# U.S. Department of Education
# 2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [ ] Title I    [ ] Charter    [ ] Magnet    [ ] Choice

Name of Principal Dr. Megan C Stryjewski
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.)  (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Concord Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 10305 Concord School Road
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City St. Louis                    State MO                    Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 63128-1288

County    St. Louis                    State School Code Number* 096-093-5070

Telephone 314-729-2470                    Fax 314-729-3654

Web site/URL
                    http://go.lindberghschools.ws/conc
ordes

E-mail
                    MSTRYJEWSKI@LINDBERGHSCHOOL
S.WS

Twitter Handle
https://twitter.com/ConcordFlyer
s

Facebook Page
https://www.facebook.com/concordflyer
s                    Google+

YouTube/URL                    Blog                    Other Social Media Link

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

                                                            Date
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Jim Simpson                    E-mail: jsimpson@lindberghschools.ws
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Lindbergh Schools                    Tel. 314-729-2400
I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

                                                            Date
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mrs.  Kathy Kienstra
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

                                                            Date
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

*Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

# PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

**Include this page in the school's application as page 2.**

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.

6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.

7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.

8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

# PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

**All data are the most recent year available.**

**DISTRICT** (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1.  Number of schools in the district    <u>5</u> Elementary schools (includes K-8)
    (per district designation):          <u>2</u> Middle/Junior high schools
                                           <u>1</u> High schools
                                             <u>0</u> K-12 schools

                                             <u>8</u> TOTAL

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

2.  Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

    [ ] Urban or large central city
    [ ] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
    [X]  Suburban
    [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
    [ ] Rural

3.  <u>5</u> Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

4.  Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 39 | 43 | 82 |
| 1 | 41 | 48 | 89 |
| 2 | 66 | 46 | 112 |
| 3 | 52 | 41 | 93 |
| 4 | 55 | 53 | 108 |
| 5 | 43 | 49 | 92 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total Students** | 296 | 280 | 576 |

5.  Racial/ethnic composition of      0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
    the school:                        6 % Asian
                                       1 % Black or African American
                                       3 % Hispanic or Latino
                                       0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
                                      86 % White
                                       4 % Two or more races
                                  **100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6.  Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 5%

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

| **Steps For Determining Mobility Rate** | **Answer** |
|---|---|
| (1) Number of students who transferred *to* the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year | 13 |
| (2) Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year | 15 |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 28 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 547 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.051 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 5 |

7.  English Language Learners (ELL) in the school:      9 %
                                                       55 Total number ELL
    Number of non-English languages represented:      20
    Specify non-English languages: Chinese, Farsi, French, Greek, Hebrew, Spanish, Tamil, Tagalog, Korean, Marathi, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian, Slovakian, Swedish, Turkish, Vietnamese, Bosnian, Arabic, Albanian

8.  Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:      12 %

    Total number students who qualify:      67

    If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

9.  Students receiving special education services:     <u>16</u> %

       <u>93</u> Total number of students served

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

   <u>12</u> Autism                              <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
   <u>0</u> Deafness                            <u>17</u> Other Health Impaired
   <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness                      <u>5</u> Specific Learning Disability
   <u>3</u> Emotional Disturbance               <u>44</u> Speech or Language Impairment
   <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment                  <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
   <u>6</u> Mental Retardation                  <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
   <u>2</u> Multiple Disabilities               <u>4</u> Developmentally Delayed

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

| | **Number of Staff** |
|---|---|
| Administrators | 1 |
| Classroom teachers | 29 |
| Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc. | 20 |
| Paraprofessionals | 7 |
| Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc. | 2 |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1     <u>20:1</u>

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

| Required Information | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily student attendance | 97% | 97% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| High school graduation rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

    Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

| Post-Secondary Status | |
|---|---|
| Graduating class size | 0 |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 0% |
| Enrolled in a community college | 0% |
| Enrolled in career/technical training program | 0% |
| Found employment | 0% |
| Joined the military or other public service | 0% |
| Other | 0% |

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.
    Yes___        No _X_

    If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

# PART III – SUMMARY

As one of the oldest schools in the district, Concord School prides itself on a rich tradition of excellence as well as a renewed sense of community and commitment to high-quality education. Lindbergh Schools has been a part of the community for over 60 years, but Concord School has been a fixture in the area since as early as 1844. Starting as a one-room log cabin schoolhouse in 1844, Concord School was the center of town and the start of a long-standing tradition of excellence for the area. In 2011, our school completed a major renovation and redistricting of our district, allowing us to offer students a new, state-of-the-art school. We house the school bell in our lobby from the original Concord School and ring it on the first day of school each year to signify the start of another school year.

Concord Elementary School is a growing school comprised of over 580 students. We are fortunate to have a diverse community of learners. Our student population includes 85% white, 1% Black or African-American, 6% Asian, 3% Hispanic, and 5% other. In addition, 9% of our students are English Language Learners (ELL). Twelve percent of our students are eligible for free or reduced lunch. We are proud to have over 20 languages represented in our school.

Our district mission is to develop competent and caring graduates through exceptional programs, services, and personnel. We support that mission through our Concord School core beliefs, which are based on our beliefs that children learn best when: the school community provides students with a safe, inviting, and positive experience; learning is meaningful, individualized, and constant; and parents and teachers come together to meet the unique needs of students in a nurturing and engaging environment.

Being a part of a National and State District of Character means that we consider character education as an integral part of our students' education. Students initiate and participate in service-learning opportunities at our school each year. Our projects have spanned the globe including our own backyard. We spent a year supporting the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation through fundraising drives, theme days, all school events, book studies, and more, all to support a Concord student living with CF. We had the honor of partnering with a school in Haiti following the devastating earthquake, providing them with support both financially and academically. Our students learned about the Haitian culture, became fast friends with the students through letter writing, project sharing, and more, as well as becoming more familiar with the devastating effects of nature and how to prepare for those events in the future. It is through projects like these that our students have developed an understanding about others and have formed a caring heart that looks to support others, not just themselves. These projects and more have allowed us to receive a Promising Practice award in Character Education award each year for the past 7 years.

We have maintained an extraordinary attendance rate of over 96% for the past 5 years, with an improved rate of over 97% for the past 2 years. Making sure that school is a place children love to be is very important to us. Our school community is a culture of collaboration. It takes everyone—teachers, parents, and students—to meet our goals and maintain our culture of excellence.

Our highly qualified teachers are the root of our success. Our teachers spend time weekly in their professional learning communities setting goals, analyzing student growth, planning effective lessons, and collaborating on ways to meet the individual needs of students. Formative and summative assessments are given regularly to evaluate the learning needs of our students, plan meaningful learning opportunities for our students, and provide feedback to students about their growth as learners. Professional development is provided to our teachers regularly to support their classrooms. Data is used daily to assess growth and plan future instruction. Monthly, criterion-referenced assessments are given to provide teachers with feedback on specific strands and skills. Reading levels are tracked monthly to analyze student growth.

Using student data to plan highly effective lessons and provide individualized instruction has led to some of the highest achievement levels in the state. Based on the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP), our school has ranked in the top ten for the past 7 years. This past year, we reached a #2 ranking in the state of Missouri. Reading scores at Concord Elementary school have increased 10% points in the past 5 years. In 2013, we reached our highest reading score of 79%. Math scores have remained at or above 80% for the

past 5 years, with over 50% of our students scoring Advanced in 2013.  This high level of student achievement is a testament to the hard working community we have at Concord.

# PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

**1.   Assessment Results:**

a)  Concord Elementary participates in the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) for grades third through fifth.  Students are assessed in Communication Arts, Mathematics, and Science.  Student achievement is measured in four levels: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, or Below Basic.  Students scoring Proficient are considered meeting the expectation for the state, while students scoring Advanced are considered above the expectation.  Concord's goal is to surpass the benchmark established yearly by the state and the Lindbergh District; while also ensuring that each student shows growth in achievement from year to year.

Since 2007, our school has not only made adequate yearly progress, but has been ranked as one of the top 10 schools in the state of Missouri.  In 2013, we achieved our highest ELA total score of 79% while, our math total score of 87% continued to be above 80% as it has been the last five years.  In 2013, all grade levels scored above 80% on the math assessment with our 5th grade topping the charts with a score of 91%.  Additionally, 50% of students taking the math assessment scored in the Advanced range.  We strive daily to improve instruction for all students and the faculty works diligently to maximize each student's personal growth.  Not only has our assessment results regularly surpassed the state average, but for the past two years, we have performed the highest among Lindbergh elementary schools.

b) Concord Elementary has had great success in total student achievement and strives to continually close the gap with the subgroups.  Teachers are actively participating in Professional Learning Communities and data team meetings monthly to review data, set goals, and develop academic plans for students belonging to subgroups.

In 2013, we achieved our highest ELA total score of 79% while, our math total score of 87% continued to be above 80% as it has been the last five years.  Our total ELA score has increased over 10 percentage points in the past 5 years.  Our total math score has increased over 7 percentage points in the past 5 years.  The number of total students scoring Advanced in math has doubled in the past 5 years to 50% in 2013.

Math achievement scores for subgroups are increasingly closer to the achievement scores of all students.  For the past 5 years, each subgroup has made growth.  African American students have increased their scores 22 percentage points within the last 5 years.  Special Education and English Language Learner students have increased their scores 16 and 13 percentage points respectively.  Additional academic programs and instruction improvements have led to these increases.  Concord Elementary has a math intervention program for students who need additional math support.  The students meet daily to strengthen foundational math skills in a small group setting.  Time is spent building upon grade level content as well as increasing fact fluency.

In 2013, three subgroups fell more than 10 percentage points from the total of all students in the area of mathematics.  Special Education students were 17 percentage points from the total; however this was an increase from 2012 of 11 percentage points.  Free and Reduced students and African American students are 24 and 20 percentage points from the total, respectively.  Faculty continues to research and improve instruction for this group of students.  Students are enrolled in math intervention and teachers work daily with the students in small groups.  Students are discussed monthly at Professional Learning Communities and data team meetings.  However, the most significant change has been the incorporation of math workshop, which allows students to learn in flexible groups, based on their individual needs.  Teachers have a better understanding of each student's level and can reteach skills as necessary.

English Language Arts scores are also increasing yearly for our subgroups.  Free and Reduced students have increased their achievement score 19 percentage points within the last 5 years and African American students have increased their achievement score 31 percentage points within the last 5 years.  In 2013, Free and Reduced students and Hispanic students increased their English Language Arts score 12 and 18 percentage points, respectively. While this achievement is remarkable, subgroups continue to have an achievement gap from the total student scores.  In 2013, Special Education students and English Language

Learners were 27 and 29 percentage points, respectively below the total achievement score for all students. We are addressing the achievement gap in a variety of ways. Teachers instruct students in small groups utilizing a balanced literacy approach. Students have access to reading intervention and additional school instruction (ASI). Classrooms are provided with Literacy Teacher Assistants (LTAs) to work with students in small groups as well. Special Education teachers co-teach during literacy instruction instead of pulling students out of the classroom. English Language Learner students are receiving additional literacy instruction as well as ELL services daily. These subgroups are identified at the beginning of the year and are carefully monitored by teachers and specialists through our monthly data team meetings and on-going professional development.

## 2.    Using Assessment Results:

A variety of assessment tools are used daily, weekly, monthly and annually in our school to help us analyze and track student progress as well as plan differentiated instruction for our students. Formative assessments are used daily by our teachers to assess students' understanding of key concepts and most importantly, to plan for differentiated, small group instruction. In addition to classroom formative assessments, our teachers in Grades 2-5 also utilize the eValuate assessment, a monthly formative assessment. Our annual state summative assessment, the MAP test, is given to students in Grades 3-5, which helps us to better understand the effectiveness of our instruction and the learning of our students. Each of these assessments is an integral component of what makes our teaching and learning individualized and highly effective.

Using a small group and workshop approach allows our teachers to individualize instruction for our students on a daily basis. To do this, formative assessments are essential. Teachers assess the on-going learning of students, making adjustments to their lesson plans to ensure that each child gets exactly what he/she needs to grasp the learning goals in the classroom. These assessments vary from exit slips at the end of a lesson, pre-assessments at the start of a unit or a given lesson, student feedback, teacher observation, and more.

Another assessment tool that strengthens our teaching and learning is our monthly criterion-referenced assessment in reading and math given to all students in Grades 2-5. The results allow teachers to analyze what strands and skills students are struggling to understand. Additionally, individual student progress can be tracked through the use of student-created goals and our data analysis of monthly progress. Teachers meet in Professional Learning Communities weekly to discuss student performance and plan instruction based on these results. This assessment allows teachers to identify who might need additional practice in a particular area, plan for intervention support when needed, and communicate growth to parents and students.

We use our annual state test, the MAP test, to help us plan for individual student needs and future instruction. Each year, results are reviewed by teachers and administrators to analyze student and school results, making adjustments in areas as needed. "Cusp" students are identified using these results, which teachers use to plan intervention supports and instruction throughout the year. Students are recognized by the community through our Academic All-Stars program, encouraging them to celebrate their accomplishments and hard work.

Assessments are not given at our school to simply assign a grade and move on with the next unit or topic. They are used to plan for and implement the highest quality of instruction possible to our students. Additionally, they are used as a communication tool to parents and students about individual progress.

## 3.    Sharing Lessons Learned:

We are fortunate to be a part of the number one school district in our state for student achievement. As a result, we have many opportunities to share our strategies and practices with other schools and districts. Additionally, we spend a great deal of time with our colleagues in the district sharing ideas and learning new things together.

Our school and district prides itself in being a Professional Learning Community. At Concord, teachers meet every week in their PLC to write SMART goals, plan instruction, create and score common assessments, and plan further support for students. In PLCs, a constant sharing of ideas and strategies goes

on, resulting in better instruction for all students.

We spend time hosting visitors both from within our district and from outside of our district, sharing our best practices. We have had many schools come visit to see our use of assessment data to differentiate instruction. Recently, we have been hosting a great deal of visits in regards to guided reading instruction and math workshop. Visiting teachers spend time with our teachers, observing their teaching practices and asking questions to gain a better understanding of what makes our school so successful. Another practice that we participate in regularly is learning walks. Administrators and teachers from around the district visit our school to learn more about and analyze our teaching practices and our students' learning. The feedback we get from these "walks" help us to adjust where needed and hone in on specific areas of best practices.

Our master teachers spend time outside of the classroom presenting and sharing with others. Some in-district opportunities that our teachers have participated in include our Technology Unconference, with teachers presenting ways they utilize technology to further student learning. Our district professional development team has utilized our teachers and school for a variety of learning opportunities for other schools including writing workshop development days, character education visits, and more. Our school has hosted the St. Louis Leadership Academy, a group of principals and leaders in the area, sharing our successes with learning walks and school-wide SMART goals.

We are honored to be part of such a strong learning community in our district and around the state. We learn daily from others and have enjoyed sharing our successes as well.

4.    **Engaging Families and Community:**

Concord has a powerful relationship between parents, teachers, and students, which leads to a successful environment for students to grow and learn. We have two parent groups, PTG (Parent Teacher Group) and DOC (Dads of Concord). Both groups' main mission is engaging families, supporting the teachers, and promoting student achievement.

PTG and DOC are keys to bridging the community and school together. They begin by bringing families together as early as summertime, with grade level playdates, and an ice cream social for families to socialize and meet their child's new teacher. This welcomes new families, as well as gives them an opportunity to build relationships. The support continues with family events throughout the year such as Family Trivia, Movie, and Bingo Night. They also host adult activities for the parents, including Casino, Bowling, and Trivia Night. An annual tradition the PTG organizes, in relation to our character education program, is our Adopt-A-Family program. Students donate various items, money, and gifts for the families. This event focuses on Concord families that are in need. PTG has continued to work effortlessly with local venues, encouraging the Concord families to patronize local vendors such as, Orange Leaf, Smugala's, Roller Cade, P'sghettis, and Concord Bowl. The elected leaders of the PTG facilitate communication with parents on a regular basis with monthly magazines, regular emails, and their website. Both groups have monthly meetings, where teacher representatives are present and share ideas and strategies to strengthen the bond between school and home.

Concord engages the community by inviting them in for assemblies that honor their influence and dedication. They include a Hero's Assembly for our first responders, and a Veteran's Assembly honoring the military. Concord also has special days, Muffins with Mom and Donuts with Dad, to promote reading. Concord has created different learning environments with the help from the community. We have a garden with various vegetation, as well as a Butterfly Garden and Weather Station that requires help from the community to enhance these learning opportunities.

Technology is a focus in the Lindbergh community. Teachers communicate with families in new and engaging ways. They use Facebook, blogs, Twitter, and online gradebooks to provide feedback to the families. Social Media opens the door for families to look into their child's school day. Immediate feedback about student progress is readily available to make the school home connection a positive, successful tool.

# PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

## 1. Curriculum:

Concord Elementary School's curriculum follows the Lindbergh Schools' core content curriculum. We are aligned to the Missouri Learning Standards which align to the common core standards. Concord places high emphasis on instruction in English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics to create a strong foundation from which students can build further learning.

The reading program at Concord is a balanced literacy approach that includes mini-lessons, small group guided reading instruction, reading conferences, read aloud, and independent reading. Teachers model the various thinking strategies and skills during the daily mini-lessons. The teachers utilize leveled texts of fiction, nonfiction, and poetry to meet with small groups of students on their reading level for guided reading instruction. Students are able to continue to practice the skills and strategies during independent reading time. In addition to small group instruction, teachers are able to meet the needs of individual readers through one-on-one reading conferences.

We utilize a writing workshop model that allows all students an opportunity to learn the writing craft and techniques through teacher modeling during a mini-lesson. The students have an opportunity to practice the writing process through independent writing. During this time, the teacher conducts writing conferences to help meet the individual needs of each writer. Teachers use Lucy Calkins' Units of Study as a guide to teach the students the knowledge to create narrative, opinion, and informational pieces of writing throughout the school year. However, writing is not only taught explicitly during writing workshop. The teachers continuously teach writing across the curriculum.

Concord teachers incorporate the math workshop model to teach students the math curriculum which focuses on students learning procedural and conceptual knowledge. Teachers utilize daily formative assessments to create small groups of students to meet their needs in the foundational skills of number sense, operations, geometry, measurement, and data. Students take part in math centers to continue to build on these concepts.

Science investigations are conducted using the inquiry method which allows students to show knowledge of the scientific method and process skills. Social studies focuses on an understanding of good citizenship and developing the key responsibilities of being a good citizen. Understanding our nation's history, the world around us, other cultures, and how we can make a positive impact in our community are all a part of our curriculum. We focus on the seamless integration of reading and writing across all content areas. Students learn about the purpose of text features in understanding the science and social studies content. Students have the opportunity to write informational pieces to exhibit the mastery of the content.

The Music and Art programs allow for the students to learn about the Fine Arts. The classes study the different composers and genres of music. The students visit Powell Symphony Hall and Sheldon Music Hall in St. Louis to support their learning. The third graders begin to learn to read music notes and play the recorder in music class. Beginning in fourth grade, students have the opportunity to learn to play a strings instrument and be part of the optional Strings program. The Art program at Concord encourages creativity in the students. They study different artists and then are given the opportunity to create similar pieces.

The Physical Education curriculum provides an opportunity for students to get active and learn about healthy choices. The physical activities allows for the students to be a well-rounded teammate and provides opportunities for them to show good sportsmanship.

Technology is a natural part of all the curriculum that supports student learning. Each classroom is equipped with an interactive white board and document camera that allows teachers to create engaging lessons for the students. All classrooms contain iPads and laptops that the students utilize to assist in their learning. Students are allowed to bring in their own devices to school to use in all areas of the curriculum.

Character education is embedded naturally cross-curricular. Concord students learn and utilize the seven habits of happy kids adapted from Sean Covey's work and the Leader in Me program. Teachers encourage students to find their strengths and have the opportunity to become leaders in those areas.

## 2. Reading/English:

Our approach to reading instruction is through Balanced Literacy. This approach allows us to instruct students on their reading level, addressing the need to extend for those above grade level and remediate for those below grade level. Teachers utilize the leveled reading library to provide small group instruction, teach mini lessons based on reading strategies and skills with the purpose of guiding students through the reading process. When students are not receiving direct instruction from the teacher, their skills are practiced and reinforced with The Daily Five/CAFÉ, literacy centers and student-led literature circles.

Balanced Literacy starts in the primary grades with teachers coaching students through the early reading behaviors in shared reading with print concepts to assess their reading readiness. Teachers utilize the previously described instructional methods to transition students into the emergent reading stages. A highly trained push-in reading teacher shares the reading instruction responsibilities with the classroom teacher to allow for multiple reading groups to be seen each day. As the students continue to develop their reading processing system, the teachers are consistently incorporating inferential-based questioning to prepare them for the analytical skills they will need to use in the intermediate grades.

Balanced Literacy continues in the intermediate grades with teachers training students to continue their effective reading habits through reading conferences and close reading. Teachers often use short articles and passages from periodicals to expose students to various types of texts. Utilizing high-quality fiction and nonfiction texts is essential to the success of our guided reading instruction. Frequent, informal assessments allow teachers to reorganize groups based on reading level or skill.

Assessments are used throughout the school year to monitor individual student progress and plan purposeful instruction. Annually, the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) is administered to measure reading growth from year to year. In addition, students in grades 2-5 take a monthly eValuate test which measures specific reading skills and strategies. In grades K-1, teachers measure a student's reading abilities with a running record. Results from all assessments are analyzed and used to guide future instruction during monthly literacy team meetings. Individual student progress is discussed, current data is analyzed, and team planning occurs at these monthly meetings.

When students need additional support, they receive Reading Intervention services or Additional School Instruction (ASI) in addition to classroom instruction. This individual or small group intense instruction is designed to close the learning gap.

## 3. Mathematics:

Concord uses an interactive method for teaching mathematics, the math workshop approach. This method is a true example of differentiated instruction. Teachers utilize pre- and post- assessments on a daily basis to guide their instruction. This allows teachers to design lessons based on the needs of the learners in the classroom. Instruction is driven by the students' abilities rather than the progression of the textbook. Small group instruction can be seen daily in all classrooms. Additional School Instruction (ASI) and Math Intervention support the curriculum being taught in the classroom, whether by reviewing skills or challenging students.

In the math workshop model, the teacher creates flexible groupings of students to work on rigorous and relevant center work, while they focus on the individual learners and their mathematical needs. In these centers, students use skills and strategies to apply knowledge to situations that require mathematical thinking.

When students develop a good understanding of numbers at an early age, other mathematical concepts such as algebra, geometry, and arithmetic, follow naturally. Concord teachers do not just focus on procedural

skills and fluency, but go deeper into the understanding of mathematics with conceptual knowledge and application of math skills. Vocabulary review, fact fluency, problem-solving strategies, tactile lessons, math manipulatives, incorporating math into other subject areas, and continuous concept review are some of the best practices used in our math instruction.

Technology is an important tool in Concord's math instruction. Interactive whiteboards are utilized to present visuals, virtual manipulaltives, and flipcharts to enhance learning with engaging lessons. Students also have access to an e-book to assist them at school and at home with tutorials and independent practice, as well as mathematical concept games. The use of Activote clickers by students allows immediate feedback to the teacher, which assists in student learning. FastMath and Xtra Math support fact fluency by engaging the students.

The math curriculum is a progression from concrete models that build number sense to abstract problem-solving skills. This method of math instruction has led to 80% of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient or advanced on the MAP test for the past five years. In 2013, 50% of students in grades 3-5 scored advanced.

## 4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Our music program offers numerous opportunities for students to explore, create, perform, serve, and develop talents in an engaging and expressive environment. Students develop an appreciation for different genres of music and how it has shaped history, while studying classical, world, folk, and jazz. They learn about perseverance and character as they study various composers and performers throughout the world who used music to tell their stories. Field trips to performances by the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra and local jazz and folk musicians bring learning to life.

Music connects classroom experiences. Concepts taught in class are integrated and reinforced through singing, playing, and composing songs. Students work individually and in groups to compose raps and songs about math, science, grammar, and units of study. Older students compose math raps, illustrating them in art class to teach their younger buddy classes. Others write songs about "The 7 Habits" and perform these at School-Wide Leader in Me Assemblies, helping students remember the habits of leaders. The staff comes together to write and perform songs to teach test-taking strategies before MAP testing.

Grade-level musicals bring families together and provide students with a culminating event to share and perform on the big stage at the high school auditorium. Themes for the musical have a curricular connection, and every grade has a different musical each year. All students have the opportunity to sing, dance, recite lines, and/or sing a solo. These productions are possible because the entire community comes together for our children. Parents create costumes, practice at home, help with props, and cheer at their children's performances. Teachers and staff support their students by attending and performing in the shows.

Most importantly, Concord students serve their community through music. Kindergartners sing for their grandparents at Grandparents' Day, honoring them. Fifth graders, led by student directors, perform holiday songs for residents of local retirement homes each December. The entire student body prepares and performs a meaningful tribute to our local Veterans' at our yearly Veterans' Day Assembly. Yearly, our Concord Flyer Choir performs two musicals for the community, and one spring prepared a Benefit Concert to raise money for an orphanage our school had adopted in Haiti. They perform for the community's senior luncheon, the Lindbergh Leaders' Banquet, the District's Spirit Festival, and Busch Stadium. Each fall the choir sings and cheers at "Sunday Night Lights", an event where kids with cancer play football and cheer alongside high school students. This summer, the choir performed for veterans at the Traveling Wall Vietnam Veterans War Memorial program.

## 5. Instructional Methods:

Differentiated instruction is at the forefront of what we do at Concord Elementary. Teachers work collaboratively to create lessons focusing on essential skills, as well as what individual learners need.

Collaborative planning focuses on creating formative assessments, differentiating across the curriculum, and educating a diverse student population.

Our instructional decision-making is driven by formative assessment data. Data from monthly evaluate tests help guide teachers in planning effective classroom instruction on specific strands and skills. Teachers utilize pre- and post-assessments from reading and math to guide instruction, as well as evaluate student success. During instruction teachers utilize technology to monitor student progress. Examples include Activote clickers and online resources (i.e. Socrative, TodaysMeet), which enables teachers to adapt instruction during teaching.

Balanced Literacy and math workshop are frameworks that Concord uses for instructional planning and implementation of reading and math. This involves the use of observation and assessment to make instructional decisions; the structure of classroom delivery that moves through whole group, small group, and independent learning to build student competence and independence. These small, flexible groups allow teachers to target individual needs on a daily basis.

Concord's instruction goes beyond the classroom teacher. Students who need additional assistance in reading and math receive instruction from reading specialists and math specialists. Special education teachers work cooperatively with classroom teachers to meet the needs of students with IEPs. We also use the collaborative teaching model, where special education teachers and classroom teachers instruct together. Literacy teaching assistants are used in the primary grades, pushing into classrooms to accommodate the many reading levels. Intermediate students work with Additional School Instruction (ASI) teachers on specific focus areas, which includes above grade level material. Our English Language Learners receive additional support daily in communication arts and mathematics.

Technology is used throughout the curriculum to support student learning. Each classroom is equipped with interactive whiteboards and computer access. Students have access to iPads and laptops and are invited to bring their own devices to school. These tools are utilized to support curriculum and enhance instruction.

**6. Professional Development:**

At Concord, we have a team of teacher representatives from each grade level and department who serve on our building professional development (PD) committee who plans the professional learning of the teachers based on the needs assessment of the staff and current educational instructional trends. Chairs from this committee serve on the district committee to promote collaboration among the district as well as a tool of resources.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) are the core of our professional development. Twice a month grade levels and specialists meet during common plan time to collaborate and develop SMART Goals in English Language Arts and mathematics. They utilize student data to design lessons to address the needs of the students and the curriculum. In addition to PLCs, grade level teams meet during plan time monthly for Data Team meetings in which the teachers have the opportunity to analyze monthly assessment data, discuss ways to help increase student performance, and share out Best Practices. Each grade level also participates in Instructional Team meetings monthly. Various math or ELA instructional strategies are provided based on teacher- and student- needs.

We also provide other opportunities for professional development during monthly early release time and full days throughout the year. With our staff needing diverse topics to meet their specialty areas, we provide subject-specific professional development for our math and reading intervention teachers, ELL teacher, counselor, librarian, art, music and PE teachers.

All teachers are required to participate in our district's ELITE (Enhancing Lindbergh's Instruction Technology Education) program, which provides them with three years of technology training. This provides teachers with the knowledge and resources to implement technology effectively in their classrooms. Since the start of the ELITE program, all classrooms in our building have interactive whiteboards, iPads, and laptops. In addition, our district has successfully implemented a Bring Your Own

Device (BYOD) program, allowing students to use devices to access curriculum. Communication with parents and students has improved tremendously through social media training, with teachers utilizing daily blogs, facebook updates, twitter, and more.

The amount of time we spend developing professionally has a positive impact on our teachers' instructional strategies as well as student achievement, which has consistently been supported through district and building level learning walk data. Concord teachers have a passion for learning and are always wanting to improve their instruction to help our students reach success.

## 7. School Leadership

One of our core beliefs at Concord Elementary School is that learning is constant when it is meaningful, individualized, and engaging. We feel strongly that the learning of all students is best met using a shared leadership model. As a school community, we rely on the leadership of our principal, our instructional coach (mentor teacher), our school committees, our instructional specialists, and our grade level professional learning communities to ensure that we are meeting the needs of all our students.

Our principal, instructional coach, and instructional specialists meet monthly with our grade levels to lead data team meetings and instructional team meetings. The purpose of these meetings is to introduce, provide support on, and learn together new instructional practices to support student learning. Additionally, these leaders discuss student progress and provide support to teachers in regards to interventions to implement in the classroom. The belief is that we all play an integral role in the achievement of every student in our school.

Building committees such as our character education team and our professional development team plan for and provide meaningful learning opportunities for our teachers in a variety of areas. The teacher leaders on these teams assess the building's needs and provide on-going, student-focused professional development. Each year, as a staff, we decide upon our learning focuses for the year and make sure to spend quality time learning more about these areas throughout the year. Early release days are used to provide professional development and PLC time. Learning walks provide teachers with feedback from our school leaders on their progress in these areas.

Our Response to Intervention (RTI) team, which consists of special education teachers, intervention teachers, instructional specialists, our school counselor, and our principal, meet regularly to work with teachers on specific, student-centered interventions to address areas that are in need of further development. Teachers rely on these leaders to provide insight, expertise, and support for their most struggling students. The RTI team regularly observes students in the classroom to provide feedback to teachers, meets with parents to communicate current needs and future plans, and collects data on the interventions being used to assess effectiveness.

To meet the needs of all our students and ensure that a focus on student achievement is at the forefront of all that we do, we find this shared leadership model to be the most effective way to lead our school to success.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Math
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3
**Publisher:** McGraw-Hill

**Test:** Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES*** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 83 | 92 | 86 | 77 | 79 |
| % Advanced | 36 | 44 | 33 | 17 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 93 | 75 | 124 | 155 | 144 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 60 | 78 | 74 | 48 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 20 | 22 | 11 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 9 | 19 | 21 | 16 |
| **2. Students receiving Special Education** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 73 | 71 | 78 | 41 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 47 | 14 | 33 | 4 | 15 |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 15 | 27 | 27 | 20 |
| **3. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 80 | 75 | 75 | 63 | 58 |
| % Advanced | 20 | 25 | 25 | 13 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 12 |
| **4. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 100 | 100 | 67 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 75 | 33 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| **5. African- American Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 50 | 100 | 100 | 33 | 60 |
| % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **6. Asian Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students** | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **9. White Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 83 | 91 | 83 | 77 | 79 |
| % Advanced | 32 | 46 | 30 | 16 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 81 | 66 | 116 | 140 | 131 |
| **10. Two or More Races identified Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **11. Other 1:  Other 1** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **12. Other 2:  Other 2** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **13. Other 3:  Other 3** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

**NOTES:**

# STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Math
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4
**Publisher:** McGraw-Hill

**Test:** Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES*** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 89 | 87 | 87 | 86 | 76 |
| % Advanced | 45 | 34 | 29 | 30 | 22 |
| Number of students tested | 80 | 89 | 157 | 147 | 149 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 63 | 58 | 82 | 79 | 53 |
| % Advanced | 25 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 8 | 12 | 22 | 19 | 17 |
| **2. Students receiving Special Education** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 59 | 63 | 50 | 69 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 12 | 21 | 14 | 5 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 17 | 19 | 22 | 19 | 30 |
| **3. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 75 | 67 | 83 | 83 | 77 |
| % Advanced | 0 | 33 | 50 | 17 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 13 |
| **4. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **5. African- American Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 100 | 67 | 75 | 0 |
| % Advanced | 100 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| **6. Asian Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **9. White Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 91 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 75 |
| % Advanced | 45 | 35 | 28 | 31 | 21 |
| Number of students tested | 67 | 78 | 139 | 134 | 139 |
| **10. Two or More Races identified Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **11. Other 1:  Other 1** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **12. Other 2:  Other 2** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **13. Other 3:  Other 3** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

**NOTES:**

# STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Math
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5
**Publisher:** McGraw-Hill

**Test:** Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES*** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 91 | 88 | 91 | 92 | 86 |
| % Advanced | 72 | 62 | 59 | 56 | 35 |
| Number of students tested | 87 | 109 | 150 | 151 | 127 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 67 | 70 | 71 | 86 | 57 |
| % Advanced | 50 | 50 | 38 | 62 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 10 | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| **2. Students receiving Special Education** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 79 | 44 | 68 | 77 | 65 |
| % Advanced | 61 | 6 | 23 | 36 | 15 |
| Number of students tested | 18 | 16 | 22 | 22 | 20 |
| **3. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 80 | 73 | 83 | 67 |
| % Advanced | 67 | 60 | 18 | 50 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 3 |
| **4. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 40 | 80 | 100 | 100 |
| % Advanced | 100 | 40 | 80 | 100 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| **5. African- American Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 67 | 50 | 67 | 33 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 67 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 14 |
| **6. Asian Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **9. White Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **10. Two or More Races identified Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **11. Other 1:  Other 1** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **12. Other 2:  Other 2** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **13. Other 3:  Other 3** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

**NOTES:**

# STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Reading/ELA  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3  
**Publisher:** McGraw-Hill

**Test:** Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES\*** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 72 | 77 | 73 | 62 | 62 |
| % Advanced | 37 | 39 | 32 | 31 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 93 | 75 | 124 | 155 | 143 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 99 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 40 | 44 | 63 | 38 | 25 |
| % Advanced | 10 | 22 | 16 | 14 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 9 | 19 | 21 | 16 |
| **2. Students receiving Special Education** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 53 | 50 | 64 | 33 | 45 |
| % Advanced | 33 | 21 | 30 | 7 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 14 | 27 | 27 | 20 |
| **3. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 60 | 50 | 50 | 25 | 18 |
| % Advanced | 0 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 11 |
| **4. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 0 | 100 | 33 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 50 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| **5. African- American Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 100 | 100 | 67 | 20 |
| % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| **6. Asian Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **9. White Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 68 | 79 | 73 | 63 | 65 |
| % Advanced | 36 | 40 | 29 | 31 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 81 | 65 | 116 | 140 | 131 |
| **10. Two or More Races identified Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **11. Other 1:  Other 1** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **12. Other 2:  Other 2** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **13. Other 3:  Other 3** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

**NOTES:**

# STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Reading/ELA
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4
**Publisher:** McGraw-Hill

**Test:** Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES*** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 81 | 79 | 80 | 76 | 68 |
| % Advanced | 49 | 48 | 36 | 42 | 29 |
| Number of students tested | 80 | 89 | 157 | 147 | 149 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 63 | 50 | 68 | 53 | 41 |
| % Advanced | 38 | 25 | 5 | 16 | 12 |
| Number of students tested | 8 | 12 | 22 | 19 | 17 |
| **2. Students receiving Special Education** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 41 | 58 | 59 | 42 | 47 |
| % Advanced | 18 | 26 | 14 | 16 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 17 | 19 | 22 | 19 | 30 |
| **3. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 50 | 33 | 50 | 50 | 69 |
| % Advanced | 25 | 33 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 13 |
| **4. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | 100 | 40 | 67 | 100 |
| % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 20 | 33 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| **5. African- American Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 0 | 100 | 67 | 50 | 0 |
| % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| **6. Asian Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **9. White Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 85 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 68 |
| % Advanced | 54 | 49 | 38 | 44 | 29 |
| Number of students tested | 67 | 78 | 139 | 134 | 139 |
| **10. Two or More Races identified Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **11. Other 1:  Other 1** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **12. Other 2:  Other 2** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **13. Other 3:  Other 3** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

**NOTES:**

# STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Reading/ELA
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5
**Publisher:** McGraw-Hill

**Test:** Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES*** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 85 | 78 | 81 | 83 | 76 |
| % Advanced | 48 | 32 | 48 | 45 | 38 |
| Number of students tested | 87 | 109 | 150 | 151 | 127 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 75 | 50 | 62 | 81 | 52 |
| % Advanced | 17 | 10 | 33 | 33 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 10 | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| **2. Students receiving Special Education** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 61 | 50 | 41 | 64 | 55 |
| % Advanced | 28 | 0 | 18 | 27 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 18 | 16 | 22 | 22 | 20 |
| **3. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 33 | 60 | 55 | 75 | 33 |
| % Advanced | 33 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 5 | 11 | 12 | 3 |
| **4. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 100 |
| % Advanced | 100 | 20 | 60 | 100 | 50 |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| **5. African- American Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 67 | 50 | 33 | 33 | 50 |
| % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 14 |
| **6. Asian Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **9. White Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 86 | 79 | 81 | 84 | 78 |
| % Advanced | 49 | 33 | 49 | 45 | 37 |
| Number of students tested | 79 | 92 | 135 | 142 | 109 |
| **10. Two or More Races identified Students** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **11. Other 1:  Other 1** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **12. Other 2:  Other 2** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **13. Other 3:  Other 3** | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

**NOTES:**