

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2013 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program**  
**A Public School - 13ND1**

School Type (Public Schools):      Charter      Title 1      Magnet      Choice  
                                                                                                                 

Name of Principal: Mr. David Hanson

Official School Name: Wyndmere Elementary School

School Mailing Address:      101 Date Avenue  
   PO Box 190  
   Wyndmere, ND 58081-0190

County: 39                                      State School Code Number\*: 042

Telephone: (701) 439-2287      E-mail: D.Hanson@sendit.nodak.edu

Fax: (701) 439-2804                      Web site/URL: http://www.wyndmere.k12.nd.us

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

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent\*: Mr. Chris Swenson      Superintendent e-mail:  
Chris.Swenson@sendit.nodak.edu

District Name: Wyndmere Public School District #42      District Phone: (701) 439-2287

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: Mr. David Buskohl

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge 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.*

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Director, National Blue Ribbon Schools (Aba.Kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, National Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

## **PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

---

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

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or its equivalent 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, the school must meet the state's AYP requirement or its equivalent in the 2012-2013 school year. Meeting AYP or its equivalent must be certified by the state. Any AYP 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 and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take foreign language courses.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2007 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for that period.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 or 2012.
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

1. Number of schools in the district 0 Elementary schools (includes K-8)  
0 Middle/Junior high schools  
0 High schools  
1 K-12 schools  
1 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 9717

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

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Rural
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 28
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2012 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade                            | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|----------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK                             | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| K                                | 5          | 7            | 12          |
| 1                                | 9          | 9            | 18          |
| 2                                | 12         | 8            | 20          |
| 3                                | 6          | 5            | 11          |
| 4                                | 15         | 8            | 23          |
| 5                                | 11         | 5            | 16          |
| 6                                | 11         | 5            | 16          |
| 7                                | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 8                                | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 9                                | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 10                               | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 11                               | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 12                               | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| <b>Total in Applying School:</b> |            |              | <b>116</b>  |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
0 % Asian  
0 % Black or African American  
6 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
93 % White  
0 % Two or more races  
100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting 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.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2011-2012 school year: 4%

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

| Step | Description   | Value |
|------|---|-------|
| (1)  | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year.   | 1     |
| (2)  | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year. | 4     |
| (3)  | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].  | 5     |
| (4)  | Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2011  | 120   |
| (5)  | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).                                       | 0.04  |
| (6)  | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.  | 4     |

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school: 4%

Total number of ELL students in the school: 5

Number of non-English languages represented: 1

Specify non-English languages:

Hispanic

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 36%  
 Total number of students who qualify: 43

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

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 17%  
 Total number of students served: 20

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>1</u> Autism                | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>0</u> Deafness              | <u>5</u> Other Health Impaired                 |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u>5</u> Specific Learning Disability          |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>8</u> Speech or Language Impairment         |
| <u>1</u> Hearing Impairment    | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation    | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed               |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

|   | <u><b>Full-Time</b></u> | <u><b>Part-Time</b></u> |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Administrator(s)  | <u>1</u>                | <u>0</u>                |
| Classroom teachers  | <u>7</u>                | <u>0</u>                |
| Resource teachers/specialists<br>(e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.) | <u>1</u>                | <u>4</u>                |
| Paraprofessionals   | <u>5</u>                | <u>1</u>                |
| Support staff<br>(e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.)                              | <u>0</u>                | <u>2</u>                |
| Total number  | <u>14</u>               | <u>7</u>                |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:

16:1

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

|                             | <b>2011-2012</b> | <b>2010-2011</b> | <b>2009-2010</b> | <b>2008-2009</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Daily student attendance    | 97%              | 97%              | 97%              | 97%              | 98%              |
| High school graduation rate | %                | %                | %                | %                | %                |

14. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools):**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2012.

Graduating class size: \_\_\_\_\_

Enrolled in a 4-year college or university \_\_\_\_\_ %

Enrolled in a community college \_\_\_\_\_ %

Enrolled in vocational training \_\_\_\_\_ %

Found employment \_\_\_\_\_ %

Military service \_\_\_\_\_ %

Other \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Total** \_\_\_\_\_ **0%**

15. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award:

No

Yes

If yes, what was the year of the award?

## **PART III - SUMMARY**

---

Wyndmere Elementary is a K-6 Target Assist Title 1 school. We are a part of the Wyndmere Public School system. Our K-12 school is located in Wyndmere, ND, on the southeaster corner of the state. The population of Wyndmere is approximately five hundred people. We are in a rural setting with the majority of the community receiving income from the area of farming. There are also several people who work in an industrial setting.

Our mission statement is one that was created by the K-12 District staff. Although we will continue to revisit the mission statement, I believe it gives an accurate picture of what the school strives to achieve. "The mission of the Wyndmere Public School is to create an environment where students and staff are safe, respectful, and responsible. The staff is committed to ensure all students are proficient and will graduate with the necessary skills to thrive as 21st century learners, workers, and citizens."

Despite our size, the Wyndmere community has many assets. We have a twenty-four hour volunteer ambulance service. There is a senior citizen center, which offers daily noon meals as well as classes to the community. A community center building was added on to the school to create a space for school needs. This building is also a place for community gatherings to take place as well. The latest addition to the Community Center building is a brand new community fitness center.

Like many small towns the school is the hub of activity. We have programs before, during and after school.

Before school, we have staff available to work with students in all academic areas as well as some music lessons being offered. A full breakfast program is also available. Students come in to work on "Compass Learning" lessons before and after school as well. (Web based Common Core Skills Site)

After school, students have opportunities to receive extra tutoring and instruction. The first program was initially created through a 21st Century Grant that we had received for an "After School" program. When the money from that grant was no longer available the program continues with "In-Kind" support from the school. We also offer a separate tutoring program for grades 4-6 that is staffed by classroom teachers and para-professionals. Many of the students that take part in these services come from recommendations from our RTI process. NDSA scores as well as scores from Star Reading Enterprise, Star Math Enterprise and Star Early Literacy assessments help us determine which students would benefit the most from these after school services.

Along with the after school programs we offer an after school snack to students as well.

Our school follows the State School Improvement model. All staff are assigned to a curricular committee. Two high school and two elementary classroom instructors serve on the School Improvement Advisory Committee. This group also includes all three of the administrators. The advisory committee is responsible for making sure that we stay on course and that we meet all guidelines as set forth by the state for school improvement. We have found it to be very helpful to have classroom instructors in this leadership role.

## **PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

---

### **1. Assessment Results:**

#### **Part A**

The school's assessment results in Reading and Mathematics comes to us from the State of North Dakota, the Department of Public Instruction, in the form of a report entitled, "Annual Adequate Yearly Progress Report". The report is a single page with scores for Reading and Math. Subgroups are also reported out (Economically Disadvantaged, which includes students that qualify for free and reduced meal benefits, Ethnicity, Students with Disabilities, and Students with Limited English Proficiency). The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction sets the proficiency scores.

The data for North Dakota is set up into four categories. Student scores above the cut score are placed in either the level of Proficient, or Advanced. Scores that are below the cut score fall into either Partially Proficient or Novice. The Department of Public Instruction's website is <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us>.

It is our belief that all students can learn and it is our responsibility to give them the support they need to reach these goals. We take the planning for the state assessment very seriously. Careful attention is given to the type of test a child is given as well as creating a schedule that gives children the best opportunity to perform at the highest level.

Our goal for all students, regardless of disability is to help them achieve a proficient or advanced rating on all state assessments.

#### **Part B**

Wyndmere Elementary has made AYP every year since No Child Left Behind became a law. Our overall proficiency scores for the area of math were, 2007 (94%) 2008 (94%) 2009 (93%) 2010 (95%) 2011 (95%). In the area of Mathematics we have shown excellent overall scores. Our efforts have been to move students who are proficient to the advanced level. In 2011-2012 we had our highest level of advanced students with a percentage of 48%. Those students that make up our subgroups have also been an area of attention. The special education numbers have also shown good growth. The overall percentages are very close to that of the general population. In 2011-2012 fifty percent of the students in the Special Education subgroup scored at the Advanced level with a total of 90% of those students scoring Proficient or Advanced. In that same year the Low Income subgroup also scored at the 95% for Proficient or Advanced and had 48% of those students scoring in the Advanced category.

The area of Reading was more of a challenge. Our overall proficiency scores for the area of Reading were, 2007 (75%) 2008 (96%) 2009 (85%) 2010 (91%) 2011 (90%). The starting point for Reading proficiency was much lower. Steady growth has allowed us to make AYP in this area each year as well. We have again achieved the highest level of students scoring in the Advanced level in 2011-2012 with 29% achieving that level. The sub groups for the area of Reading have also shown good growth. Students in the low income area have increased their proficiency percentage from 71% in 2007-2008 to 89% in 2011-2012.

Our goal is to continue to work towards the 100% proficiency that will be in affect during the 2013-2014 school year. We have much to be proud of but are aware of the daunting task that continues to lie ahead of us.



## **2. Using Assessment Results:**

Up until the 2012-2013 school year we had been utilizing a program called NWEA (Northwest Evaluation Association) testing. This standardized test gave classroom teachers a look at each individual student in the areas of math, language arts, and reading in grades Kindergarten through 6. All students, including educationally disadvantaged students took the tests and over time, we were able to chart the progress of each individual child within the school. Beginning this year our school has moved the Renaissance Place product called Star Math, Star Reading and Star Early Literacy. NWEA served us well and gave us valuable data from which to help plan individual education plans for our students. The change was made in response to the new challenge of Common Core. The time it takes to test and the results/reports that we are able to generate from this new standardized on-line test will hopefully help us as we work to align our standards and expectations with these new standards. This new assessment also allows us to better "progress monitor" our students as well.

All students K-6 are assessed during the first week of school. From these results we determine which students may be in need of further interventions. The RTI team meets to discuss the results and makes recommendations as to what interventions are most appropriate. Students who are receiving extra services are given the same tests about every three to four weeks to help determine if the interventions in place are effective.

The results from all Star Reading, Star Math and Star Early Literacy assessments are shared with the parents. This is done through the parent-teacher conferences as well as being sent home with the students themselves. Our Reading specialist gets a copy of all results as well as the Superintendent. The RTI Team, including the classroom instructor, reviews all results.

Another way we use the assessment results is in the creating of "Individual Learning Paths" for each and every student. These learning paths are a part of a product called "Compass Learning". This on-line tutorial program, coupled with an individual learning path based on their assessment data, has been a key factor in helping us raise the achievement level of all of our students. Our goal is to not just be proficient but to move those that are proficient to the advanced level.

We test all of the students four different times during the year. This allows us to check for growth within the academic school year and regression over the summer months. This will allow us to adjust academic goals in the three areas on an individual classroom basis as necessary. Students who are being progressed monitored would of course have several more assessments.

We also utilize this data as part of our school improvement information.

## **3. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

The first way that our school has shared successful strategies is to invite schools to send faculty to come and observe. There have been several schools that have come to observe our Math curriculum/strategies over the past several years. I have been led to believe that they have found these visits to be helpful and have had a positive affect on their own Math instruction. In the early years of NWEA I also had several schools come to observe the Primary MAP assessment. Not many schools in our area were utilizing this assessment. After observing, most of those schools adopted the Primary MAP assessment as a part of their testing procedures. Compass Learning is another successful strategy that my peers have been interested in. There have been several school visits regarding this program as well. I have also presented to my state principals executive committee as well at a regional principals meeting regarding Compass Learning. Our move from NWEA to STAR was a significant decision. I have presented my rationale for this change to the "New Elementary Principals" group that met in conjunction with our umbrella group conference this past October. Many of my peers have contacted me to talk about this change in assessment procedures.

#### **4. Engaging Families and Communities:**

Support from parents and community is one of the strengths of our school. Having parents and community members that are willing to help and support the education of our students, makes our job of engaging them that much easier.

Communication is without a doubt the first key to success. We begin each school year with an open house. This typically takes place the 2nd Wednesday of each school year. Historically we have over 80% of our parents participating. It is important to start building these bridges of support early on in the school year. I believe that both parents and staff feel it is very beneficial. I also meet with the parents during that event. This gives me an excellent opportunity to communicate to them all of those things that we deem important to the education of their children. I too am building bridges with the parents as well.

On the first night of the first day of school I personally call each kindergarten parent and the parents of any student new to our school system. I don't do this just for the PR but because I want parents and students to know that they are individually important. This is one of the advantages a smaller school has.

Like most schools we have two formal parent-teacher conferences a year where we schedule an individual meeting with every parent. Our attendance numbers are often 100%. Part of this is due to the persistence of my staff to reschedule when needed and to be flexible in meeting when it works best for parents. We share our STAR assessment results during these conferences but also send them home when conferences don't fall within an assessment time frame.

Many community members are asked to come in to present in elementary classrooms. Many times these are not parents but are simply members of our community that have something that is educationally valuable to share with our students. I think it is very important to tap into these experts when possible.

The local Game Warden would be one example of a community member that has come in to share with the elementary students. He has brought mounted animals to show to the students. This is typically done in conjunction with a unit in science dealing with the food chain but he also talks about how wild animals are not meant to be pets.

We have a small percentage of Native Americans in our school but their traditions are still important. One community member comes in to assist with the making of "Dream Catchers" for the fifth grade class when they are reading a story from their basal that talks about this topic. It is great to hear first hand the meaning behind this tradition.

# PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

## 1. Curriculum:

The school's curriculum is strongly influenced by the state standards established by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction. These standards are what drive the content of instruction in each classroom. We, as a staff, feel that the new Common Core State Standards in Reading, Writing and Mathematics are vigorous, high standards that challenge the youth of North Dakota. It is an ongoing challenge to prepare our students for these new standards. You can go to the North Dakota Department Of Public Instruction's web site, <http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/index.shtm> , to find all the standards listed.

We are currently in the process of looking at adopting a new Math series. This curricular decision will be highly influenced by the ability of that series to align with our State Common Core Standards. All other curricular areas are being assessed with this same alignment strategy. Not all curriculums can be updated (purchased) in one year. Strategies to fill in the gaps for these other curricular areas are being implemented until a formal adoption process can take place.

**Anchor Standards for Reading include:** 1) Key Ideas and Details 2) Craft and Structure 3) Integration of Knowledge and Ideas 4) Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity. **Anchor Standards for Writing include:** 1) Text Types and Purposes 2) Production and Distribution of Writing 3) Research to Build and Present Knowledge 4) Range of Writing. **Anchor Standards for Speaking and Listening include:** 1) Comprehension and Collaboration 2) Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas. **Anchor Standards for Language include:** 1) Conventions of Standard English 2) Knowledge of Language 3) Vocabulary Acquisition and Use.

**Mathematical Practices include:** 1) Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them 2) Reason abstractly and quantitatively 3) Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others 4) Model with mathematics 5) Use appropriate tools strategically 6) Attend to precision 7) Look for and make sure of structure 8) Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning. **Anchor Standards for Mathematics include:** 1) Operations and Algebraic Thinking 2) The Number System 3) Expressions and Equations 4) Geometry 5) Statistics and Probability.

**Science has 8 main standards.** They include: 1) Unifying Concepts 2) Science Inquiry 3) Physical Science 4) Life Science 5) Earth and Space Science 6) Science Technology 7) Science and Other Areas and 8) History and Nature of Science. **Social Studies have 9 main standards.** They include: 1) Nature of History 2) Political Institutions 3) Economic Systems 4) Social Studies Resources 5) role of a Citizen 6) Geography 7) Culture 8) Sociology and Psychology and 9) Sovereignty. **In Music there are 9 main standards.** They include: 1) Singing 2) Instructional Achievement 3) Improvisation 4) Composition 5) Reading Music 6) Listening 7) evaluating Music 8) Music and other Disciplines and 9) Music History and Culture. **The Visual Arts have 6 main standards.** They include: 1) Media Techniques and Processes 2) Structure and Function 3) Subject Matter, Themes, Symbols and Ideas in Visual Arts 4) Visual Art, History and Culture 5) Merits of Visual Art and 6) Connections. **There are currently no State Common Core Standards for Physical Education available.**

## 2. Reading/English:

Our school purchased the Houghton Mifflin Reading Series 2011. This was a difficult decision. We checked with the many of the regional schools in the southeast corner of the state, along with colleagues from around the state. Several schools have adopted many different programs –with success. This shows that there is more to teaching any subject than just having a good series. The real success comes from the teachers in the rooms doing what has to be done for students to have success.

The new series helps us to stress the importance of phonics and sight words in the lower elementary grades. The stories are interesting and provide the students with phonetic practice of the skills introduced along with visual and auditory practice. The progress of the students is monitored with weekly checks and also unit tests. We are able to work with the students individually when needed and give them the support of their peers in cooperative learning, small group instruction, or partner reading. We are fortunate to have access to a wide variety of technology which helps make learning relevant and fun for the students. It's always fun to see students enjoying themselves when they don't necessarily realize they are learning something!

We also supplement our reading series with the use of Star Early Literacy testing in the primary grades of Kindergarten through First grade and Star Reading testing for grades 2-6. Our instructional interventionist works with staff to help analyze the data and set up custom learning paths through Compass Learning for all of the elementary students. This gives enrichment opportunities for those that are already proficient/advanced as well as remedial help for those that are in need of that help. Our Title One program is also an integral part of what we do for remedial assistance for our students in the area of Language Arts. We check for comprehension by utilizing the AR (Accelerated Reader) program.

Our school uses a basal reading program. It offers oral reading stories both fiction and non-fiction for the students to increase their fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. A basal gives reading skills which enhance the student's ability to learn new vocabulary. The skills help students to decode and break words into syllables. The individual workbooks give the students independent work and a way of measuring what each student has gleaned from each group reading presentations. The basal teaches students strategies of writing summaries and webbing to enhance their learning. Our school has used this approach for several years and we have found it to be a most effective and enjoyable way of teaching reading.

### **3. Mathematics:**

Our school purchased the Saxon Math series for the fall of 2002. As with all curriculum adoptions a lot of time was spent investigating, observing and reviewing. On two different days, the elementary classroom teachers visited a neighboring school to see first-hand what teaching Saxon Math looked like and to be given an opportunity to talk with the peers about what they observed as the pros and cons of this series. This site visit made the decision to adopt Saxon Math very easy. One of the more striking comments from my staff was... "Their students are easily two grade levels above our kids..." The other key was the alignment to state standards. Our state assessment scores in Mathematics have risen from the 70% to a yearly score of 95%.

Saxon Math takes a spiral approach to instruction. Students are taught a concept but are then asked to continue to show their understanding and mastery of that concept throughout the school year. The primary grades have what is called a "Math Meeting". This is a bulletin board activity that involves a lot of recitation practice. Later in the day those same grades have a guided lesson to introduce new concepts. The students complete a worksheet called Side A as a class and the backside is completed at home. I like the Side B homework as it involves the parents and gives them an opportunity to participate and be involved with their child's education. The Side A/B has questions-skills that are from previous lessons. Grades 5-6 have a hard cover book and follow a more traditional structure. The spiraling curriculum with questions from previous lessons being included throughout the year is still a part of these grades as well. Both the primary and upper grade levels have access to websites that are a part of the Saxon Math series.

Star Math is used to further assess our students Math skills. From these assessments we are able to create individual custom learning paths for all of our elementary students through the Compass Learning program. Our students really enjoy this web based tutorial site and we feel it has been a great enrichment as well as remedial site for our students.

The last thing I will say about Math instruction is that no matter what you have for a curriculum, you need a staff that delivers that curriculum in a professional manner. Saxon Math is very scripted. My staff

deliver the Saxon Math curriculum with due diligence and adhere to the core principals that this curriculum professes.

We are currently in the process of running the new Common Core Math Standards against the Saxon curriculum and are hopeful that it will continue to be our mainstay as we prepare our students to continue to be highly successful in the area of Mathematics.

#### **4. Additional Curriculum Area:**

The additional curriculum area that I would like to speak to is not just one subject but is a conscious effort by the instructional staff to take action in striving towards supporting our school's mission statement. In part our mission statement states that our graduates will have the necessary skills to thrive as 21st century learners, workers and citizens. The elementary has adopted the following 21st century skills as our areas of emphasis for the 2012-2013 school year. (Communication, Critical Thinking, Collaboration, Organization)

The classroom instructors have made a conscious effort to increase the rigor (critical thinking skills) across all of the curriculums. We are trying our best to model the Common Core philosophy of no longer teaching a mile wide and an inch deep but rather to teach at a deeper level those standards that are assigned to each grade. I have never seen my students being asked to explain the why and how instead of just the "what" an answer is. Collaboration is another 21st Century Skill that I have observed being utilized at all grade levels. We are striving to not just do "group work" but are working towards making that group work more purposeful. Communication is not just oral but also written. More writing, again meaningful and with a purpose has been implemented throughout the elementary. Essay questions are now the common and expected part of written assessments. Organization skills are a key to success. Our assignment notebooks and the growing responsibility put on the students themselves as they progress through the grades have helped with this area greatly. Our sixth grade class is self-contained but that instructor has added Junior High elements (going back to lockers during the day) to help them with the transition to seventh grade.

#### **5. Instructional Methods:**

The first key is to determine what the specific and diverse needs are. This is done through our Star Reading, Star Math and Star Early Literacy assessments. One of the advantages of this on-line assessment is that it can be given multiple times over a short period of time if needed.

Once we have a good idea of what the needs are, our RTI team meets with the classroom instructor to review the results and determine what interventions, including differentiated instruction would be the most helpful to that individual student. Special Education plays a role for some students but by in large we are able to make modifications and accommodations within the regular education setting to meet the needs of most children.

We have implemented several different modifications to better meet the needs of our students. One idea that has worked well is to have students complete their independent work in a small group with a trained paraprofessional or classroom instructor. This works well because the skill that had been taught can be re-taught, often times in a little different way to this small group. Classroom teachers also teach some skills to multiple of small groups within a lesson. While she works with one group, the others are going through "stations". (i.e. reading together, completing skill sheets, etc...) Modified tests have been created for some students. Some teachers include "word lists" for some students to assist them.

Title One is of course a key piece of the puzzle. Many of our students receive the original instruction in the classroom but then are able to get a similar lesson covering the same skill, in a small group setting through Title One. Our Title One students have faired very well on our State Testing.

Our ELL instructor has an after school program for those students to again repeat instruction in a manner that may be better suited for those learners.

Compass Learning (On-line Tutorial) is an example of how we utilize technology to assist us in our attempt to help all learners be successful. We also have specialized iPad applications being utilized as well.

## **6. Professional Development:**

Professional Development is a key component of our school improvement plan. The approach is to make professional development timely and relevant. In order to be effective it also needs to be ongoing. The improvement goals for our school are data driven. In turn, the professional development to equip teachers and administrators to work toward the attainment of these goals is derived from this same data. The data from one of our recent state assessments was showing a weakness in the area of writing. Professional development took place to help staff better understand the "best practices" needed to improve student achievement in this area (Six Traits of Writing). In all cases our staff has a significant voice in the planning of professional development. There are two elementary and two high school instructors that serve on the School Improvement Advisory Committee.

A graduate level technology course is offered "in-house" to staff every other year. We have found it very important that this PD be centered around technology that staff have readily available. Our school has evolved into what I would call a "SmartBoard" school. We have SmartBoards in all classrooms. Extensive professional development took place to help staff utilize this technology tool in an appropriate manner. Professional development is offered every school year but is only offered for graduate credit every other year. Evaluations of the technology professional development have been very favorable. My observations as elementary principal have allowed me the opportunity to see the growth in the staff's ability to utilize technology in an appropriate and effective manner.

On the years that we do not offer the technology class we offer a book study for graduate credit. The topic of the book study is again based on the school improvement goals of that given year. These collegial discussions have proven to be very beneficial and have led to some school wide changes (i.e. Teaching With Love & Logic). The major impact of this book study led to a District wide approach to behavior management. Although we share the same building, the elementary and high school used to be very different in their approaches. Now we have a school wide plan with the same language and approaches being implemented. This has had a significant impact on both staff and students.

Historically we have had up to four professional development days just prior to the school year beginning. In some instances there is an additional PD day before the second semester begins. Our school board has been very supportive of staff requests to attend workshops and conferences. These workshops and conferences have to meet the criteria of aligning with our school improvement goals and in supporting student achievement.

## **7. School Leadership:**

Since I began my administrative career in Wyndmere we have had basically the same leadership make up and philosophy. We are a small K-12 school district. Our Superintendent has served as our Business Manager for many years but that position has recently become two separate positions. Our High School Principal also serves as the Athletic Director and in addition to being the Elementary Principal I also serve as the K-12 Technology Coordinator and the Performance Strategist.

The overall philosophy comes from the example of the Superintendent. The leadership team needs to be willing to do anything to help each other, certified staff as well as non-certified staff. The leadership team subs for drivers on the bus route, covers for teachers in the classroom, works in the lunch line serving

food and cleans up and sets up for events. These are just a few examples of how the leadership team approaches the "team" concept. It is not enough to just talk a good game, one has to be engaged and "show" that they are committed to the school, the students and the staff.

Our school spent quite a bit of time looking at our Mission Statement. Our new statement came about through many staff meetings. A conscious effort was made to make sure it said what we believed. "The mission of the Wyndmere Public School is to create an environment where students and staff are safe, respectful, and responsible. The staff is committed to ensure all students are proficient and will graduate with the necessary skills to thrive as 21st century learners, workers, and citizens." All decisions regarding policy, programs, must meet the test of being aligned with this mission statement. Key staff members with a gift for writing were important players in this process.

The leadership team is active in our school improvement committee. Being actively involved in the discussions that look at student achievement in regards to programs and resources is vital. Too often I hear of situations where the leadership team is a silent partner at best. The chairperson for the school improvement committee is a staff person. The administrative team works along side the teachers that serve on this committee but make a conscious effort to not be in the lead. I feel this has been an important strategy in helping staff take ownership for our school improvement and has helped to develop leaders from within the instructional staff.

One way I show my focus on student achievement is through the RTI committee. I am the one that is responsible for proctoring the on-line assessments and create all the reports for the teachers. I then lead the RTI grade level meetings that discuss achievement and the need for intervention. I do however see the other RTI members (Title One Instructor, LD Instructor, Speech Pathologist and ED Instructor) as participants in the leadership of this group. Their input and suggestions have been invaluable as they help lead staff to better and more efficient interventions for their students. I am also the one responsible for creating custom learning paths for all of my students in the Compass Learning program.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: NDSA

Edition/Publication Year: 2010

Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

|  | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | 95        | 95        | 87        | 95        | 95        |
| % Advanced   | 45        | 50        | 53        | 47        | 0         |
| Number of students tested  | 23        | 14        | 15        | 14        | 13        |
| Percent of total students tested   | 96        | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 1         | 0         | 0         | 1         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   | 4         | 0         | 0         | 7         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | 95        | Masked    |           | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced   | 45        | Masked    |           | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested  | 11        | 7         | 10        | 4         | 5         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested  | 1         | 1         | 1         | 2         | 1         |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested  | 2         | 4         | 4         | 4         | 1         |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| % Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| Number of students tested  | 1         | 1         | 1         | 2         |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Subgroups of 10 or less did not have any proficiency data available. Not reported out in the Grade Level Reports. Only listed the number from those sub-groups. Elementary proficiency for these sub-groups has been very strong in our combined grade AYP reports. |           |           |           |           |           |

13ND1



## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: NDSA

Edition/Publication Year: 2010

Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

|   | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | 91        | 95        | 93        | 93        | 85        |
| % Advanced  | 35        | 21        | 27        | 13        | 8         |
| Number of students tested   | 23        | 14        | 15        | 16        | 13        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 100       | 100       | 100       | 94        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed   | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed  | 4         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | 83        | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | 25        | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 12        | 7         | 5         | 5         | 5         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 1         | 1         | 2         | 1         |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 4         | 4         | 4         | 1         |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 1         | 1         | 2         |           |
| <b>6.</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Subgroups of 10 or less did not have any proficiency data available. Not reported out in the Grade Level Reports. Only listed the number from those sub-groups. Elementary proficiency for these sub-groups has been very strong in our combined grade AYP reports. |           |           |           |           |           |

13ND1

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: NDSA

Edition/Publication Year: 2010

Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

|   | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | 95        | 95        | 93        | 83        | 93        |
| % Advanced  | 27        | 22        | 13        | 17        | 43        |
| Number of students tested   | 15        | 18        | 15        | 12        | 14        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed   | 0         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed  | 0         | 5         | 6         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 5         | 6         | 4         | 5         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 1         | 2         | 2         | 1         | 3         |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 4         | 4         | 1         | 3         |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| Number of students tested   | 1         | 1         | 2         | 1         |           |
| <b>6.</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Subgroups of 10 or less did not have any proficiency data available. Not reported out in the Grade Level Reports. Only listed the number from those sub-groups. Elementary proficiency for these sub-groups has been very strong in our combined grade AYP reports. |           |           |           |           |           |

13ND1

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: NDSA

Edition/Publication Year: 2010

Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

|   | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | 87        | 94        | 80        | 95        | 86        |
| % Advanced  | 27        | 39        | 20        | 17        | 29        |
| Number of students tested   | 15        | 18        | 15        | 12        | 14        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed   | 0         | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed  | 0         | 5         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 5         | 6         | 4         | 5         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 1         | 2         | 2         | 1         | 3         |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 4         | 4         | 1         | 3         |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| Number of students tested   | 1         | 1         | 2         | 1         |           |
| <b>6.</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Subgroups of 10 or less did not have any proficiency data available. Not reported out in the Grade Level Reports. Only listed the number from those sub-groups. Elementary proficiency for these sub-groups has been very strong in our combined grade AYP reports. |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: NDSA

Edition/Publication Year: 2010

Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

|   | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | 95        | 95        | 95        | 93        | 86        |
| % Advanced  | 58        | 33        | 15        | 53        | 43        |
| Number of students tested   | 16        | 16        | 13        | 16        | 14        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 100       | 94        | 100       | 94        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed   | 1         | 1         | 0         | 1         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed  | 6         | 6         | 0         | 6         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 4         | 5         | 3         | 7         | 8         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| Number of students tested   | 1         | 2         | 1         | 3         |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 4         | 1         | 4         | 4         |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| Number of students tested   | 1         | 2         | 1         | 2         |           |
| <b>6.</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Subgroups of 10 or less did not have any proficiency data available. Not reported out in the Grade Level Reports. Only listed the number from those sub-groups. Elementary proficiency for these sub-groups has been very strong in our combined grade AYP reports. |           |           |           |           |           |

13ND1

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: NDSA

Edition/Publication Year: 2010

Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

|   | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | 95        | 80        | 77        | 93        | 64        |
| % Advanced  | 25        | 13        | 7         | 40        | 21        |
| Number of students tested   | 16        | 15        | 13        | 16        | 14        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 100       | 100       | 100       | 94        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed   | 1         | 0         | 0         | 1         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed  | 6         | 0         | 0         | 6         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 4         | 5         | 3         | 7         | 8         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| Number of students tested   | 1         | 2         | 1         | 3         |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 4         | 1         | 4         | 4         |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |
| Number of students tested   | 1         | 2         | 1         | 2         |           |
| <b>6.</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Subgroups of 10 or less did not have any proficiency data available. Not reported out in the Grade Level Reports. Only listed the number from those sub-groups. Elementary proficiency for these sub-groups has been very strong in our combined grade AYP reports. |           |           |           |           |           |

13ND1

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6 Test: NDSA

Edition/Publication Year: 2010

Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

|   | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month   | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | 93        | 95        | 94        | 95        | 95        |
| % Advanced  | 67        | 36        | 34        | 39        | 33        |
| Number of students tested   | 15        | 14        | 18        | 13        | 15        |
| Percent of total students tested  | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed   | 1         | 0         | 1         | 1         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed  | 6         | 0         | 5         | 8         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    |           | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    |           | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 6         | 3         | 10        | 7         | 3         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 2         | 3         |           | 1         |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested   | 3         | 1         | 3         | 3         | 1         |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |           |
| % Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |           |
| Number of students tested   | 2         | 1         | 2         |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Subgroups of 10 or less did not have any proficiency data available. Not reported out in the Grade Level Reports. Only listed the number from those sub-groups. Elementary proficiency for these sub-groups has been very strong in our combined grade AYP reports. |           |           |           |           |           |

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6 Test: NDSA

Edition/Publication Year: 2010

Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill

|  | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       | Oct       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | 80        | 93        | 89        | 95        | 67        |
| % Advanced   | 27        | 7         | 44        | 14        | 20        |
| Number of students tested  | 15        | 14        | 18        | 13        | 15        |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0         | 0         | 1         | 1         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   | 0         | 0         | 5         | 8         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    |           | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    |           | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested  | 6         | 3         | 10        | 7         | 3         |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           | Masked    |
| % Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           | Masked    |
| Number of students tested  | 2         | 2         | 3         |           | 1         |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| % Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |
| Number of students tested  | 3         | 1         | 3         | 3         | 1         |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |           |
| % Advanced   | Masked    | Masked    | Masked    |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 2         | 1         | 2         |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Proficient & Advanced  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Advanced   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Subgroups of 10 or less did not have any proficiency data available. Not reported out in the Grade Level Reports. Only listed the number from those sub-groups. Elementary proficiency for these sub-groups has been very strong in our combined grade AYP reports. |           |           |           |           |           |

13ND1