83
		2004	91	73	91	68	91	79	91	87	91	90
		2005	82	55	82	55	82	79	82	71	80	90
WOOD ACRES ES	2	2000	84	82	84	82	84	79	84	87	83	68
		2001	100	90	100	82	100	87	100	87	100	83
		2002	84	90	84	82	85	87	84	87	85	76
		2003	98	86	98	89	97	79	97	87	97	76
		2004	114	82	114	82	114	79	114	77	114	68
		2005	99	90	99	95	99	98	99	94	99	94
WOODFIELD ES	2	2000	75	73	75	55	75	79	75	65	75	76
		2001	77	73	77	68	77	79	77	77	77	90
		2002	85	73	85	68	86	79	86	87	84	83
		2003	86	78	86	55	86	70	86	77	86	83
		2004	73	82	73	68	73	87	73	77	72	94
		2005	63	90	63	82	63	94	63	94	63	90

Appendix B: CTBS Battery Index by School

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
WHETSTONE ES	2000	90	47.8%	90	56.7%	89	66.3%	90	73.3%	89	71.9%	448	63.2%
	2001	98	50.0%	98	62.2%	98	64.3%	98	75.5%	95	67.4%	487	63.9%
	2002	85	49.4%	85	49.4%	85	56.5%	85	70.6%	81	71.6%	421	59.4%
	2003	109	55.0%	109	53.2%	109	69.7%	109	71.6%	106	80.2%	542	65.9%
	2004	91	67.0%	91	65.9%	91	79.1%	91	79.1%	91	84.6%	455	75.2%
	2005	82	54.9%	82	58.5%	82	73.2%	82	67.1%	80	82.5%	408	67.2%
WOOD ACRES ES	2000	83	91.6%	83	88.0%	83	85.5%	83	89.2%	83	68.7%	415	84.6%
	2001	102	89.2%	102	89.2%	102	91.2%	102	91.2%	102	73.5%	510	86.9%
	2002	83	89.2%	83	88.0%	84	91.7%	83	95.2%	84	71.4%	417	87.1%
	2003	98	82.7%	98	81.6%	97	86.6%	97	91.8%	97	75.3%	487	83.6%
	2004	114	86.8%	114	76.3%	114	86.8%	114	87.7%	114	63.2%	570	80.2%
	2005	99	90.9%	99	87.9%	99	97.0%	99	93.9%	99	91.9%	495	92.3%
WOODFIELD ES	2000	75	65.3%	75	65.3%	75	82.7%	75	76.0%	75	69.3%	375	71.7%
	2001	78	73.1%	78	61.5%	78	87.2%	78	91.0%	78	89.7%	390	80.5%
	2002	85	80.0%	85	67.1%	86	80.2%	86	87.2%	84	79.8%	426	78.9%
	2003	86	70.9%	86	58.1%	86	74.4%	86	76.7%	86	80.2%	430	72.1%
	2004	73	84.9%	73	67.1%	73	86.3%	73	76.7%	72	91.7%	364	81.3%
	2005	63	92.1%	63	95.2%	63	93.7%	63	92.1%	63	90.5%	315	92.7%
WOODLIN ES	2000	91	60.4%	91	72.5%	91	74.7%	91	72.5%	91	63.7%	455	68.8%
	2001	83	57.8%	83	63.9%	83	65.1%	82	70.7%	77	57.1%	408	63.0%
	2002	72	62.5%	72	59.7%	72	70.8%	72	69.4%	72	56.9%	360	63.9%
	2003	65	69.2%	65	69.2%	65	78.5%	65	64.6%	63	85.7%	323	73.4%
	2004	68	80.9%	68	76.5%	68	77.9%	69	79.7%	69	85.5%	342	80.1%
	2005	84	71.4%	84	75.0%	84	77.4%	84	71.4%	83	75.9%	419	74.2%
WYNGATE ES	2000	92	89.1%	92	78.3%	90	87.8%	92	90.2%	90	73.3%	456	83.8%
	2001	74	78.4%	74	89.2%	74	82.4%	74	91.9%	74	78.4%	370	84.1%
	2002	100	85.0%	100	84.0%	100	86.0%	100	94.0%	100	82.0%	500	86.2%
	2003	87	81.6%	87	85.1%	87	73.6%	87	89.7%	87	82.8%	435	82.5%
	2004	84	95.2%	84	94.0%	84	96.4%	84	97.6%	84	90.5%	420	94.8%
	2005	76	94.7%	76	96.1%	76	96.1%	76	96.1%	76	92.1%	380	95.0%

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
ASHBURTON ES	2000	84	53.6%	84	56.0%	84	70.2%	84	66.7%	84	58.3%	420	61.0%
	2001	70	77.1%	70	75.7%	70	82.9%	70	88.6%	69	81.2%	349	81.1%
	2002	80	73.8%	80	73.8%	80	75.0%	80	82.5%	79	91.1%	399	79.2%
	2003	83	72.3%	83	73.5%	83	80.7%	83	81.9%	83	84.3%	415	78.6%
	2004	98	69.4%	98	76.5%	97	79.4%	98	75.5%	97	83.5%	488	76.8%
	2005	85	85.9%	85	82.4%	85	89.4%	85	88.2%	84	91.7%	424	87.5%
BANNOCKBURN ES	2000	82	91.5%	82	86.6%	82	86.6%	82	86.6%	82	85.4%	410	87.3%
	2001	57	89.5%	57	84.2%	57	94.7%	57	89.5%	57	88.0%	285	88.8%
	2002	62	88.7%	62	88.7%	62	88.7%	62	87.1%	62	74.2%	310	85.5%
	2003	81	82.7%	81	82.7%	81	91.4%	81	82.7%	80	76.3%	404	83.2%
	2004	66	92.4%	66	89.4%	66	93.9%	66	90.9%	65	87.7%	329	90.9%
	2005	57	89.5%	57	84.2%	57	96.5%	57	86.0%	56	92.9%	284	89.8%
BARNESLEY (LUCY V.) ES	2000	80	66.3%	81	55.6%	81	67.9%	80	68.8%	76	65.8%	398	64.8%
	2001	71	64.8%	70	72.9%	70	74.3%	71	74.6%	70	64.3%	352	70.2%
	2002	53	64.2%	53	64.2%	53	62.3%	53	64.2%	53	54.7%	265	61.9%
	2003	72	73.6%	72	72.2%	72	75.0%	72	72.2%	69	81.2%	357	74.8%
	2004	79	60.8%	79	67.1%	79	79.7%	79	74.7%	79	82.3%	395	72.9%
	2005	72	58.3%	72	77.8%	72	79.2%	72	75.0%	68	73.5%	356	72.8%
BEALL ES	2000	96	70.8%	96	62.5%	95	69.5%	96	78.1%	95	65.3%	478	69.2%
	2001	95	56.8%	95	60.0%	95	61.1%	95	75.8%	94	58.5%	474	62.4%
	2002	100	61.0%	100	58.0%	100	68.0%	100	77.0%	99	65.7%	499	65.9%
	2003	107	64.5%	107	69.2%	103	76.7%	106	77.4%	101	75.2%	524	72.5%
	2004	72	69.4%	72	72.2%	72	87.5%	72	84.7%	72	81.9%	360	79.2%
	2005	94	68.1%	94	71.3%	94	81.9%	94	79.8%	94	84.0%	470	77.0%
BEL PRE ES	2000	142	45.1%	142	54.9%	142	64.1%	142	79.6%	142	61.3%	710	61.0%
	2001	129	61.2%	129	63.6%	129	58.9%	129	73.6%	129	50.4%	645	61.6%
	2002	171	46.2%	171	48.5%	171	67.3%	171	64.3%	170	62.9%	854	57.8%
	2003	153	61.4%	153	66.0%	153	72.5%	153	73.9%	153	80.4%	765	70.8%
	2004	134	62.7%	134	68.7%	134	80.6%	133	77.4%	133	82.7%	668	74.4%
	2005	128	60.9%	128	68.0%	128	73.4%	128	77.3%	128	78.9%	640	71.7%
BELLS MILL ES	2000	61	73.8%	61	77.0%	61	75.4%	61	85.2%	61	77.0%	305	77.7%
	2001	86	72.1%	86	79.1%	85	80.0%	85	85.9%	85	78.8%	427	79.2%
	2002	76	73.7%	76	81.6%	76	77.6%	75	90.7%	75	84.0%	378	81.5%
	2003	75	78.7%	75	76.0%	74	79.7%	73	89.0%	73	78.1%	370	80.3%
	2004	84	91.7%	84	94.0%	84	94.0%	84	90.5%	83	90.4%	419	92.1%
	2005	61	86.9%	61	90.2%	61	91.8%	61	82.0%	61	88.5%	305	87.9%

B-1

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
BELMONT ES	2000	54	70.4%	54	68.5%	51	64.7%	51	78.4%	51	45.1%	261	65.5%
	2001	88	71.6%	88	71.6%	88	73.9%	88	69.3%	86	60.5%	438	69.4%
	2002	62	82.3%	62	71.0%	62	85.5%	62	88.7%	62	67.7%	310	79.0%
	2003	79	78.5%	79	62.0%	79	79.7%	79	69.6%	79	81.0%	395	74.2%
	2004	70	74.3%	70	71.4%	70	88.6%	70	75.7%	70	82.9%	350	78.6%
	2005	65	75.4%	65	70.8%	65	90.8%	65	78.5%	65	93.8%	325	81.8%
BETHESDA ES	2000	54	66.7%	54	63.0%	54	77.8%	54	55.6%	54	79.6%	270	68.5%
	2001	56	80.4%	56	78.6%	55	78.2%	56	80.4%	55	87.3%	278	80.9%
	2002	64	76.6%	64	76.6%	63	81.0%	64	78.1%	63	84.1%	318	79.2%
	2003	61	91.8%	61	88.5%	61	88.5%	61	91.8%	61	96.7%	305	91.5%
	2004	61	91.8%	61	82.0%	61	88.5%	58	86.2%	61	90.2%	302	87.7%
	2005	68	89.7%	68	85.3%	68	94.1%	68	89.7%	67	88.1%	339	89.4%
BEVERLY FARMS ES	2000	103	84.5%	103	85.4%	104	82.7%	103	87.4%	101	84.2%	514	84.8%
	2001	91	71.4%	91	68.1%	92	71.7%	91	84.6%	81	75.3%	446	74.2%
	2002	78	85.9%	78	74.4%	77	84.4%	78	92.3%	74	87.8%	385	84.9%
	2003	89	83.1%	89	74.2%	89	82.0%	89	89.9%	86	82.6%	442	82.4%
	2004	85	84.7%	85	87.1%	85	87.1%	85	89.4%	85	95.3%	425	88.7%
	2005	97	92.8%	97	92.8%	97	94.8%	97	94.8%	94	93.6%	482	93.8%
BRADLEY HILLS ES	2000	62	75.8%	62	71.0%	61	86.9%	62	72.6%	61	82.0%	308	77.6%
	2001	89	88.8%	89	83.1%	89	93.3%	89	82.0%	89	79.8%	445	85.4%
	2002	57	86.0%	57	80.7%	57	87.7%	57	89.5%	55	76.4%	283	84.1%
	2003	72	93.1%	72	90.3%	72	93.1%	72	97.2%	72	80.6%	360	90.8%
	2004	64	93.8%	64	93.8%	64	98.4%	64	93.8%	64	90.6%	320	94.1%
	2005	55	96.4%	55	89.1%	55	98.2%	55	94.5%	55	98.2%	275	95.3%
BROAD ACRES ES	2000	73	24.7%	73	26.0%	73	34.2%	30	40.0%	68	47.1%	317	33.4%
	2001	82	22.0%	82	26.8%	83	21.7%	82	37.8%	83	20.5%	412	25.7%
	2002	89	29.2%	89	40.4%	89	38.2%	89	50.6%	88	37.5%	444	39.2%
	2003	95	47.4%	95	57.9%	95	53.7%	95	66.3%	95	43.2%	475	53.7%
	2004	70	57.1%	70	61.4%	70	72.9%	70	78.6%	70	91.4%	350	72.3%
	2005	75	49.3%	75	69.3%	75	64.0%	75	72.0%	74	83.8%	374	67.6%
BROOKE GROVE ES	2000	99	64.6%	99	65.7%	99	84.8%	98	81.6%	93	81.7%	488	75.6%
	2001	89	69.7%	89	58.4%	89	77.5%	88	78.4%	85	72.9%	440	71.4%
	2002	101	71.3%	101	66.3%	101	73.3%	101	84.2%	92	65.2%	496	72.2%
	2003	101	60.4%	101	48.5%	101	71.3%	101	70.3%	91	79.1%	495	65.7%
	2004	87	71.3%	87	70.1%	87	74.7%	87	80.5%	87	72.4%	435	73.8%
	2005	74	68.9%	74	67.6%	73	75.3%	73	67.1%	72	73.6%	366	70.5%

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
BROOKHAVEN ES	2000	67	43.3%	67	53.7%	65	47.7%	65	66.2%	65	36.9%	329	49.5%
	2001	55	45.5%	55	43.6%	54	38.9%	54	59.3%	49	36.7%	267	44.9%
	2002	58	50.0%	58	60.3%	55	61.8%	58	65.5%	57	56.1%	286	58.7%
	2003	39	59.0%	39	59.0%	39	64.1%	39	64.1%	39	69.2%	195	63.1%
	2004	59	54.2%	59	62.7%	59	69.5%	59	86.4%	59	78.0%	295	70.2%
	2005	64	42.2%	64	53.1%	64	53.1%	64	57.8%	63	57.1%	319	52.7%
BROWN STATION ES	2000	58	58.6%	58	48.3%	59	61.0%	58	72.4%	59	62.7%	292	60.6%
	2001	55	50.9%	55	58.2%	55	61.8%	55	63.6%	55	47.3%	275	56.4%
	2002	41	61.0%	41	53.7%	41	73.2%	40	77.5%	41	75.6%	204	68.1%
	2003	66	45.5%	66	47.0%	65	52.3%	66	50.0%	65	50.8%	328	49.1%
	2004	49	65.3%	49	71.4%	49	65.3%	49	81.6%	49	69.4%	245	70.6%
	2005	54	61.1%	54	61.1%	54	66.7%	54	68.5%	53	75.5%	269	66.5%
BURNING TREE ES	2000	84	82.1%	84	81.0%	84	89.3%	82	86.6%	77	92.2%	411	86.1%
	2001	83	84.3%	83	88.0%	83	85.5%	83	88.0%	79	89.9%	411	87.1%
	2002	77	87.0%	77	80.5%	77	85.7%	77	83.1%	72	84.7%	380	84.2%
	2003	88	85.2%	88	77.3%	88	87.5%	88	78.4%	82	85.4%	434	82.7%
	2004	83	83.1%	83	73.5%	83	84.3%	83	85.5%	75	92.0%	407	83.5%
	2005	84	88.1%	84	90.5%	84	95.2%	84	88.1%	81	97.5%	417	91.8%
BURNT MILLS ES	2000	78	37.2%	78	42.3%	78	47.4%	78	55.1%	78	52.6%	390	46.9%
	2001	93	32.3%	93	32.3%	93	48.4%	93	58.1%	93	39.8%	465	42.2%
	2002	87	46.0%	87	43.7%	87	51.7%	87	59.8%	81	66.7%	429	53.4%
	2003	99	46.5%	99	48.5%	99	56.6%	99	64.6%	96	61.5%	492	55.5%
	2004	66	45.5%	66	53.0%	66	57.6%	66	60.6%	66	59.1%	330	55.2%
	2005	87	47.1%	87	60.9%	86	67.4%	87	66.7%	87	74.7%	434	63.4%
BURTONSVILLE ES	2000	132	60.6%	132	66.7%	132	59.8%	132	75.0%	131	63.4%	659	65.1%
	2001	110	62.7%	110	68.2%	111	58.6%	110	83.6%	110	61.8%	551	67.0%
	2002	108	63.0%	108	56.5%	108	57.4%	82	65.9%	108	61.1%	514	60.5%
	2003	132	55.3%	132	41.7%	131	50.4%	131	61.8%	131	55.0%	657	52.8%
	2004	123	70.7%	123	66.7%	123	70.7%	122	80.3%	123	76.4%	614	73.0%
	2005	110	62.7%	110	60.0%	110	70.0%	110	70.0%	110	71.8%	550	66.9%
CANDLEWOOD ES	2000	64	76.6%	64	75.0%	64	78.1%	64	90.6%	63	77.8%	319	79.6%
	2001	61	72.1%	61	65.6%	61	77.0%	61	85.2%	61	62.3%	305	72.5%
	2002	70	68.6%	70	77.1%	70	74.3%	70	80.0%	70	72.9%	350	74.6%
	2003	55	83.6%	55	74.5%	55	70.9%	55	76.4%	55	76.4%	275	76.4%
	2004	61	78.7%	61	75.4%	61	86.9%	61	86.9%	61	82.0%	305	82.0%
	2005	63	73.0%	63	87.3%	62	90.3%	63	92.1%	63	87.3%	314	86.0%

B-3

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
CANNON ROAD ES	2000	65	49.2%	65	63.1%	64	54.7%	64	70.3%	59	47.5%	317	57.1%
	2001	55	54.5%	55	58.2%	55	47.3%	55	70.9%	48	41.7%	268	54.9%
	2002	71	57.7%	71	56.3%	71	57.7%	71	71.8%	65	66.2%	349	61.9%
	2003	67	59.7%	67	49.3%	67	55.2%	67	62.7%	64	59.4%	332	57.2%
	2004	53	67.9%	53	69.8%	53	71.7%	53	77.4%	53	75.5%	265	72.5%
	2005	57	70.2%	57	68.4%	57	82.5%	57	80.7%	57	77.2%	285	75.8%
CARDEROCK SPRINGS ES	2000	62	83.9%	62	83.9%	62	87.1%	62	85.5%	62	80.6%	310	84.2%
	2001	51	90.2%	51	76.5%	51	80.4%	50	90.0%	50	70.0%	253	81.4%
	2002	55	90.9%	55	92.7%	54	96.3%	55	96.4%	54	94.4%	273	94.1%
	2003	54	90.7%	54	87.0%	54	100.0%	54	83.3%	54	94.4%	270	91.1%
	2004	60	90.0%	60	90.0%	60	93.3%	59	79.7%	60	93.3%	299	89.3%
	2005	42	88.1%	42	92.9%	42	92.9%	42	83.3%	42	90.5%	210	89.5%
CARSON (RACHEL) ES	2000	109	60.6%	109	54.1%	109	67.9%	109	79.8%	103	60.2%	539	64.6%
	2001	123	66.7%	123	66.7%	122	82.0%	123	80.5%	120	70.0%	611	73.2%
	2002	113	68.1%	113	63.7%	113	62.8%	113	70.8%	113	59.3%	565	65.0%
	2003	121	69.4%	121	66.9%	121	78.5%	121	75.2%	115	68.7%	599	71.8%
	2004	110	87.3%	110	82.7%	110	81.8%	110	78.2%	108	80.6%	548	82.1%
	2005	112	76.8%	112	74.1%	112	83.9%	112	75.9%	105	86.7%	553	79.4%
CASHELL ES	2000	73	71.2%	73	72.6%	73	69.9%	73	86.3%	71	66.2%	363	73.3%
	2001	49	79.6%	49	75.5%	48	87.5%	50	92.0%	50	72.0%	246	81.3%
	2002	55	74.5%	55	83.6%	54	85.2%	55	94.5%	55	74.5%	274	82.5%
	2003	66	84.8%	66	84.8%	66	92.4%	66	92.4%	65	86.2%	329	88.1%
	2004	58	79.3%	58	77.6%	58	93.1%	58	82.8%	58	91.4%	290	84.8%
	2005	63	74.6%	63	79.4%	63	85.7%	63	98.4%	62	88.7%	314	85.4%
CEDAR GROVE ES	2000	95	66.3%	95	54.7%	95	74.7%	95	64.2%	95	58.9%	475	63.8%
	2001	93	66.7%	93	63.4%	92	75.0%	93	87.1%	91	61.5%	462	70.8%
	2002	92	57.6%	92	65.2%	92	73.9%	92	73.9%	90	60.0%	458	66.2%
	2003	103	73.8%	103	69.9%	102	85.3%	103	75.7%	99	86.9%	510	78.2%
	2004	90	81.1%	90	78.9%	90	87.8%	90	82.2%	90	86.7%	450	83.3%
	2005	92	73.9%	92	79.3%	92	80.4%	92	73.9%	93	78.5%	461	77.2%
CLARKSBURG ES	2000	58	56.9%	58	53.4%	60	66.7%	59	72.9%	55	47.3%	290	59.7%
	2001	59	67.8%	59	71.2%	58	65.5%	59	78.0%	53	66.0%	288	69.8%
	2002	55	63.6%	55	65.5%	55	81.8%	55	83.6%	49	89.8%	269	76.6%
	2003	52	44.2%	52	51.9%	52	63.5%	52	69.2%	49	63.3%	257	58.4%
	2004	76	84.2%	76	81.6%	76	88.2%	76	89.5%	70	90.0%	374	86.6%
	2005	88	81.8%	88	78.4%	87	85.1%	88	83.0%	84	89.3%	435	83.4%

B-4

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
CLEARSPRING ES	2000	79	67.1%	79	62.0%	76	61.8%	79	73.4%	77	54.5%	390	63.8%
	2001	69	42.0%	69	44.9%	69	39.1%	69	62.3%	67	34.3%	343	44.6%
	2002	58	55.2%	58	65.5%	57	66.7%	58	77.6%	56	66.1%	287	66.2%
	2003	69	59.4%	69	62.3%	68	70.6%	68	70.6%	65	81.5%	339	68.7%
	2004	71	67.6%	71	64.8%	70	74.3%	70	80.0%	70	81.4%	352	73.6%
	2005	89	65.2%	89	59.6%	88	63.6%	89	65.2%	87	71.3%	442	64.9%
CLOPPER MILL ES	2000	77	54.5%	77	45.5%	77	58.4%	77	55.8%	76	53.9%	384	53.6%
	2001	91	25.3%	91	30.8%	91	29.7%	89	34.8%	89	36.0%	451	31.3%
	2002	88	39.8%	88	43.2%	88	47.7%	88	51.1%	85	62.4%	437	48.7%
	2003	71	40.8%	71	39.4%	71	49.3%	70	52.9%	70	58.6%	353	48.2%
	2004	67	52.2%	67	55.2%	67	67.2%	67	76.1%	67	74.6%	335	65.1%
	2005	85	56.5%	85	61.2%	85	72.9%	85	69.4%	84	77.4%	424	67.5%
CLOVERLY ES	2000	82	84.1%	82	80.5%	81	91.4%	82	89.0%	80	86.3%	407	86.2%
	2001	75	77.3%	75	86.7%	75	88.0%	75	90.7%	74	91.9%	374	86.9%
	2002	68	79.4%	68	80.9%	68	83.8%	68	89.7%	68	85.3%	340	83.8%
	2003	68	85.3%	68	76.5%	68	89.7%	68	89.7%	68	89.7%	340	86.2%
	2004	64	81.3%	64	85.9%	63	95.2%	64	96.9%	64	95.3%	319	90.9%
	2005	76	86.8%	76	86.8%	76	94.7%	76	94.7%	76	97.4%	380	92.1%
COLD SPRING ES	2000	39	89.7%	39	84.6%	39	87.2%	39	87.2%	39	89.7%	195	87.7%
	2001	55	94.5%	55	76.4%	55	92.7%	55	98.2%	55	94.5%	275	91.3%
	2002	38	97.4%	38	94.7%	38	94.7%	38	97.4%	38	94.7%	190	95.8%
	2003	54	83.3%	54	85.2%	54	94.4%	54	88.9%	54	90.7%	270	88.5%
	2004	46	97.8%	46	91.3%	46	100.0%	46	100.0%	46	97.8%	230	97.4%
	2005	71	88.7%	71	95.8%	71	98.6%	71	93.0%	71	94.4%	355	94.1%
COLLEGE GARDENS ES	2000	81	58.0%	81	51.9%	81	66.7%	81	53.1%	81	60.5%	405	58.0%
	2001	61	68.9%	61	70.5%	60	78.3%	61	68.9%	60	78.3%	303	72.9%
	2002	79	60.8%	79	73.4%	80	86.3%	79	73.4%	78	96.2%	395	78.0%
	2003	78	80.8%	78	73.1%	78	78.2%	78	75.6%	78	91.0%	390	79.7%
	2004	80	77.5%	80	78.8%	80	78.8%	80	86.3%	80	95.0%	400	83.3%
	2005	55	70.9%	55	85.5%	55	85.5%	55	87.3%	55	98.2%	275	85.5%
CRESTHAVEN ES	2000	96	53.1%	96	52.1%	97	55.7%	96	72.9%	92	53.3%	477	57.4%
	2001	98	46.9%	98	42.9%	98	50.0%	98	60.2%	92	48.9%	484	49.8%
	2002	80	52.5%	80	57.5%	80	57.5%	80	76.3%	77	66.2%	397	62.0%
	2003	94	42.6%	94	47.9%	94	59.6%	94	62.8%	91	64.8%	467	55.5%
	2004	96	56.3%	96	59.4%	96	74.0%	96	80.2%	93	83.9%	477	70.6%
	2005	90	48.9%	90	50.0%	90	58.9%	90	72.2%	86	67.4%	446	59.4%

B-5

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
DALY (CAPT. JAMES E.) ES	2000	105	38.1%	105	42.9%	108	59.3%	106	64.2%	108	42.6%	532	49.4%
	2001	106	46.2%	106	50.9%	104	51.9%	106	67.0%	105	47.6%	527	52.8%
	2002	98	40.8%	98	39.8%	96	41.7%	84	59.5%	89	39.3%	465	43.9%
	2003	89	43.8%	89	47.2%	89	64.0%	86	53.5%	86	68.6%	439	55.4%
	2004	103	51.5%	103	63.1%	103	65.0%	103	72.8%	103	70.9%	515	64.7%
	2005	88	65.9%	88	55.7%	88	58.0%	77	71.4%	85	70.6%	426	64.1%
DAMASCUS ES	2000	54	63.0%	54	57.4%	54	75.9%	54	74.1%	54	63.0%	270	66.7%
	2001	47	72.3%	47	70.2%	47	72.3%	47	74.5%	45	51.1%	233	68.2%
	2002	63	61.9%	63	50.8%	63	54.0%	63	77.8%	61	60.7%	313	61.0%
	2003	66	60.6%	66	60.6%	66	62.1%	66	56.1%	66	62.1%	330	60.3%
	2004	53	81.1%	53	71.7%	53	84.9%	53	75.5%	53	79.2%	265	78.5%
	2005	55	61.8%	55	69.1%	55	80.0%	55	70.9%	55	80.0%	275	72.4%
DARNESTOWN ES	2000	61	78.7%	61	82.0%	61	83.6%	61	90.2%	57	64.9%	301	80.1%
	2001	64	87.5%	64	68.8%	64	82.8%	64	92.2%	63	69.8%	319	80.3%
	2002	64	92.2%	64	87.5%	64	96.9%	63	95.2%	63	92.1%	318	92.8%
	2003	76	81.6%	76	77.6%	76	92.1%	76	86.8%	75	77.3%	379	83.1%
	2004	76	86.8%	76	84.2%	75	96.0%	76	96.1%	75	94.7%	378	91.5%
	2005	61	90.2%	61	90.2%	60	90.0%	61	98.4%	60	95.0%	303	92.7%
DIAMOND ES	2000	78	70.5%	78	62.8%	79	74.7%	78	78.2%	79	69.6%	392	71.2%
	2001	82	52.4%	82	48.8%	82	63.4%	82	79.3%	80	70.0%	408	62.7%
	2002	59	69.5%	59	69.5%	59	83.1%	59	83.1%	58	82.8%	294	77.6%
	2003	64	71.9%	64	78.1%	62	80.6%	62	87.1%	61	83.6%	313	80.2%
	2004	75	84.0%	75	86.7%	76	86.8%	71	84.5%	72	93.1%	369	87.0%
	2005	72	72.2%	72	76.4%	71	91.5%	71	70.4%	70	94.3%	356	80.9%
DREW (DR. CHARLES R.) ES	2000	63	44.4%	63	54.0%	63	60.3%	63	66.7%	63	61.9%	315	57.5%
	2001	58	43.1%	58	56.9%	58	60.3%	58	63.8%	56	73.2%	288	59.4%
	2002	52	46.2%	52	55.8%	52	61.5%	52	65.4%	46	76.1%	254	60.6%
	2003	53	52.8%	53	43.4%	53	56.6%	53	52.8%	49	69.4%	261	54.8%
	2004	73	57.5%	73	63.0%	72	66.7%	73	69.9%	73	78.1%	364	67.0%
	2005	53	69.8%	53	64.2%	53	73.6%	53	83.0%	52	78.8%	264	73.9%
DUFIEF ES	2000	71	88.7%	71	90.1%	70	94.3%	70	94.3%	70	94.3%	352	92.3%
	2001	59	83.1%	59	72.9%	59	94.9%	59	84.7%	59	84.7%	295	84.1%
	2002	71	83.1%	71	78.9%	71	84.5%	71	88.7%	69	89.9%	353	85.0%
	2003	80	91.3%	80	85.0%	80	90.0%	80	83.8%	76	96.1%	396	89.1%
	2004	90	87.8%	90	93.3%	90	91.1%	90	90.0%	89	93.3%	449	91.1%
	2005	65	78.5%	65	81.5%	65	87.7%	65	87.7%	63	90.5%	323	85.1%

B-6

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
EAST SILVER SPRING ES	2000	107	48.6%	107	47.7%	107	52.3%	107	60.7%	102	45.1%	530	50.9%
	2001	92	34.8%	93	37.6%	93	37.6%	93	52.7%	88	38.6%	459	40.3%
	2002	78	48.7%	78	56.4%	78	55.1%	78	65.4%	75	48.0%	387	54.8%
	2003	86	47.7%	86	40.7%	86	53.5%	86	53.5%	85	65.9%	429	52.2%
	2004	67	44.8%	67	50.7%	66	60.6%	60	75.0%	63	73.0%	323	60.4%
	2005	72	41.7%	72	56.9%	71	64.8%	72	61.1%	71	76.1%	358	60.1%
FAIRLAND ES	2000	87	62.1%	87	60.9%	86	60.5%	86	90.7%	86	74.4%	432	69.7%
	2001	82	37.8%	82	37.8%	82	41.5%	83	73.5%	82	61.0%	411	50.4%
	2002	83	56.6%	83	59.0%	82	68.3%	83	71.1%	83	61.4%	414	63.3%
	2003	73	49.3%	74	43.2%	74	59.5%	74	64.9%	73	69.9%	368	57.3%
	2004	79	55.7%	79	54.4%	79	62.0%	79	58.2%	79	70.9%	395	60.3%
	2005	80	52.5%	80	56.3%	80	60.0%	80	66.3%	80	58.8%	400	58.8%
FALLSMEAD ES	2000	85	75.3%	85	72.9%	85	78.8%	85	80.0%	84	78.6%	424	77.1%
	2001	87	81.6%	87	80.5%	87	78.2%	87	89.7%	86	75.6%	434	81.1%
	2002	92	79.3%	92	73.9%	91	81.3%	91	80.2%	91	80.2%	457	79.0%
	2003	99	84.8%	99	82.8%	96	85.4%	99	86.9%	99	82.8%	492	84.6%
	2004	82	85.4%	82	79.3%	82	86.6%	82	84.1%	82	80.5%	410	83.2%
	2005	78	82.1%	78	83.3%	77	88.3%	77	94.8%	77	93.5%	387	88.4%
FARMLAND ES	2000	78	91.0%	78	89.7%	77	92.2%	78	97.4%	77	89.6%	388	92.0%
	2001	92	81.5%	92	83.7%	92	91.3%	92	93.5%	91	95.6%	459	89.1%
	2002	93	89.2%	93	90.3%	91	97.8%	92	97.8%	92	93.5%	461	93.7%
	2003	86	87.2%	86	91.9%	86	89.5%	86	96.5%	86	90.7%	430	91.2%
	2004	98	86.7%	98	82.7%	98	91.8%	98	88.8%	97	89.7%	489	87.9%
	2005	83	81.9%	83	85.5%	83	94.0%	83	81.9%	83	94.0%	415	87.5%
FIELDS ROAD ES	2000	97	62.9%	97	66.0%	97	77.3%	97	80.4%	93	76.3%	481	72.6%
	2001	77	62.3%	77	64.9%	77	71.4%	77	80.5%	76	68.4%	384	69.5%
	2002	92	60.9%	92	65.2%	92	73.9%	92	78.3%	90	74.4%	458	70.5%
	2003	83	71.1%	83	71.1%	83	71.1%	83	68.7%	83	74.7%	415	71.3%
	2004	86	69.8%	86	76.7%	86	81.4%	86	83.7%	84	79.8%	428	78.3%
	2005	75	76.0%	75	70.7%	75	81.3%	75	84.0%	75	84.0%	375	79.2%
FLOWER HILL ES	2000	98	51.0%	98	55.1%	97	47.4%	98	69.4%	94	42.6%	485	53.2%
	2001	75	56.0%	75	58.7%	75	53.3%	54	74.1%	75	50.7%	354	57.6%
	2002	91	47.3%	91	54.9%	91	48.4%	91	75.8%	90	33.3%	454	52.0%
	2003	85	55.3%	85	58.8%	85	58.8%	85	74.1%	83	71.1%	423	63.6%
	2004	91	47.3%	91	52.7%	91	70.3%	91	73.6%	89	71.9%	453	63.1%
	2005	82	57.3%	82	62.2%	82	81.7%	81	77.8%	80	80.0%	407	71.7%

B-7

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
FLOWER VALLEY ES	2000	84	71.4%	84	75.0%	84	78.6%	84	79.8%	84	81.0%	420	77.1%
	2001	69	68.1%	69	72.5%	69	81.2%	67	76.1%	67	61.2%	341	71.8%
	2002	71	76.1%	71	76.1%	71	74.6%	68	88.2%	66	75.8%	347	78.1%
	2003	79	83.5%	79	87.3%	79	93.7%	80	90.0%	80	91.3%	397	89.2%
	2004	80	78.8%	80	78.8%	80	86.3%	80	83.8%	80	91.3%	400	83.8%
	2005	76	78.9%	76	63.2%	76	80.3%	74	87.8%	73	75.3%	375	77.1%
FOREST KNOLLS ES	2000	86	60.5%	86	61.6%	86	65.1%	86	75.6%	82	67.1%	426	66.0%
	2001	97	69.1%	97	70.1%	96	72.9%	97	84.5%	95	73.7%	482	74.1%
	2002	105	66.7%	105	72.4%	104	76.0%	105	81.0%	103	80.6%	522	75.3%
	2003	89	65.2%	89	61.8%	89	68.5%	88	77.3%	88	78.4%	443	70.2%
	2004	96	64.6%	96	78.1%	96	80.2%	96	86.5%	96	89.6%	480	79.8%
	2005	81	69.1%	81	81.5%	81	90.1%	81	90.1%	81	91.4%	405	84.4%
FOX CHAPEL ES	2000	69	39.1%	69	33.3%	69	50.7%	69	63.8%	66	48.5%	342	47.1%
	2001	77	45.5%	77	44.2%	77	51.9%	77	72.7%	73	47.9%	381	52.5%
	2002	69	46.4%	69	46.4%	69	53.6%	69	60.9%	67	40.3%	343	49.6%
	2003	83	59.0%	83	55.4%	82	58.5%	83	74.7%	80	56.3%	411	60.8%
	2004	73	53.4%	73	63.0%	73	74.0%	73	69.9%	73	83.6%	365	68.8%
	2005	74	48.6%	74	67.6%	74	70.3%	73	61.6%	72	68.1%	367	63.2%
GAITHERSBURG ES	2000	79	36.7%	79	48.1%	79	62.0%	79	75.9%	73	54.8%	389	55.5%
	2001	86	41.9%	86	39.5%	86	43.0%	86	57.0%	86	64.0%	430	49.1%
	2002	86	38.4%	86	51.2%	82	42.7%	86	65.1%	86	55.8%	426	50.7%
	2003	79	45.6%	79	51.9%	79	57.0%	79	63.3%	78	69.2%	394	57.4%
	2004	95	55.8%	95	61.1%	95	58.9%	95	69.5%	95	68.4%	475	62.7%
	2005	85	58.8%	85	60.0%	85	61.2%	85	63.5%	84	76.2%	424	63.9%
GALWAY ES	2000	126	54.8%	126	59.5%	126	68.3%	126	77.0%	126	64.3%	630	64.8%
	2001	108	63.9%	108	65.7%	108	81.5%	108	84.3%	108	77.8%	540	74.6%
	2002	109	65.1%	109	69.7%	109	68.8%	109	80.7%	106	67.9%	542	70.5%
	2003	120	42.5%	120	50.8%	120	52.5%	120	67.5%	120	63.3%	600	55.3%
	2004	100	63.0%	100	59.0%	100	73.0%	98	80.6%	99	60.6%	497	67.2%
	2005	106	64.2%	106	65.1%	106	73.6%	105	81.0%	104	75.0%	527	71.7%
GARRETT PARK ES	2000	57	66.7%	57	80.7%	58	72.4%	57	84.2%	58	65.5%	287	73.9%
	2001	73	76.7%	73	76.7%	72	84.7%	72	81.9%	72	70.8%	362	78.2%
	2002	95	87.4%	95	86.3%	95	87.4%	95	88.4%	95	77.9%	475	85.5%
	2003	78	91.0%	78	87.2%	78	88.5%	78	88.5%	78	94.9%	390	90.0%
	2004	68	82.4%	68	88.2%	68	85.3%	68	89.7%	68	83.8%	340	85.9%
	2005	70	85.7%	70	71.4%	70	85.7%	70	80.0%	69	89.9%	349	82.5%

B-8

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
GEORGIAN FOREST ES	2000	73	50.7%	73	47.9%	73	54.8%	73	54.8%	72	48.6%	364	51.4%
	2001	68	52.9%	68	54.4%	68	64.7%	68	82.4%	66	71.2%	338	65.1%
	2002	80	40.0%	80	42.5%	80	55.0%	80	57.5%	79	59.5%	399	50.9%
	2003	59	54.2%	59	50.8%	59	50.8%	64	62.5%	64	57.8%	305	55.4%
	2004	70	51.4%	70	51.4%	70	60.0%	70	60.0%	69	63.8%	349	57.3%
	2005	82	62.2%	82	59.8%	82	65.9%	68	70.6%	81	71.6%	395	65.8%
GERMANTOWN ES	2000	67	59.7%	67	55.2%	67	59.7%	67	73.1%	67	53.7%	335	60.3%
	2001	61	49.2%	61	44.3%	61	60.7%	61	72.1%	61	49.2%	305	55.1%
	2002	78	60.3%	78	56.4%	78	60.3%	75	68.0%	78	52.6%	387	59.4%
	2003	75	56.0%	75	57.3%	74	60.8%	75	70.7%	75	74.7%	374	63.9%
	2004	76	60.5%	76	57.9%	76	56.6%	76	72.4%	76	76.3%	380	64.7%
	2005	74	51.4%	74	55.4%	74	60.8%	74	63.5%	74	77.0%	370	61.6%
GLEN HAVEN ES	2000	72	31.9%	72	41.7%	72	34.7%	71	64.8%	70	25.7%	357	39.8%
	2001	77	24.7%	77	27.3%	76	28.9%	77	45.5%	77	20.8%	384	29.4%
	2002	78	32.1%	78	39.7%	78	57.7%	79	72.2%	75	36.0%	388	47.7%
	2003	86	31.4%	86	39.5%	85	36.5%	86	51.2%	83	44.6%	426	40.6%
	2004	77	53.2%	77	71.4%	77	76.6%	77	70.1%	76	84.2%	384	71.1%
	2005	79	54.4%	79	64.6%	79	74.7%	79	69.6%	78	83.3%	394	69.3%
GLENALLAN ES	2000	80	52.5%	80	67.5%	79	62.0%	80	71.3%	75	64.0%	394	63.5%
	2001	75	45.3%	75	60.0%	74	62.2%	74	64.9%	65	64.6%	363	59.2%
	2002	66	60.6%	66	74.2%	66	66.7%	65	73.8%	64	78.1%	327	70.6%
	2003	69	63.8%	69	68.1%	69	66.7%	69	82.6%	69	84.1%	345	73.0%
	2004	64	59.4%	64	76.6%	64	81.3%	64	82.8%	63	74.6%	319	74.9%
	2005	71	62.0%	71	63.4%	71	71.8%	71	77.5%	69	84.1%	353	71.7%
GOSHEN ES	2000	112	60.7%	112	58.9%	112	65.2%	112	79.5%	110	50.9%	558	63.1%
	2001	118	70.3%	118	61.0%	117	66.7%	118	86.4%	117	70.1%	588	70.9%
	2002	125	66.4%	125	61.6%	124	71.8%	124	83.9%	122	67.2%	620	70.2%
	2003	120	68.3%	120	63.3%	120	77.5%	120	75.8%	119	74.8%	599	72.0%
	2004	100	70.0%	100	67.0%	100	81.0%	100	80.0%	98	83.7%	498	76.3%
	2005	115	65.2%	115	69.6%	115	80.0%	115	82.6%	113	85.0%	573	76.4%
GREENCASTLE ES	2000	114	37.7%	114	38.6%	116	44.8%	114	46.5%	115	60.9%	573	45.7%
	2001	102	38.2%	102	33.3%	102	45.1%	102	54.9%	102	55.9%	510	45.5%
	2002	104	47.1%	104	49.0%	104	52.9%	104	58.7%	103	67.0%	519	54.9%
	2003	82	39.0%	82	32.9%	82	41.5%	70	54.3%	81	58.0%	397	44.8%
	2004	131	44.3%	131	40.5%	131	59.5%	131	53.4%	131	70.2%	655	53.6%
	2005	96	53.1%	96	53.1%	96	71.9%	96	65.6%	96	78.1%	480	64.4%

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
GREENWOOD ES	2000	116	74.1%	116	66.4%	115	60.9%	115	75.7%	113	53.1%	575	66.1%
	2001	99	83.8%	99	80.8%	98	84.7%	99	90.9%	96	80.2%	491	84.1%
	2002	112	82.1%	112	83.0%	112	81.3%	112	93.8%	112	76.8%	560	83.4%
	2003	106	80.2%	106	88.7%	106	90.6%	106	91.5%	104	93.3%	528	88.8%
	2004	94	89.4%	94	86.2%	92	87.0%	90	88.9%	94	89.4%	464	88.1%
	2005	104	80.8%	104	84.6%	103	88.3%	104	93.3%	101	93.1%	516	88.0%
HARMONY HILLS ES	2000	65	43.1%	65	53.8%	65	55.4%	65	75.4%	64	62.5%	324	58.0%
	2001	68	19.1%	68	33.8%	68	42.6%	68	54.4%	62	53.2%	334	40.4%
	2002	76	42.1%	76	51.3%	76	44.7%	76	63.2%	70	52.9%	374	50.8%
	2003	70	31.4%	70	40.0%	70	60.0%	70	71.4%	70	67.1%	350	54.0%
	2004	69	49.3%	69	56.5%	69	69.6%	69	72.5%	69	79.7%	345	65.5%
	2005	72	43.1%	72	50.0%	72	59.7%	72	72.2%	72	69.4%	360	58.9%
HIGHLAND ES	2000	109	26.6%	109	37.6%	109	52.3%	109	58.7%	99	52.5%	535	45.4%
	2001	97	33.0%	97	39.2%	97	35.1%	97	61.9%	95	45.3%	483	42.9%
	2002	117	28.2%	117	31.6%	116	39.7%	117	47.9%	113	41.6%	580	37.8%
	2003	98	41.8%	98	40.8%	98	51.0%	97	55.7%	97	73.2%	488	52.5%
	2004	122	36.9%	122	48.4%	122	57.4%	122	50.0%	122	68.0%	610	52.1%
	2005	0	.	0	.	101	53.5%	0	.	101	74.3%	202	63.9%
HIGHLAND VIEW ES	2000	87	57.5%	87	43.7%	88	62.5%	88	54.5%	82	58.5%	432	55.3%
	2001	57	35.1%	57	21.1%	56	60.7%	57	45.6%	56	62.5%	283	44.9%
	2002	57	47.4%	57	47.4%	56	55.4%	57	45.6%	55	65.5%	282	52.1%
	2003	52	69.2%	52	67.3%	51	88.2%	52	84.6%	52	94.2%	259	80.7%
	2004	50	64.0%	50	68.0%	50	78.0%	50	82.0%	50	80.0%	250	74.4%
	2005	44	68.2%	44	75.0%	44	79.5%	44	77.3%	44	77.3%	220	75.5%
JACKSON ROAD ES	2000	60	43.3%	60	48.3%	61	41.0%	60	53.3%	61	42.6%	302	45.7%
	2001	68	48.5%	68	47.1%	68	55.9%	68	60.3%	66	54.5%	338	53.3%
	2002	76	52.6%	76	51.3%	76	50.0%	76	71.1%	74	41.9%	378	53.4%
	2003	72	40.3%	72	45.8%	72	45.8%	72	58.3%	71	66.2%	359	51.3%
	2004	68	47.1%	68	60.3%	68	64.7%	68	72.1%	68	63.2%	340	61.5%
	2005	64	60.9%	64	64.1%	64	67.2%	64	78.1%	64	59.4%	320	65.9%
JONES LANE ES	2000	88	78.4%	88	77.3%	88	81.8%	88	88.6%	84	81.0%	436	81.4%
	2001	74	77.0%	74	79.7%	74	89.2%	74	94.6%	70	84.3%	366	85.0%
	2002	79	83.5%	79	83.5%	79	91.1%	79	91.1%	75	93.3%	391	88.5%
	2003	92	67.4%	92	67.4%	92	70.7%	88	81.8%	87	85.1%	451	74.3%
	2004	91	71.4%	91	80.2%	91	78.0%	91	83.5%	91	82.4%	455	79.1%
	2005	87	78.2%	87	72.4%	87	81.6%	87	82.8%	84	83.3%	432	79.6%

B-10

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
KEMP MILL ES	2000	112	47.3%	112	50.0%	111	51.4%	112	67.0%	110	54.5%	557	54.0%
	2001	106	40.6%	106	39.6%	106	47.2%	104	60.6%	104	48.1%	526	47.1%
	2002	100	37.0%	100	35.0%	100	42.0%	100	56.0%	100	43.0%	500	42.6%
	2003	102	35.3%	102	38.2%	101	50.5%	102	59.8%	102	60.8%	509	48.9%
	2004	100	59.0%	100	71.0%	99	71.7%	100	79.0%	100	85.0%	499	73.1%
	2005	95	57.9%	95	64.2%	95	74.7%	96	70.8%	96	81.3%	477	69.8%
KENSINGTON PARKWOOD ES	2000	54	75.9%	54	61.1%	53	79.2%	54	70.4%	49	73.5%	264	72.0%
	2001	52	78.8%	52	76.9%	52	71.2%	52	67.3%	49	63.3%	257	71.6%
	2002	68	83.8%	68	75.0%	68	82.4%	68	80.9%	63	77.8%	335	80.0%
	2003	69	75.4%	69	76.8%	68	85.3%	68	88.2%	68	83.8%	342	81.9%
	2004	77	80.5%	77	77.9%	77	79.2%	77	79.2%	73	76.7%	381	78.7%
	2005	86	86.0%	86	80.2%	86	89.5%	86	80.2%	86	93.0%	430	85.8%
LAKE SENECA ES	2000	61	68.9%	61	63.9%	61	70.5%	61	65.6%	55	76.4%	299	68.9%
	2001	54	66.7%	54	63.0%	54	66.7%	54	70.4%	51	72.5%	267	67.8%
	2002	53	60.4%	53	50.9%	52	67.3%	53	64.2%	51	66.7%	262	61.8%
	2003	71	50.7%	71	52.1%	70	52.9%	70	61.4%	70	67.1%	352	56.8%
	2004	55	50.9%	55	49.1%	55	69.1%	55	63.6%	55	69.1%	275	60.4%
	2005	55	52.7%	55	50.9%	55	67.3%	54	61.1%	52	59.6%	271	58.3%
LAKEWOOD ES	2000	104	77.9%	103	88.3%	103	85.4%	103	92.2%	99	81.8%	512	85.2%
	2001	94	79.8%	94	83.0%	94	86.2%	94	88.3%	90	86.7%	466	84.8%
	2002	86	87.2%	86	83.7%	86	89.5%	86	90.7%	85	89.4%	429	88.1%
	2003	92	76.1%	92	83.7%	92	91.3%	92	88.0%	88	90.9%	456	86.0%
	2004	108	88.9%	108	86.1%	108	92.6%	108	90.7%	104	97.1%	536	91.0%
	2005	92	83.7%	92	90.2%	92	95.7%	92	92.4%	92	91.3%	460	90.7%
LAYTONSVILLE ES	2000	97	74.2%	97	73.2%	97	71.1%	97	66.0%	97	54.6%	485	67.8%
	2001	89	76.4%	89	66.3%	89	75.3%	89	79.8%	89	62.9%	445	72.1%
	2002	89	75.3%	89	68.5%	89	78.7%	89	91.0%	89	61.8%	445	75.1%
	2003	96	75.0%	96	80.2%	96	86.5%	96	90.6%	95	88.4%	479	84.1%
	2004	104	78.8%	104	85.6%	104	88.5%	104	94.2%	104	89.4%	520	87.3%
	2005	87	81.6%	87	78.2%	87	87.4%	87	83.9%	87	88.5%	435	83.9%
LUXMANOR ES	2000	38	76.3%	38	84.2%	38	94.7%	38	84.2%	38	89.5%	190	85.8%
	2001	39	87.2%	39	79.5%	39	89.7%	39	89.7%	39	87.2%	195	86.7%
	2002	41	85.4%	41	78.0%	41	87.8%	41	90.2%	40	82.5%	204	84.8%
	2003	48	79.2%	48	70.8%	48	91.7%	48	79.2%	48	85.4%	240	81.3%
	2004	45	86.7%	45	93.3%	45	88.9%	46	91.3%	46	95.7%	227	91.2%
	2005	47	78.7%	47	85.1%	47	87.2%	47	80.9%	47	85.1%	235	83.4%

B-11

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
MARSHALL (THURGOOD) ES	2000	73	68.5%	73	61.6%	75	72.0%	73	79.5%	74	54.1%	368	67.1%
	2001	87	59.8%	87	60.9%	87	59.8%	87	81.6%	87	54.0%	435	63.2%
	2002	75	69.3%	75	60.0%	75	64.0%	75	72.0%	75	65.3%	375	66.1%
	2003	90	73.3%	90	71.1%	90	74.4%	90	70.0%	90	77.8%	450	73.3%
	2004	102	63.7%	102	54.9%	100	72.0%	101	60.4%	99	68.7%	504	63.9%
	2005	71	64.8%	71	67.6%	70	71.4%	71	74.6%	70	80.0%	353	71.7%
MARYVALE ES	2000	68	26.5%	68	35.3%	68	48.5%	68	50.0%	68	32.4%	340	38.5%
	2001	90	34.4%	90	30.0%	88	47.7%	88	29.5%	88	52.3%	444	38.7%
	2002	89	34.8%	89	37.1%	90	50.0%	89	39.3%	89	68.5%	446	46.0%
	2003	88	52.3%	88	51.1%	88	69.3%	88	53.4%	88	78.4%	440	60.9%
	2004	101	44.6%	101	51.5%	101	64.4%	101	49.5%	101	74.3%	505	56.8%
	2005	87	49.4%	87	49.4%	87	74.7%	87	57.5%	87	75.9%	435	61.4%
MATSUNAGA (SPARK M.) ES	2002	111	64.9%	111	68.5%	111	74.8%	111	84.7%	111	79.3%	555	74.4%
	2003	161	67.7%	161	71.4%	161	72.0%	159	83.0%	156	81.4%	798	75.1%
	2004	180	71.7%	180	73.9%	181	87.8%	180	85.6%	180	87.2%	901	81.2%
	2005	169	72.2%	169	73.4%	169	84.0%	169	87.0%	168	85.7%	844	80.5%
MCAULIFFE (S. CHRISTA) ES	2000	122	50.8%	122	47.5%	122	55.7%	122	49.2%	122	49.2%	610	50.5%
	2001	122	45.9%	122	50.0%	121	47.1%	120	65.8%	120	46.7%	605	51.1%
	2002	114	53.5%	114	50.0%	113	67.3%	113	57.5%	111	69.4%	565	59.5%
	2003	111	63.1%	111	66.7%	110	68.2%	108	57.4%	109	82.6%	549	67.6%
	2004	119	58.8%	119	62.2%	119	67.2%	119	55.5%	115	67.8%	591	62.3%
	2005	108	64.8%	108	68.5%	107	74.8%	108	66.7%	99	79.8%	530	70.8%
MCNAIR (RONALD A.) ES	2000	151	61.6%	151	63.6%	152	72.4%	152	80.9%	152	66.4%	758	69.0%
	2001	160	63.1%	160	65.0%	161	74.5%	161	85.7%	159	74.2%	801	72.5%
	2002	96	55.2%	96	64.6%	96	81.3%	96	90.6%	95	78.9%	479	74.1%
	2003	104	68.3%	105	71.4%	105	71.4%	105	77.1%	102	71.6%	521	72.0%
	2004	107	76.6%	107	76.6%	107	90.7%	107	93.5%	107	88.8%	535	85.2%
	2005	117	77.8%	117	85.5%	117	87.2%	117	93.2%	117	93.2%	585	87.4%
MEADOW HALL ES	2000	56	44.6%	56	50.0%	56	46.4%	56	60.7%	54	33.3%	278	47.1%
	2001	66	45.5%	66	51.5%	66	45.5%	66	59.1%	66	48.5%	330	50.0%
	2002	63	30.2%	63	36.5%	63	46.0%	62	51.6%	62	46.8%	313	42.2%
	2003	56	50.0%	56	46.4%	56	39.3%	55	50.9%	56	55.4%	279	48.4%
	2004	58	53.4%	58	62.1%	58	69.0%	58	60.3%	58	65.5%	290	62.1%
	2005	58	50.0%	58	46.6%	58	56.9%	58	69.0%	55	74.5%	287	59.2%

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
MILL CREEK TOWNE ES	2000	62	56.5%	62	69.4%	62	66.1%	62	66.1%	56	60.7%	304	63.8%
	2001	76	46.1%	76	51.3%	76	59.2%	74	64.9%	73	67.1%	375	57.6%
	2002	50	56.0%	50	64.0%	50	74.0%	50	82.0%	48	85.4%	248	72.2%
	2003	69	71.0%	69	71.0%	69	76.8%	69	79.7%	68	94.1%	344	78.5%
	2004	83	79.5%	83	77.1%	83	90.4%	82	79.3%	79	94.9%	410	84.1%
	2005	55	78.2%	55	72.7%	54	79.6%	55	81.8%	51	92.2%	270	80.7%
MONOCACY ES	2000	47	68.1%	47	63.8%	47	76.6%	47	72.3%	44	75.0%	232	71.1%
	2001	43	58.1%	43	48.8%	43	58.1%	43	72.1%	43	48.8%	215	57.2%
	2002	50	56.0%	50	60.0%	50	76.0%	50	74.0%	50	58.0%	250	64.8%
	2003	46	58.7%	46	47.8%	46	73.9%	46	65.2%	46	71.7%	230	63.5%
	2004	35	77.1%	35	80.0%	35	80.0%	35	88.6%	35	82.9%	175	81.7%
	2005	30	70.0%	30	73.3%	30	80.0%	30	76.7%	30	83.3%	150	76.7%
MONTGOMERY KNOLLS ES	2000	80	53.8%	80	45.0%	79	60.8%	80	75.0%	79	51.9%	398	57.3%
	2001	92	48.9%	92	48.9%	92	50.0%	92	70.7%	91	36.3%	459	51.0%
	2002	90	44.4%	90	32.2%	89	51.7%	90	67.8%	90	48.9%	449	49.0%
	2003	105	41.0%	105	41.9%	105	57.1%	107	59.8%	107	65.4%	529	53.1%
	2004	93	41.9%	93	45.2%	93	57.0%	93	54.8%	93	60.2%	465	51.8%
	2005	103	43.7%	103	47.6%	103	56.3%	103	63.1%	103	67.0%	515	55.5%
NEW HAMPSHIRE ESTATES ES	2000	111	27.0%	111	33.3%	112	29.5%	111	53.2%	112	36.6%	557	35.9%
	2001	119	20.2%	119	32.8%	119	31.9%	119	39.5%	119	31.9%	595	31.3%
	2002	100	35.0%	100	40.0%	100	58.0%	99	46.5%	99	48.5%	498	45.6%
	2003	116	47.4%	116	50.0%	115	56.5%	115	67.0%	116	58.6%	578	55.9%
	2004	87	40.2%	87	63.2%	86	69.8%	85	58.8%	84	88.1%	429	63.9%
	2005	81	48.1%	81	67.9%	81	75.3%	81	69.1%	81	90.1%	405	70.1%
OAKLAND TERRACE ES	2000	108	52.8%	108	49.1%	109	58.7%	108	67.6%	109	55.0%	542	56.6%
	2001	116	46.6%	116	43.1%	116	52.6%	115	67.0%	115	52.2%	578	52.2%
	2002	112	61.6%	112	56.3%	112	67.9%	112	79.5%	111	66.7%	559	66.4%
	2003	110	62.7%	110	61.8%	109	70.6%	109	70.6%	109	72.5%	547	67.6%
	2004	124	60.5%	124	57.3%	124	66.9%	124	69.4%	124	67.7%	620	64.4%
	2005	123	69.1%	123	72.4%	123	84.6%	123	78.0%	123	84.6%	615	77.7%
OLNEY ES	2000	88	65.9%	88	52.3%	87	70.1%	88	65.9%	84	58.3%	435	62.5%
	2001	84	56.0%	84	64.3%	84	67.9%	84	65.5%	84	61.9%	420	63.1%
	2002	90	70.0%	90	60.0%	90	71.1%	90	65.6%	87	66.7%	447	66.7%
	2003	99	70.7%	99	67.7%	97	74.2%	98	65.3%	98	72.4%	491	70.1%
	2004	96	62.5%	96	55.2%	96	67.7%	96	67.7%	96	62.5%	480	63.1%
	2005	92	72.8%	92	75.0%	92	78.3%	71	69.0%	93	76.3%	440	74.5%

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
PAGE (WILLIAM TYLER) ES	2000	49	46.9%	49	42.9%	49	57.1%	49	69.4%	45	48.9%	241	53.1%
	2001	69	49.3%	69	52.2%	69	59.4%	69	65.2%	67	73.1%	343	59.8%
	2002	52	53.8%	52	51.9%	52	67.3%	52	65.4%	52	73.1%	260	62.3%
	2003	52	53.8%	52	44.2%	52	59.6%	52	71.2%	52	67.3%	260	59.2%
	2004	62	53.2%	62	56.5%	62	77.4%	62	77.4%	56	83.9%	304	69.4%
	2005	64	48.4%	64	57.8%	64	67.2%	64	65.6%	64	73.4%	320	62.5%
POOLESVILLE ES	2000	80	63.8%	80	53.8%	80	70.0%	80	65.0%	79	57.0%	399	61.9%
	2001	75	58.7%	75	62.7%	75	72.0%	75	65.3%	75	45.3%	375	60.8%
	2002	64	73.4%	64	70.3%	64	85.9%	64	87.5%	64	57.8%	320	75.0%
	2003	77	59.7%	77	61.0%	76	75.0%	75	58.7%	77	70.1%	382	64.9%
	2004	91	73.6%	91	68.1%	90	83.3%	90	66.7%	91	74.7%	453	73.3%
	2005	64	79.7%	64	70.3%	64	85.9%	64	68.8%	64	75.0%	320	75.9%
POTOMAC ES	2000	102	74.5%	102	81.4%	102	87.3%	102	83.3%	101	77.2%	509	80.7%
	2001	108	85.2%	108	82.4%	108	86.1%	107	89.7%	107	82.2%	538	85.1%
	2002	116	82.8%	116	84.5%	116	90.5%	116	94.8%	117	84.6%	581	87.4%
	2003	116	85.3%	116	84.5%	117	89.7%	116	89.7%	116	86.2%	581	87.1%
	2004	102	92.2%	102	93.1%	102	93.1%	102	94.1%	102	89.2%	510	92.4%
	2005	78	85.9%	78	88.5%	78	88.5%	78	93.6%	78	83.3%	390	87.9%
RESNIK (JUDITH A.) ES	2000	116	44.0%	116	45.7%	117	52.1%	116	69.0%	114	54.4%	579	53.0%
	2001	95	53.7%	95	58.9%	95	61.1%	95	80.0%	95	58.9%	475	62.5%
	2002	100	54.0%	100	57.0%	100	64.0%	100	78.0%	99	69.7%	499	64.5%
	2003	81	53.1%	81	53.1%	81	67.9%	81	76.5%	81	72.8%	405	64.7%
	2004	105	59.0%	105	63.8%	105	79.0%	105	76.2%	105	77.1%	525	71.0%
	2005	105	54.3%	105	61.9%	105	76.2%	105	76.2%	104	82.7%	524	70.2%
RIDE (DR. SALLY K.) ES	2000	116	57.8%	116	61.2%	117	56.4%	117	71.8%	113	53.1%	579	60.1%
	2001	128	47.7%	128	49.2%	129	48.1%	128	58.6%	128	39.8%	641	48.7%
	2002	109	54.1%	109	56.9%	109	58.7%	109	69.7%	104	55.8%	540	59.1%
	2003	110	56.4%	110	52.7%	110	62.7%	110	73.6%	109	72.5%	549	63.6%
	2004	84	60.7%	85	62.4%	85	71.8%	85	76.5%	84	72.6%	423	68.8%
	2005	94	52.1%	94	56.4%	94	72.3%	94	75.5%	91	68.1%	467	64.9%
RITCHIE PARK ES	2000	57	61.4%	57	57.9%	59	81.4%	57	80.7%	59	79.7%	289	72.3%
	2001	55	69.1%	56	66.1%	56	64.3%	56	67.9%	56	71.4%	279	67.7%
	2002	50	70.0%	50	68.0%	50	70.0%	50	82.0%	50	72.0%	250	72.4%
	2003	61	68.9%	61	57.4%	61	67.2%	61	65.6%	61	68.9%	305	65.6%
	2004	55	70.9%	55	76.4%	55	87.3%	55	76.4%	55	83.6%	275	78.9%
	2005	57	87.7%	57	91.2%	57	93.0%	57	93.0%	57	91.2%	285	91.2%

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
ROCK CREEK FOREST ES	2000	93	62.4%	93	67.7%	93	71.0%	93	78.5%	93	73.1%	465	70.5%
	2001	83	69.9%	83	74.7%	83	79.5%	83	89.2%	83	83.1%	415	79.3%
	2002	86	67.4%	86	61.6%	86	81.4%	86	72.1%	86	79.1%	430	72.3%
	2003	86	65.1%	86	69.8%	86	79.1%	86	83.7%	86	77.9%	430	75.1%
	2004	84	52.4%	84	52.4%	82	67.1%	84	76.2%	82	69.5%	416	63.5%
	2005	82	72.0%	82	70.7%	82	78.0%	82	78.0%	82	86.6%	410	77.1%
ROCK CREEK VALLEY ES	2000	41	43.9%	41	41.5%	40	55.0%	40	45.0%	40	42.5%	202	45.5%
	2001	57	47.4%	57	57.9%	56	58.9%	57	78.9%	53	54.7%	280	59.6%
	2002	46	50.0%	46	67.4%	45	57.8%	46	76.1%	44	52.3%	227	60.8%
	2003	43	44.2%	43	55.8%	43	46.5%	42	78.6%	41	68.3%	212	58.5%
	2004	48	56.3%	48	50.0%	48	58.3%	48	72.9%	41	82.9%	233	63.5%
	2005	57	68.4%	57	75.4%	55	70.9%	57	82.5%	57	84.2%	283	76.3%
ROCK VIEW ES	2000	75	44.0%	75	53.3%	75	48.0%	75	62.7%	74	47.3%	374	51.1%
	2001	72	45.8%	72	48.6%	72	41.7%	72	58.3%	72	43.1%	360	47.5%
	2002	84	41.7%	84	52.4%	84	48.8%	84	60.7%	80	55.0%	416	51.7%
	2003	79	53.2%	79	58.2%	78	52.6%	79	73.4%	76	75.0%	391	62.4%
	2004	71	59.2%	71	71.8%	71	64.8%	71	76.1%	67	74.6%	351	69.2%
	2005	77	49.4%	77	51.9%	77	63.6%	77	62.3%	70	70.0%	378	59.3%
ROCKWELL (LOIS P.) ES	2000	83	63.9%	83	59.0%	82	72.0%	84	60.7%	69	56.5%	401	62.6%
	2001	79	68.4%	79	63.3%	79	73.4%	79	77.2%	79	62.0%	395	68.9%
	2002	82	72.0%	82	62.2%	82	76.8%	82	74.4%	82	62.2%	410	69.5%
	2003	65	63.1%	65	69.2%	65	84.6%	51	74.5%	65	84.6%	311	75.2%
	2004	66	84.8%	66	80.3%	66	84.8%	66	84.8%	66	81.8%	330	83.3%
	2005	79	72.2%	79	69.6%	79	84.8%	79	79.7%	79	81.0%	395	77.5%
ROLLING TERRACE ES	2000	101	49.5%	101	57.4%	101	64.4%	101	64.4%	101	59.4%	505	59.0%
	2001	107	47.7%	107	48.6%	107	53.3%	107	51.4%	107	60.7%	535	52.3%
	2002	98	46.9%	98	46.9%	98	52.0%	98	66.3%	96	78.1%	488	58.0%
	2003	122	49.2%	122	55.7%	122	58.2%	122	60.7%	121	76.0%	609	59.9%
	2004	104	53.8%	104	60.6%	104	65.4%	104	72.1%	104	77.9%	520	66.0%
	2005	122	63.1%	122	58.2%	122	67.2%	122	68.9%	122	68.9%	610	65.2%
ROSEMARY HILLS ES	2000	175	72.6%	175	70.9%	174	69.5%	175	76.6%	174	64.4%	873	70.8%
	2001	193	72.5%	193	68.4%	194	76.8%	192	75.5%	181	71.8%	953	73.0%
	2002	167	77.2%	167	74.3%	167	82.0%	167	87.4%	167	83.2%	835	80.8%
	2003	169	76.9%	168	75.6%	169	78.7%	169	79.3%	169	83.4%	844	78.8%
	2004	155	81.3%	155	85.2%	156	82.1%	156	88.5%	155	85.8%	777	84.6%
	2005	161	81.4%	161	80.1%	161	85.7%	162	88.3%	162	82.1%	807	83.5%

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
ROSEMONT ES	2000	84	27.4%	84	33.3%	83	26.5%	82	43.9%	82	24.4%	415	31.1%
	2001	76	36.8%	76	51.3%	76	46.1%	75	54.7%	74	58.1%	377	49.3%
	2002	76	36.8%	76	40.8%	76	27.6%	76	51.3%	75	32.0%	379	37.7%
	2003	70	45.7%	70	50.0%	70	45.7%	58	67.2%	69	53.6%	337	51.9%
	2004	72	50.0%	72	58.3%	72	63.9%	72	56.9%	68	69.1%	356	59.6%
	2005	0		0		58	37.9%	3	100.0%	58	62.1%	119	51.3%
SEQUOYAH ES	2000	94	57.4%	94	64.9%	94	76.6%	94	83.0%	89	79.8%	465	72.3%
	2001	98	48.0%	98	48.0%	98	67.3%	98	68.4%	96	74.0%	488	61.1%
	2002	85	62.4%	85	72.9%	85	68.2%	85	81.2%	84	76.2%	424	72.2%
	2003	77	54.5%	77	62.3%	76	64.5%	77	80.5%	74	62.2%	381	64.8%
	2004	86	57.0%	86	58.1%	86	75.6%	86	67.4%	86	63.7%	430	68.4%
	2005	74	58.1%	74	62.2%	74	66.2%	74	74.3%	74	66.2%	370	65.4%
SEVEN LOCKS ES	2000	50	82.0%	50	76.0%	50	88.0%	50	90.0%	50	88.0%	250	84.8%
	2001	42	73.8%	42	66.7%	42	90.5%	42	81.0%	39	82.1%	207	78.7%
	2002	40	85.0%	40	90.0%	40	92.5%	40	90.0%	40	90.0%	200	89.5%
	2003	38	92.1%	38	89.5%	38	100.0%	38	94.7%	38	94.7%	190	94.2%
	2004	45	82.2%	45	73.3%	45	91.1%	45	77.8%	44	88.6%	224	82.6%
	2005	41	92.7%	41	85.4%	41	97.6%	41	97.6%	41	95.1%	205	93.7%
SHERWOOD ES	2000	74	63.5%	74	59.5%	75	77.3%	74	78.4%	75	73.3%	372	70.4%
	2001	80	56.3%	80	55.0%	80	67.5%	80	80.0%	79	60.8%	399	63.9%
	2002	86	69.8%	86	66.3%	86	75.6%	86	74.4%	86	72.1%	430	71.6%
	2003	79	73.4%	79	59.5%	79	75.9%	79	70.9%	79	72.2%	395	70.4%
	2004	69	63.8%	69	66.7%	70	70.0%	70	72.9%	70	65.7%	348	67.8%
	2005	81	71.6%	81	71.6%	81	70.4%	80	70.0%	81	65.4%	404	69.8%
SLIGO CREEK ES	2000	47	57.4%	47	51.1%	54	64.8%	47	59.6%	54	64.8%	249	59.8%
	2001	110	62.7%	110	58.2%	114	60.5%	110	65.5%	113	61.1%	557	61.6%
	2002	109	55.0%	109	46.8%	113	60.2%	109	65.1%	112	64.3%	552	58.3%
	2003	115	64.3%	115	54.8%	115	72.2%	115	63.5%	115	80.9%	575	67.1%
	2004	121	61.2%	121	57.9%	122	74.6%	121	57.9%	122	79.5%	607	66.2%
	2005	103	69.9%	103	67.0%	103	87.4%	102	67.6%	101	82.2%	512	74.8%
SOMERSET ES	2000	74	86.5%	74	87.8%	73	86.3%	73	90.4%	73	76.7%	367	85.6%
	2001	74	81.1%	74	78.4%	74	74.3%	74	90.5%	74	75.7%	370	80.0%
	2002	66	93.9%	66	87.9%	66	78.8%	66	87.9%	66	80.3%	330	85.8%
	2003	78	92.3%	78	83.3%	77	89.6%	77	87.0%	77	80.5%	387	86.6%
	2004	58	86.2%	58	81.0%	58	86.2%	58	86.2%	58	86.2%	290	85.2%
	2005	63	85.7%	63	96.8%	63	88.9%	63	93.7%	63	92.1%	315	91.4%

B-16

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
SOUTH LAKE ES	2000	80	42.5%	80	48.8%	80	38.8%	80	65.0%	80	48.8%	400	48.8%
	2001	79	49.4%	79	48.1%	79	48.1%	78	56.4%	77	48.1%	392	50.0%
	2002	75	42.7%	75	40.0%	75	33.3%	75	61.3%	73	42.5%	373	44.0%
	2003	94	55.3%	94	54.3%	94	61.7%	94	69.1%	92	72.8%	468	62.6%
	2004	91	56.0%	91	48.4%	91	58.2%	91	59.3%	90	75.6%	454	59.5%
	2005	78	57.7%	78	69.2%	77	67.5%	78	70.5%	78	78.2%	389	68.6%
STEDWICK ES	2000	84	65.5%	84	65.5%	85	74.1%	84	78.6%	85	65.9%	422	69.9%
	2001	84	64.3%	84	61.9%	84	69.0%	84	73.8%	84	44.0%	420	62.6%
	2002	109	63.3%	109	60.6%	109	67.0%	109	86.2%	108	51.9%	544	65.8%
	2003	95	53.7%	95	52.6%	95	62.1%	95	74.7%	94	75.5%	474	63.7%
	2004	102	63.7%	102	63.7%	102	65.7%	102	72.5%	102	70.6%	510	67.3%
	2005	96	72.9%	96	69.8%	96	74.0%	95	84.2%	95	74.7%	478	75.1%
STONE MILL ES	2000	129	84.5%	129	79.8%	129	89.1%	129	89.9%	126	77.8%	642	84.3%
	2001	116	91.4%	116	81.0%	115	96.5%	116	94.8%	115	90.4%	578	90.8%
	2002	128	85.9%	128	85.9%	126	92.1%	127	93.7%	125	88.8%	634	89.3%
	2003	112	75.9%	112	83.9%	112	86.6%	109	94.5%	112	88.4%	557	85.8%
	2004	106	90.6%	106	92.5%	106	92.5%	106	93.4%	106	96.2%	530	93.0%
	2005	101	91.1%	101	91.1%	101	97.0%	101	96.0%	101	93.1%	505	93.7%
STONEGATE ES	2000	72	73.6%	72	77.8%	72	75.0%	72	88.9%	72	84.7%	360	80.0%
	2001	80	77.5%	80	83.8%	80	87.5%	80	92.5%	80	93.8%	400	87.0%
	2002	69	75.4%	69	56.5%	69	75.4%	69	88.4%	68	79.4%	344	75.0%
	2003	76	75.0%	76	71.1%	76	82.9%	76	90.8%	76	92.1%	380	82.4%
	2004	61	78.7%	61	85.2%	61	91.8%	62	88.7%	62	95.2%	307	87.9%
	2005	65	80.0%	65	87.7%	65	90.8%	65	90.8%	65	92.3%	325	88.3%
STRAWBERRY KNOLL ES	2000	83	57.8%	83	61.4%	86	46.5%	82	79.3%	86	43.0%	420	57.4%
	2001	87	47.1%	87	50.6%	87	44.8%	87	67.8%	86	38.4%	434	49.8%
	2002	87	55.2%	87	63.2%	87	65.5%	87	79.3%	86	58.1%	434	64.3%
	2003	94	56.4%	94	58.5%	94	69.1%	94	83.0%	94	71.3%	470	67.7%
	2004	96	52.1%	96	72.9%	95	75.8%	96	77.1%	94	76.6%	477	70.9%
	2005	70	55.7%	70	78.6%	70	82.9%	70	91.4%	69	82.6%	349	78.2%
SUMMIT HALL ES	2000	73	27.4%	73	32.9%	73	34.2%	73	50.7%	67	28.4%	359	34.8%
	2001	81	44.4%	81	44.4%	80	43.8%	81	64.2%	78	42.3%	401	47.9%
	2002	67	32.8%	67	28.4%	67	43.3%	67	62.7%	65	53.8%	333	44.1%
	2003	93	44.1%	93	38.7%	93	60.2%	93	51.6%	91	67.0%	463	52.3%
	2004	82	40.2%	82	52.4%	82	68.3%	82	70.7%	79	67.1%	407	59.7%
	2005	0	.	0	.	87	62.1%	0	.	85	60.0%	172	61.0%

B-17

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
TAKOMA PARK ES	2000	163	70.6%	163	68.7%	166	69.3%	163	70.6%	165	66.7%	820	69.1%
	2001	135	63.0%	135	67.4%	135	73.3%	135	65.9%	135	65.2%	675	67.0%
	2002	121	62.0%	121	57.0%	121	73.6%	121	60.3%	121	71.9%	605	65.0%
	2003	102	56.9%	102	51.0%	102	58.8%	102	56.9%	102	60.8%	510	56.9%
	2004	118	76.3%	118	72.0%	118	78.8%	118	78.0%	117	79.5%	589	76.9%
	2005	119	72.3%	119	71.4%	119	77.3%	119	68.9%	118	82.2%	594	74.4%
TRAVILAH ES	2000	91	82.4%	91	87.9%	91	92.3%	91	93.4%	91	73.6%	455	85.9%
	2001	96	76.0%	96	79.2%	96	76.0%	96	83.3%	96	71.9%	480	77.3%
	2002	86	89.5%	86	81.4%	86	83.7%	85	90.6%	85	71.8%	428	83.4%
	2003	82	87.8%	82	85.4%	82	92.7%	81	96.3%	80	90.0%	407	90.4%
	2004	73	89.0%	73	83.6%	73	87.7%	73	86.3%	73	87.7%	365	86.8%
	2005	86	84.9%	86	80.2%	84	90.5%	59	94.9%	84	84.5%	399	86.5%
TWINBROOK ES	2000	67	55.2%	67	49.3%	67	67.2%	67	77.6%	65	67.7%	333	63.4%
	2001	81	51.9%	81	45.7%	80	58.8%	80	71.3%	76	71.1%	398	59.5%
	2002	92	39.1%	92	44.6%	91	51.6%	91	57.1%	87	69.0%	453	52.1%
	2003	84	50.0%	84	65.5%	84	73.8%	84	81.0%	80	76.3%	416	69.2%
	2004	87	55.2%	86	64.0%	86	69.8%	86	74.4%	82	73.2%	427	67.2%
	2005	76	52.6%	76	71.1%	76	73.7%	76	84.2%	69	81.2%	373	72.4%
VIERS MILL ES	2000	106	44.3%	106	45.3%	106	54.7%	106	51.9%	106	48.1%	530	48.9%
	2001	116	39.7%	116	47.4%	116	54.3%	116	58.6%	116	63.8%	580	52.8%
	2002	86	53.5%	86	44.2%	86	66.3%	85	69.4%	85	77.6%	428	62.1%
	2003	103	49.5%	103	49.5%	102	71.6%	103	74.8%	103	84.5%	514	66.0%
	2004	103	62.1%	103	60.2%	103	80.6%	103	76.7%	103	96.1%	515	75.1%
	2005	111	55.9%	111	55.0%	112	71.4%	111	74.8%	112	79.5%	557	67.3%
WASHINGTON GROVE ES	2000	53	50.9%	53	50.9%	53	56.6%	53	71.7%	46	63.0%	258	58.5%
	2001	58	48.3%	58	44.8%	58	50.0%	58	55.2%	53	45.3%	285	48.8%
	2002	63	52.4%	63	57.1%	63	46.0%	62	67.7%	58	56.9%	309	56.0%
	2003	66	42.4%	66	42.4%	66	43.9%	66	37.9%	62	50.0%	326	43.3%
	2004	63	69.8%	63	71.4%	61	72.1%	63	79.4%	57	78.9%	307	74.3%
	2005	57	73.7%	57	77.2%	57	75.4%	57	82.5%	57	77.2%	285	77.2%
WATERS LANDING ES	2000	113	61.1%	113	58.4%	112	56.3%	110	74.5%	111	55.0%	559	61.0%
	2001	84	52.4%	84	61.9%	84	51.2%	84	77.4%	84	48.8%	420	58.3%
	2002	110	61.8%	110	63.6%	110	51.8%	109	72.5%	108	59.3%	547	61.8%
	2003	96	71.9%	96	79.2%	95	70.5%	96	81.3%	94	75.5%	477	75.7%
	2004	110	66.4%	110	69.1%	110	75.5%	110	74.5%	110	80.0%	550	73.1%
	2005	103	68.0%	103	68.9%	103	75.7%	105	84.8%	105	71.4%	519	73.8%

Attachment B
Performance of Grade 2 Students on CTBS Subtests and Battery Index for each Elementary School
Percentage of Scores At or Above the 50th National Percentile (NP)

		Reading		Language		Mathematics		Language Mechanics		Math Computation		Battery Index	
		Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP	Number of Scores	% At/Above 50th NP
WATKINS MILL ES	2000	81	59.3%	81	59.3%	81	53.1%	81	69.1%	81	39.5%	405	56.0%
	2001	93	48.4%	93	51.6%	92	62.0%	91	71.4%	91	59.3%	460	58.5%
	2002	74	52.7%	74	56.8%	74	70.3%	74	60.8%	71	69.0%	367	61.9%
	2003	83	63.9%	83	68.7%	83	68.7%	83	83.1%	79	81.0%	411	73.0%
	2004	97	58.8%	97	61.9%	97	75.3%	97	75.3%	97	75.3%	485	69.3%
	2005	104	73.1%	104	76.9%	104	76.0%	104	84.6%	103	84.5%	519	79.0%
WAYSIDE ES	2000	111	84.7%	111	83.8%	110	90.0%	111	92.8%	110	88.2%	553	87.9%
	2001	97	83.5%	97	88.7%	96	84.4%	97	91.8%	96	83.3%	483	86.3%
	2002	115	78.3%	115	79.1%	114	86.8%	115	90.4%	114	83.3%	573	83.6%
	2003	110	87.3%	110	80.0%	109	87.2%	111	91.0%	111	87.4%	551	86.6%
	2004	108	88.9%	108	87.0%	107	93.5%	107	95.3%	107	94.4%	537	91.8%
	2005	96	83.3%	96	86.5%	96	95.8%	96	91.7%	96	88.5%	480	89.2%
WELLER ROAD ES	2000	99	38.4%	99	48.5%	99	48.5%	99	68.7%	98	54.1%	494	51.0%
	2001	101	46.5%	101	48.5%	101	49.5%	101	81.2%	101	59.4%	505	57.0%
	2002	98	36.7%	98	46.9%	97	53.6%	97	64.9%	97	53.6%	487	51.1%
	2003	88	48.9%	88	56.8%	88	65.9%	88	73.9%	88	75.0%	440	64.1%
	2004	95	44.2%	95	45.3%	95	68.4%	95	72.6%	95	82.1%	475	62.5%
	2005	88	61.4%	88	65.9%	88	64.8%	87	78.2%	87	64.4%	438	66.9%
WESTBROOK ES	2000	54	85.2%	54	64.8%	54	81.5%	54	70.4%	52	65.4%	268	73.5%
	2001	47	91.5%	47	85.1%	47	87.2%	47	85.1%	47	83.0%	235	86.4%
	2002	56	87.5%	56	87.5%	56	85.7%	56	94.6%	55	81.8%	279	87.5%
	2003	44	93.2%	44	93.2%	44	95.5%	44	88.6%	44	86.4%	220	91.4%
	2004	48	91.7%	48	89.6%	48	93.8%	48	87.5%	48	91.7%	240	90.8%
	2005	48	93.8%	48	91.7%	48	97.9%	48	89.6%	48	93.8%	240	93.3%
WESTOVER ES	2000	63	58.7%	63	58.7%	63	69.8%	62	75.8%	61	57.4%	312	64.1%
	2001	43	60.5%	43	48.8%	43	65.1%	43	74.4%	42	66.7%	214	63.1%
	2002	43	74.4%	43	58.1%	43	67.4%	43	72.1%	41	61.0%	213	66.7%
	2003	54	72.2%	54	63.0%	54	61.1%	54	85.2%	52	53.8%	268	67.2%
	2004	43	76.7%	43	60.5%	43	69.8%	43	86.0%	43	65.1%	215	71.6%
	2005	41	65.9%	41	65.9%	41	80.5%	41	85.4%	41	68.3%	205	73.2%
WHEATON WOODS ES	2000	87	42.5%	87	49.4%	89	46.1%	87	64.4%	89	48.3%	439	50.1%
	2001	90	34.4%	90	46.7%	89	57.3%	90	65.6%	89	57.3%	448	52.2%
	2002	93	38.7%	93	45.2%	93	51.6%	93	60.2%	89	60.7%	461	51.2%
	2003	87	51.7%	87	46.0%	87	71.3%	86	70.9%	85	89.4%	432	65.7%
	2004	106	46.2%	106	65.1%	105	71.4%	106	70.8%	104	82.7%	527	67.2%
	2005	100	57.0%	100	61.0%	103	67.0%	102	73.5%	102	79.4%	507	67.7%

