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 [X] Choice

Name of Principal Mr. Dennis O'Brien
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Ernest Bowen deSilva Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 278 Ainako Avenue
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Hilo State HI Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 96720-1604

County Hawaii County State School Code Number* 351

Telephone 808-974-4855 Fax 808-974-4858

Web site/URL http://www.desilva.k12.hi.us E-mail dennis_o'brien@notes.k12.hi.us

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ 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*Ms. Kathryn Matayoshi
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

E-mail: kathryn_matayoshi@notes.k12.hi.us

District Name Hawaii Tel. 808-974-6600

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. Donald Horner
(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 (per district designation):
   171 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
   38 Middle/Junior high schools
   39 High schools
   7 K-12 schools

   255 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
   [X] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [ ] Suburban
   [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
   [ ] Rural

3. 10 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	5	1	6
K	39	38	77
1	29	32	61
2	31	31	62
3	36	34	70
4	27	30	57
5	28	21	49
6	28	26	54
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	223	213	436

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
26 % Asian
0 % Black or African American
9 % Hispanic or Latino
27 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
11 % White
27 % 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: 3%

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	11
(2) Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	2
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	13
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	436
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.030
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	3

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %
6 Total number ELL

Number of non-English languages represented: 3
Specify non-English languages: Marshallese, Spanish, Vietnamese

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 36 %

Total number students who qualify: 157

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: 9 %
40 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.

3 Autism	0 Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	0 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	20 Specific Learning Disability
0 Emotional Disturbance	3 Speech or Language Impairment
0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
0 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0 Multiple Disabilities	13 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	18
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	5
Paraprofessionals	2
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	4

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 25:1

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	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
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

Ernest Bowen deSilva Elementary School, home to 452 “SuperBees” is a K-6 public school nestled on the slopes of Mauna Kea in the Ainako residential area on the island of Hawaii (Big Island). Our Mission Statement of "E.B. deSilva teachers, administrators, parents, students, staff, and community members share the responsibility to promote life-long learning and excellence" is at the heart of all that we do each and every day. The following narratives will illustrate much of our actions to embody this belief. Our students represent all of Hawaii’s ethnic groups with Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian as the largest single group. Thirty-eight percent of our students are considered “Disadvantaged”, based on their Free/Reduced lunch status. Through the years, our students have continued to excel academically as evidenced by 89% proficient/higher in Reading and 88% proficient/higher in Mathematics on our most recent Hawaii State Assessment (HSA) for grades 3, 4, 5, & 6. We are particularly delighted to share that our “Disadvantaged” and “Pacific Islander” subgroups have scored as high as their peers.

We will have our 2013-14 HSA/SBAC hybrid assessment results available after our final round of assessments this coming May. Of interest to us is the Hawaii State Department of Education’s (HIDOE) prediction of an implementation dip during the transition from HCPS III to Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The HIDOE’s prediction follows a nation-wide implementation dip during the transition school years.

Just five years ago, we celebrated 50 years of commitment to excellence in education and service to our community. The very first principal and her faculty/staff were handpicked to establish the best possible elementary school for the Ainako and Hilo community. Each principal and teacher who has followed the start-up group has been compelled to continue the tradition of excellence through the years. Over the last ten years, we have been fortunate to hire deSilva school graduates as teachers and staff members, the majority of whom have or had children attending this school. A few of us have grandchildren attending E.B. deSilva Elementary. These facts go a long way in demonstrating the extraordinary degree of commitment to our school’s Vision and Mission Statements. Being a part of the school team is more than a job or a career, for most of us, there is an extremely unique connection with the school that has given us so much, this is our home.

The dedication of our faculty helps to explain the 55 years of unbroken commitment to “Educating for Excellence” as stated in our school’s Mission Statement. Each of our teachers, whether an actual E.B. graduate, a parent, or grandparent lives the Mission Statement. Each of our school’s community members is honored with the long history of academic performance, but is also especially proud of the excellent citizenship of our children. We teach all of our children to live the meaning of kindness, respect, Aloha, and being Pono (making things right) as they acquire the lifelong value of treating each other well, just as they wish to be treated. We believe that academic success without learning the true meaning of kindness, respect and Aloha is relatively meaningless, therefore, we take pride in teaching the whole child.

Although our teachers are the most important factor in this school’s long term success, we would be remiss not to mention our school’s governance system. Within this system, each teacher is afforded an equal voice in our continuous school improvement efforts. As a relatively small school, each of our teachers is either a member of a major committee (Language Arts, Mathematics, Technology, Safety, Comprehensive Student Support System (CSSS), our Academic Review Team (ART), and/or the Grade Level Chairperson’s (GLC). The result of this internal governance system is that each teacher is equally enfranchised as a key member in our success. Our major committees act as a “think-tank” (School Leadership Team) during which possible school improvement steps are considered and developed in draft form. Once refined, the school improvement options are introduced to the GLCs, which includes the Principal, for further discussion and final determination to implement.

We are a school that has benefited greatly from visitations to, and ongoing articulation with top rated elementary schools in Honolulu. To a significant extent, as an outer island school, we are further away from the core of innovation and resources. In an effort to bridge this unintended “geographical gap” we have

fielded teams of our key staff members to visit the number one rated public elementary school in Hawaii, Momilani Elementary, in the heart of Honolulu. A good deal of our school improvement over the past several years has been a direct result of learning how other top rated schools employ "best practices". Likewise, we have shared out with other Big Island schools as they request information.

In recognition of E.B.'s long standing traditions of excellence, we are currently rated #4 amongst the DOE's 270+ public and charter schools. This rating is determined by the HIDOE's STRIVE HI recognition program. In October of this school year, in recognition of our status as a "Recognition School", Superintendent Matayoshi, Assistant Superintendent Nozoe, and Governor Abercrombie presented representatives of our school, including teachers, students, parents, and PTA President with a STRIVE HI award of $75,000. These funds were immediately applied towards the purchase of the new HIDOE endorsed and mandated Language Arts (LA) curriculum to be implemented this coming school year.

Although we know that we have worked tirelessly to support the success of our children and families we also realize that there is much work ahead of us. Our faculty is seldom heard congratulating each other on our achievements, but rather spends time listing all that we can do, and will do, to build upon student success as we continue our efforts to improve in all areas.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) For the purpose of this section we will review Hawaii State Assessment (HSA) and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) scores from school year 2003-04 through 2012-13. From the inception of the HSA, the AYP benchmark has been set at 300, which is the threshold for "Meets Proficiency". While 300 is the minimal threshold for proficiency in Reading and Mathematics, we take the most serious look at student growth over the course of the entire school year. Students who achieve a 300 on the first or second of three HSA attempts are encouraged and supported to increase as far as possible over a given school year. Likewise, students who are in the "Approaches Proficiency" or "Well Below" categories are provided a wide array of supports in order to help them improve as much as they can within the school year. A quick review of the HSA results from 2003-04 to the present reveals that this school has met and/or exceeded AYPs each year. Our Reading score in 2004-05 was 68% "Meets/Exceeds" proficiency. In school year 2012-13, the number of students in these categories had increased to 87%. Our Mathematics HSA score in 2003-04 was 38% "Meets/Exceeds" which met the AYP threshold for that year; however in 2012-13 a full 88% of students in tested grades were achieving in the "Meets/Exceeds" category. Also of note, is the fact that our "Disadvantaged" and "Pacific Islanders" students became measurable subgroups in 2005-06. Of particular interest is the growth of student achievement within these subgroups. In 2005-06, the "Disadvantaged" subgroup scored 46% "Meets/Exceeds" in Reading and just 20% "Meets/Exceeds" in Math. However, by 2012-13 the AYP scores of this subgroup had improved to 84% "Meets/Exceeds in Reading and 85% in Math. The narrowing and eventual closure of the so called achievement gap is one that is particularly heartwarming for our school community.

b) The performance trend range discussed in Part A indicates that even though this school has met AYP since the inception of the HSA, there continues to be enormous growth over time. There are several factors responsible for this rate of growth. For example in Reading, we determined in 2002-03 to implement a K-6 LA program known as Open Court. Prior to this vertical alignment, various grades had utilized an assortment of LA curriculum. We determined that a single LA program would best afford grades K-6 with a common language, terminology, and the critical element of scaffolding from one grade level to the next. Granted, Open Court has been around for decades, but it is also a tried and proven LA curriculum. Although this series is used from K-6, our teachers have liberally used aspects of Write Traits, Kid Biz 3000, and non-fiction reading selections as part of their grade level LA curriculum. In large part due to the LA curriculum alignment in K-6, our students "non-disadvantaged" and "Disadvantaged" alike have been achieving 80% proficiency of higher in each of the last four years. The same type of K-6 curriculum alignment was needed for Mathematics. Prior to the 2005-06 SY our Math AYP stood at 28% "Meets/Exceeds". Although this was a significant increase from the previous year, our entire faculty recognized the need to research a best fit K-6 Math curriculum that would meet the demanding needs of our school mission statement, which calls for each child to experience success. The resulting research led us to adopt the Envision Program as our K-6 Math curriculum. This is a Math series strong on inquiry, requiring that it be taught K-6 in order to develop the foundational math terminology students would need as they matriculate through the grades and onto college. In order to successfully implement the Envision Math curriculum it was necessary to provide pullout days for our staff to be trained. On these days, they worked to understand the new curriculum themselves, aligned the series with our State Academic Standards, and began to determine how best to scaffold the program math concepts. The act of adopting a single, high quality Math curriculum for K-6 enabled the school to jump from 44% "Meets/Exceeds" in 2005-06 to 57% in 2006-07. During this time, we also experienced corresponding growth with our "Disadvantaged" sub-group. Our new Math curriculum experienced an "implementation dip" in 2007-08 and again in 2008-09 as our Math AYPs flat-lined at 50% "Meets/Exceeds". Nonetheless, our staff was unanimously in support of the Envisions series and stayed the course – believing, correctly, that the students would be able to master the curriculum's more complex method of introducing and teaching math concepts. As a result of our teachers' belief in themselves and in the students, we continued to provide Professional Development with the Envision Program Representative, further pull-out time to become even more familiar with the series, and stayed the course. A direct result of our actions was a highly rewarding increase in AYPs in 2009-10 to 76% "Meets/Exceeds", with 75% of our "Disadvantaged" sub-group scoring equally high. As a school, we

have always believed that it is within the ability of teachers, students, and parents to support all of our students achieving AYP of 90% "Meets/Exceeds" or higher. In addition to ongoing Professional Development and enhanced planning time, we also employed the support of Para-Professional Tutors (PPTS) by placing one in each classroom to assist with instructional support to the children. This additional support allowed the classroom teachers to provide direct instruction to struggling students at key junctures. This factor, in concert with an iron-clad belief in our ability to achieve our school mission resulted in Math AYP scores in 2010-11 of 84% "Meets/Exceeds", 87% in 2011-12, and 87% again in 2012-13. Ninety percent "Meets/Exceeds" is our goal for the current school year. Although all schools in Hawaii have been advised to expect the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) hybrid assessment to result in as much as a 30% drop in AYP proficiency scores, early results this school year have us hopeful that our students will not experience the predicted implementation year dip.

2. Using Assessment Results:

E.B. deSilva staff use several summative assessments to assess student achievement and to inform instruction. The HSA is given annually and measures student progress towards state benchmarks/standards. Additionally, Lexile (Scholastic Reading Inventory and i-Ready, and quartile (i-Ready) are measured on a quarterly basis. Assessment results are used to categorize students into three distinct tiers: Tier 1 – Core Instruction, Tier2 - Targeted Instruction, and Tier 3 – Intensive Instruction, in accordance with the Response to Intervention Model. Tier 1 – Core Instruction: Emphasis is placed on skills necessary for academic achievement. Classroom teachers differentiate instruction to meet student needs. Tier 1 instruction is effective in meeting the academic needs of 80–90% of our students. Tier 2 – Targeted Instruction involves identifying students who are lacking in specific skills or are failing to meet specific benchmarks. We are in the process of revising Tier 2 interventions to include a multi-disciplinary instructional support team. The team will work along with the classroom teacher to create a comprehensive, measurable intervention plan. They will meet periodically to assess the effectiveness of the plan and revise as necessary. Tier 3 – Intensive Instruction is necessary only when students fail to respond to Tier 2 interventions. The process for eligibility to IDEA services/supports is initiated. IDEA services are delivered in the regular education setting following the inclusion model. Ongoing formative assessments are used to frequently inform/develop instruction. Teachers meet weekly with grade level peers to discuss student data and to adjust curricula/instruction. With the implementation of new CCSS, and State mandated curriculum in both LA and Mathematics, teachers will need to closely monitor student progress towards benchmarks. As a proactive measure we are currently adjusting our bell schedule to build vertical articulation time to ensure teachers have an opportunity to review formative assessment data and develop appropriate instruction. Our bell schedule of the past several years allows for weekly grade level teacher articulation time. The new bell schedule will maintain this time and also provide time for vertical dialogue.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Our school has benefited greatly from a professional development relationship with Momilani Elementary School in Honolulu and the Oahu Pearl City District. We have fielded visitation teams of key E. B. staff members to Momilani Elementary in past years in which we learned a good deal about that award winning school's best practices. In particular, we need to acknowledge Momilani Principal, Doreen Higa, for her graciousness and willingness to spend time with our staff to explain many of the strategies and processes her school explores to reach its highly rated status each year. Most recently, she was willing to send her Curriculum Coordinator to spend a day working with our staff to update them on Write Traits, their school wide writing program, and how this program integrates with the HIDOE mandated Wonders Reading Program. He also explained and demonstrated for our staff the features of a formative assessment program known as iReady. As a result of this demonstration and the program's features, our school has purchased iReady for the next two school years. More recently, we sent a team of our staff to join Pearl City teachers in a Write Traits workshop. This is a program that we expect to integrate into our LA program. Our staff has shared much of what we've learned from Momilani School and Pearl City District with our neighboring schools here in Hilo. For example, three other Hilo area schools joined our faculty on campus here for the presentation by Momilani's Curriculum Coordinator. In planning for implementation of the HIDOE mandated Wonders LA program at the start of school year 2014-15, we are collaborating with several Hilo

elementary schools to maximize the summer training sessions. We shared our "best practices" with each of our fellow Hilo area elementary schools, including how we developed an award winning Robotics Program that placed in District and State competitions. Our staff believes that Robotics can be a springboard in the arena of Science-Technology-Engineering-Math (STEM). Several of our students have continued to excel in Robotics as they matriculate on to the intermediate and high school teams, sharing what they've learned at E.B. at each level. We have also presented, at the District level, the main features of our highly popular after school enrichment program, Edventures. We are delighted to learn that several of our neighbor elementary schools are implementing similar programs in large part modeled after ours. Our commitment to learning from and sharing with other schools and/or Districts is based on our belief that we must continuously strive to improve at our school. What we share with other schools is to the benefit of families and children who reside in our beautiful community of Hilo. We consider every opportunity to learn from a fellow school and/or share a best practice to be a cornerstone of professional development.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

There are several strategies that have helped us build and maintain a fruitful relationship with our families and community. One of these is our Parent Teacher Association (PTA). The E.B. deSilva PTA has been instrumental in much of our ongoing success. Hosting Chili Dinner Family Nights, ongoing fundraisers, supporting our after school Edventure Enrichment Program, and networking with our teachers to provide much needed funding and volunteer support. Fundraisers in recent years have enabled the school to upgrade our play ground facilities, partnering with Senator Dan Inouye's 3-R's program in share costs to install ceiling fans in each classroom, and providing a per pupil stipend to each classroom teacher to offset the cost of incidental supplies. The after school Edventure Enrichment Program was developed by the PTA in concert with E.B. teachers and administration. This extremely popular program brings highly qualified instructors in the Arts, foreign languages, Crafts, Sports, Robotics, Carpentry, Meal Preparation, Chess, to our campus five days a week for after school day exploratory instruction. In any given semester, at least 60% of our 450+ students are enrolled in one or more of these high interest classes. Although a nominal fee is charged for each class, it is the PTA that covers most of the cost for instructors and necessary supplies. A key staff member in making the Edventure Class work so well for the past several school years is our Parent Community Network Coordinator (PCNC). Although only a 17 hr. per week position, the PCNC, in addition to taking the lead with the Edventure Program is also responsible for coordinating evening sessions for parents on CPR/First Aid, Child Rearing, Home Security, how to help your child with Math, and several other related Family Night activities. Our PCNC is also our school to parent connection for securing parent volunteers as needed. Parents and school community members who are not active in the PTA are welcome to join our School Community Council (SCC). The SCC meets on a monthly basis as an advisory board to school administration, reviews and provides final approval of each school year's Academic and Financial Plan, and submits an annual rating on the principal to the Complex Area Superintendent. Another strategy mentioned in the Summary is that of purposefully hiring former students, former and present parents/grandparents as members of faculty and staff. This contributes greatly, in concert with our PTA, PCNC, and SCC, to a collective sense of ownership by faculty/staff in planning for and participating in student success and school improvement.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

At E.B. deSilva Elementary School, our academic priority is to provide our students with the rigor and relevance of the CCSS. A variety of resources are used to orchestrate the talents of our professional teaching staff to implement the CCSS as well as meet the needs of all learners. Our curriculum offers teachers a flexible platform that allows them to utilize their unique talents and creativity while delivering the instruction. We follow the scope and sequence of the CCSS in each instructional area. Teachers use their professional judgment as well as assessments to recognize the various learning styles, strengths and areas of need for all students. This determines how teachers navigate the curriculum and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each child. Our English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum integrates the components of reading, writing, listening and speaking into a comprehensive system beginning with foundational skills and progressing towards the application of these components to address real life situations. Our teachers provide students a variety of resources and strategies to address the CCSS. For the past eight years we have used the Open Court LA series in grades K-6. Using a common LA curriculum throughout the grades has lent itself well to scaffolding of terminology and instruction. Additionally, we have used aspects of Write Traits and other supplemental materials to more completely address the CCSS. For SY 2014-15, each school in Hawaii has been tasked to adopt the Wonder's LA curriculum series. We currently use the Envision Math text and online components by Pearson Scott Foresman, which we adopted four years ago. Our teachers incorporate a variety of strategies from Singapore Math, Greg Tang, and Kim Sutton to teach math concepts and address CCSS. The curriculum spirals from the foundational skills, first introduced in Kindergarten, of numbers senses and progresses toward all math domains including problem solving and applications as the children matriculate through the grades. Students are given opportunities to use manipulatives and hands-on activities to understand concepts moving from concrete to abstract.

Our science curriculum consists of a combination of integrated project based STEM activities as well as a variety of non-fiction, content based materials. Teachers utilize resources from the Discovery Education website to bring the science curriculum to life as well as to address the needs of all types of learners. E.B. deSilva School has partnerships with community organizations such as Imiloa Astronomy Center, Gemini and Subaru Telescopes. Our parents, teachers, students, and community members are highly involved in our annual "Journey Through the Universe" (JTTU). JTTU is a weeklong public event in which all of our students are able to participate in learning about space, technology, our atmosphere, and other high interest science topics. Astronomers from around the world come to Hilo to teach students about their field of expertise within the science curriculum. Many of our students leave our school in the 6th grade expressing their desire to continue learning about a topic of interest that was first introduced during JTTU.

Our Social Studies curriculum has a strong tie to our community and its history. Early elementary grades are introduced to various community members who volunteer to visit the classrooms sharing their occupation with students and why it's important in our community. Guest visitors include fire fighters, police officers, our mayor, attorneys, members of the medical community, county council members, emergency response staff, civil defense workers, and others. In the upper grades, the focus broadens to the history of Hawaii, the United States, and abroad. Our fourth grade classes study Hawaiian history throughout the year, then take a culminating field trip to the island of Oahu to confirm their studies by visiting Iolani Palace, Pearl Harbor, Bishop Museum and other high interest sites. Our fifth and sixth grade classes culminate two years of U.S. History instruction with a trip to the East Coast to visit many of the key historical places they have studied about. They begin in Boston and travel down the coast visiting various places in New York, Washington D.C., and Pennsylvania. Teachers provide students the opportunity for creative expression by integrating art and music within the curriculum.

The basic elements of art and music integrated into the curriculum allow students the opportunity to develop their intellectual processing of appreciating the arts. Additional opportunities specializing in an area of art, and/or music are provided during the after school Edventure enrichment program. In this highly popular program, students have an opportunity, each semester, to sign up for chorus, ukulele, ceramics, drawing, crafts, woodwork, and creative movement, among others. This allows for students to expand their

knowledge in an area of interest beyond the school day. Students who have been exposed to these courses in the after school program will often continue to take these as electives as their matriculate through the 12th grade. Physical Education is provided weekly for all students by a certified Physical Education Teacher. Students learn basic motor skills necessary to begin participation in an array of sports – and the Physical Fitness test. Technology is integrated throughout each of the curriculum areas. Students are able to use technological devices as a tool for research, project based learning, develop power point presentations, for assessment, content practice, as well as enriching their learning. Each classroom is equipped with a station of at least 8 computers, and interactive white board, and a document camera. Additionally, we have a full lab of 30+ computers, four 25 unit laptop carts, and one iPad cart of 25 devices which rotate between classrooms. Teachers use technology to enhance the curriculum and engage learners. They also use technology as a tool to manage attendance, lesson planning, grading, assessment, and tracking student growth.

2. Reading/English:

Excellence in student reading achievement is paramount at E.B. deSilva Elementary School. A curriculum that combines research based teaching practices, along with years of professional knowledge, helps provide an enriching educational experience for all learners. LA teachers incorporate a school wide language arts series in combination with nonfiction and fiction trade books, in a guided reading or literature circle format, to make the Core Standards accessible to students. Teachers, along with support staff (Paraprofessional Tutors – PPTs), are able to differentiate assignments depending on a student's need. In the lower elementary grades (K-2), teachers focus on teaching foundational phonics, reading fluency skills, and comprehension skills. By using whole group and small group instruction, teachers in the lower grades focus instruction to a variety of reading abilities. Small group instruction uses differentiation in learning for students with special needs to students who exceed the standard. All students read with an adult in small group or in a one to one setting in a weekly, or more often basis. Students are encouraged to move from gaining reading knowledge and skills in the lower grades to becoming critical and analytical learners in the upper grades (3-6). Teachers integrate the LA Core Standards curriculum with other subject areas as well as expose students to a variety of literature and non-fiction texts. Whole and small group instruction allows teachers to focus on students' various strengths and needs. Over time, students are able to synthesize cross curriculum reading to share new learning in writing, oral presentation, and/or multi-media presentation. A key to our students' success on the HSA over the past decade was the school's unanimous decision to use a single LA curriculum, Open Court, in all grades. To be certain, our teachers have supplemented Open Court with Write Traits and elements of Write Tools as well. Also, a growing number of our teachers have seen, first hand, how KidBiz 3000 (an online reading diagnostic and support) program enables students to more quickly increase their lexile scores while engaging in high interest non-fiction articles across multiple disciplines. A quick review of our HSA Reading data shows that just 68% of our students were proficient in the 2003-04 SY, whereas students were at 88% in the 2012- 13 SY, with two testing grade levels scoring in the mid to upper ninety percent. With a continued dedication to promote lifelong learning and excellence, teachers, administrator, parents, and students at E. B. deSilva Elementary School put a high emphasis on raising literate and productive citizens.

3. Mathematics:

In an effort to align our math curriculum, our school made a decision on articulation among teachers to invest in a math curriculum. Envision Math provides a rich math language with a primary focus on the application of math. As we spiral our math curriculum, it provides teachers with common understandings during articulation. Teachers supplement this program in personalized fashions. It provides the school a solid foundation on which to build our present math curriculum. We chose this approach because math builds on the spiraling and application of acquired knowledge and an understanding of concepts and skills to be successful. It was believed that the basic vocabulary of math would develop a stronger understanding of math concepts. It provides our students with the ability to apply those skills in their lives. It builds a strong foundation of math knowledge in our students and a strong foundation of understanding among teachers. We share the common language and strategies that allow our students to build on a spiraling curriculum based on acquired knowledge. Through articulation, teachers agree to acquire foundational math skills they

need to be grounded in math vocabulary. Teachers work to tighten the verbiage of mathematics and gain consistency throughout the school. We look at expectations of our sixth graders and the skills that we deem necessary for them to acquire, and vertical articulation takes place ensuring that the spiraling of skills and concepts are in place. Through the spiraling of language and skills, and a high standard of commitment for the success of our students, we have created a generation of students who not only understand math, but also are able to apply learned concepts. We continue to make excellent progress with all students. A conscious effort has been placed on students who are below and above grade level. Identified students are provided individual tutoring, small group pullouts, or inclusion groupings targeting specific areas. Students are encouraged to participate in math programs that take them from their current math levels and advance them accordingly. We also offer an after school program that focuses on utilizing technology to provide all students a structured environment for improvement and success. We made a school wide investment in iReady, a diagnostic and instructional program for math and LA that provides teachers individual reports of student's strengths and weaknesses. Using this data allows our teachers to group students by standards for focused group instruction.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Technology is a vital curriculum area, as well as a vehicle, in helping our students reach life-long learning and excellence at our school. All students in grades K-6 have access to and utilize technology every day. Our technology curriculum is based on the National Educational Technology Standards and our students receive direct instruction from the Technology Coordinator (resource teacher) three times a month, as well as by their classroom teacher several times each week. Our technology curriculum is the result of a collaborative effort between the Technology Coordinator and all classroom teachers. During the technology classes, students learn how to use productivity tools to create projects that integrate the CCSS. Some projects include the development of multimedia presentations, word processing, research, and even student developed projects. Students also learn basic keyboarding and computer skills so that they are able to use the available technology independently and effectively. With technology rapidly changing on a daily basis, we strive to provide our students with the technology and critical skills necessary so that they will be to intuitively adapt and utilize any technology that is available. Not only do students learn technology skills, but students also use their technology skills to help them attain and master the CCSS. Programs such as i-Ready and KidBiz 3000 enable students to increase their literacy skills. Both programs are tailored to the student's abilities and provide differentiated instruction to all students. IXL and i-Ready are programs that are also available to the students to support the improvement of their mathematical thinking. Interested students are also provided access to ALEKS, an online math program, for those who are interested in enrichment opportunities. Discovery Education is used to enhance our Science and Social Studies curriculum. Together, these tools enable us to help increase student achievement and promote a culture of academic excellence. Our technology curriculum is the result of a concerted effort by the E.B. deSilva Elementary School teachers, administrators, and students. The curriculum enables all students to gain technology skills, as well as improve their knowledge in all subject areas so that they possess the skills necessary to be lifelong learners, attain, and sustain academic excellence.

5. Instructional Methods:

E. B. deSilva School faculty and staff recognize that learners have varied readiness, interests, and learning styles. Classroom instruction attends to differentiating instructional practices to ensure that all learners are successful. Our instructional practices embody this belief. Our students' instruction is tailored to "fit" the needs of all learners, from the struggling to the more advanced learners. Our classrooms provide opportunities for students to learn at a comfortable, yet rigorous pace. Ongoing formative assessments provide data to modify instruction for students. Assessments are a means to determine student growth in the attainment of concepts, ideas, and understandings. These assessments provide teachers with specific information for interventions for each student. Classrooms utilize various settings to address instructional groupings: Centers, stations, small group instruction, individualized instruction, heterogeneous/homogeneous groupings, revolving door groupings. Groupings are dynamic, and determined by the needs of the students, which lends itself well for the inclusion of the Special Education students in settings. The use of technology is evident in every classroom, used in a variety of ways and purpose,

whether to create a web site or a Google doc presentation of student driven investigations, to research and explore topics of student interest, to communicate and collaborate with other schools, utilizing various means to demonstrate the understanding of content and process. The use of technology provides students with opportunities to demonstrate a multitude of essential skills (academic and life): the learning of content, creativity, collaboration with others, planning, and problem solving. With this new generation of learners, the "Innovation" generation, technology is a means that engages and excites learning. This is quite apparent in the classrooms throughout the grades. For example, after learning about Troy elements in LA, the first graders created their own original stories and computer-generated picture books using the PhotoStory program. Another grade level used technology to collaborate with other schools throughout the United States. Exploring their schoolyard for abiotic and biotic things, 4th graders gathered their data and compared their findings with other schools in the Midwest, East, and Western states. They then created a web site to share their findings with the "World". Our efforts are a continual, ongoing refining of effective instructional practices in all classrooms, at all grade levels.

6. Professional Development:

Although we have fielded groups of teachers to conduct visitations at top rated schools in Honolulu, with excellent results, we also rely heavily on the "expertise" from within our faculty. We have found that one of the most productive venues of professional development is to provide the time for grade level and multi-grade vertical articulation. Our yearly Academic and Financial plans support and fund pull-out opportunities for our teachers to have the time for in-the-building professional development. The opportunity for our award winning teachers to share best practices, review student assessment data, and visit each others classrooms is an excellent method of developing capacity within our faculty. To be certain, we participate in all available Complex, District, and State level professional development opportunities, but have found that these may not be timely, can be repetitive, or are often geared towards improving the performance of under achieving schools. For these reasons, we "tailor" our professional development sessions to match the needs of our teachers. In some instances, we have contracted curriculum providers to present to our teachers so that we can ask questions that are most pertinent to us. In each instance in which we have contracted a provider to present to our teachers, we also invite teachers from neighbor area schools that have a similar interest in the topic. Capacity or time for weekly professional development opportunities is built into our daily resource schedule. We have developed a system whereby resources such as Hawaiian Studies, Physical Education, Computer Lab, and Library Services are scheduled at the same time for each grade level. The result is that we can provide at least one 45 minute time block during each school day for grade level teachers to engage in professional development articulation, for planning purposes, and continuous review of student data. This schedule, known on campus as "back-to-back" provides daily time for professional development sessions by curriculum providers, members of the Complex Area Support Team, our Curriculum and Technology Coordinators, School Counselor, and administration.

7. School Leadership

The leadership philosophy of this school has a direct impact on our governance system. The administrator's leadership philosophy is based on the "Servant Leader" concept. Within this belief, the governance of our school can be compared to an inverse triangle in which the administrator is at the base, supporting upper triangle sections of faculty/staff, parents with our students at the very top. In fact, we have a visual of the inverse triangle concept in the principal's office to serve as a reminder to all that this is not a top down organization. The leader is here, at the bottom of the triangle to serve and support all levels of constituents. The "Servant Leader" doctrine is one in which each teacher has direct and equal input into ongoing school improvement efforts. Each teacher, and several of our classified employees are active members of one, or more, school committees (Safety, Language Arts, Mathematics, Technology, Comprehensive Student Support Committee,). Members of these committees, the ART and the GLC Committee are the driving force behind all school improvement efforts. Several years ago, we also developed a School Leadership Team which serves another advisory group to the administrator. The School Leadership Team has become our "think-tank" in which many school improvement efforts are first developed. All final decisions are deliberated upon and decided at the GLC level, which represents each of the seven K-6 grade levels, the Special Education Department, School Counselor, Curriculum Coordinator, Technology Coordinator,

SASA, and our SSC. Many of the GLC members also sit on one of the major committees, the ART, and or School Leadership Team. Parents become part of the school governance system via their involvement in the School Community Council (SCC), which is an advisory panel to the administrator, has final approval authority on our Academic Plan and submits a yearly rating on the administrator. A direct result of a governance system that reaches out to incorporates and listens to each teacher and parent is the development of a very strong sense of ownership in the success of this school. It is our belief that no one, two, or few persons are as effective as all of us working together in harmony to improve a school in which each person has a sense of shared ownership. We believe that the system of governance in place at this school is a major reason why our students have been meeting/exceeding No Child Left Behind AYPs each year for the past decade. At this school – each of us is a leader.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Hawaii State Assessment/Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: American Institutes for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	81	88	86	90	50
% Exceeds	28	31	42	63	22
Number of students tested	58	52	59	51	50
Percent of total students tested	98	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					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	65	83	67	100	33
% Exceeds	5	13	29	62	17
Number of students tested	20	24	21	13	12
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	90	95	96	92	53
% Exceeds	38	33	60	69	27
Number of students tested	21	21	25	13	15

7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	60	69	80	89	39
% Exceeds	10	15	20	44	4
Number of students tested	20	13	20	9	23
9. White Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	100	100	71	82	100
% Exceeds	50	56	29	82	67
Number of students tested	6	9	7	11	6
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	86	83	86	94	40
% Exceeds	29	33	57	50	40
Number of students tested	7	6	7	16	5
11. Other 1: Native Hawaiian + part Hawaiian					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	65	77	80	89	39
% Exceeds	10	15	20	44	4
Number of students tested	20	13	20	9	23
12. Other 2: Disadvantaged Students + Students receiving Special Education + English Language Learners					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	63	83	67	87	28
% Exceeds	4	13	25	53	11
Number of students tested	24	24	24	15	18
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The Hawaii DOE's testing window extends from October through May.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Hawaii State Assessment/Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: American Institutes for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	84	81	88	81	61
% Exceeds	29	24	41	42	38
Number of students tested	51	62	56	52	56
Percent of total students tested	100	100	98	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					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	80	58	88	72	50
% Exceeds	8	13	29	33	36
Number of students tested	25	24	17	18	14
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	95	96	90	93	70
% Exceeds	43	32	60	53	41
Number of students tested	21	25	20	15	27
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	77	65	90	70	37
% Exceeds	8	5	10	30	21
Number of students tested	13	20	10	27	19
9. White Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	100	75	87	100	83
% Exceeds	50	25	47	100	50
Number of students tested	6	8	15	4	6
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	80	75	75	80	75
% Exceeds	20	50	38	40	75
Number of students tested	5	8	8	5	4
11. Other 1: Native Hawaiian + part Hawaiian					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	79	67	90	70	37
% Exceeds	7	5	10	30	21
Number of students tested	14	21	10	27	19
12. Other 2: Disadvantaged Students + Students receiving Special Education + English Language Learners					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	74	56	79	64	43
% Exceeds	7	11	26	27	22
Number of students tested	27	27	19	22	23
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The Hawaii DOE's testing window extends from October through May.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Hawaii State Assessment/Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: American Institutes for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	86	86	82	64	46
% Exceeds	39	37	15	42	23
Number of students tested	59	59	55	59	48
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	98	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	2	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	68	78	89	59	38
% Exceeds	9	17	5	35	13
Number of students tested	22	18	19	17	16
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	96	90	87	78	56
% Exceeds	54	38	33	56	31
Number of students tested	24	21	15	27	16
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	79	83	76	45	29
% Exceeds	21	25	3	15	10
Number of students tested	19	12	29	20	21
9. White Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	86	87	100	63	50
% Exceeds	43	47	50	50	25
Number of students tested	7	15	4	8	4
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	75	78	75	75	80
% Exceeds	38	33	0	75	60
Number of students tested	8	9	4	4	5
11. Other 1: Native Hawaiian + part Hawaiian					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	79	91	78	45	32
% Exceeds	21	27	4	15	11
Number of students tested	19	11	27	20	19
12. Other 2: Disadvantaged Students + Students receiving Special Education + English Language Learners					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	65	70	71	48	29
% Exceeds	9	15	4	30	10
Number of students tested	23	20	24	23	21
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The Hawaii DOE's testing window extends from October through May.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Hawaii State Assessment/Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

All Students Tested/Grade: 6

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: American Institutes for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	91	90	76	67	47
% Exceeds	65	31	31	24	21
Number of students tested	54	52	58	45	57
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	98
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					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	88	90	60	60	33
% Exceeds	65	30	20	13	13
Number of students tested	17	20	20	15	15
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	89	100	93	81	67
% Exceeds	67	43	41	38	25
Number of students tested	18	14	29	16	24
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	80	82	44	47	15
% Exceeds	40	18	6	11	0
Number of students tested	10	28	18	19	13
9. White Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	93	100	86	33	50
% Exceeds	80	40	43	0	29
Number of students tested	15	5	7	3	14
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	100	100	100	100	40
% Exceeds	67	100	0	60	40
Number of students tested	9	2	1	5	5
11. Other 1: Native Hawaiian + part Hawaiian					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	80	81	47	50	15
% Exceeds	40	19	6	11	0
Number of students tested	10	27	17	18	13
12. Other 2: Disadvantaged Students + Students receiving Special Education + English Language Learners					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	79	83	65	50	33
% Exceeds	58	26	15	10	11
Number of students tested	19	23	26	20	18
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The Hawaii DOE's testing window extends from October through May.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Hawaii State Assessment/Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: American Institutes for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	76	79	88	92	72
% Exceeds	55	56	53	35	16
Number of students tested	58	52	59	51	50
Percent of total students tested	98	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					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	45	67	81	100	75
% Exceeds	20	42	33	31	17
Number of students tested	20	24	21	13	12
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	86	86	100	92	67
% Exceeds	62	57	68	46	20
Number of students tested	21	21	25	13	15
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	55	54	80	89	65
% Exceeds	30	31	35	22	4
Number of students tested	20	13	20	9	23
9. White Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	83	100	86	91	100
% Exceeds	67	89	43	27	50
Number of students tested	6	9	7	11	6
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	86	67	71	94	80
% Exceeds	71	33	57	38	20
Number of students tested	7	6	7	16	5
11. Other 1: Native Hawaiian + part Hawaiian					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	60	62	80	89	65
% Exceeds	35	38	35	22	4
Number of students tested	20	13	20	9	23
12. Other 2: Disadvantaged Students + Students receiving Special Education + English Language Learners					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	50	67	79	87	56
% Exceeds	25	42	29	27	17
Number of students tested	24	24	24	15	18
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The Hawaii DOE's testing window extends from October through May.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Hawaii State Assessment/Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: American Institutes for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	94	90	88	81	75
% Exceeds	63	68	73	23	25
Number of students tested	51	62	56	52	56
Percent of total students tested	100	100	98	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					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	92	75	82	83	71
% Exceeds	48	50	59	17	29
Number of students tested	25	24	17	18	14
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	95	96	90	73	85
% Exceeds	71	88	80	27	26
Number of students tested	21	25	20	15	27
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	92	90	80	81	63
% Exceeds	46	40	50	19	16
Number of students tested	13	20	10	27	19
9. White Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	100	88	93	100	67
% Exceeds	83	75	80	50	33
Number of students tested	6	8	15	4	6
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	80	75	75	80	75
% Exceeds	40	63	63	20	50
Number of students tested	5	8	8	5	4
11. Other 1: Native Hawaiian + part Hawaiian					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	93	90	80	81	63
% Exceeds	50	43	50	19	16
Number of students tested	14	21	10	27	19
12. Other 2: Disadvantaged Students + Students receiving Special Education + English Language Learners					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	93	78	74	77	48
% Exceeds	44	44	53	14	17
Number of students tested	27	27	19	22	23
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The Hawaii DOE's testing window extends from October through May.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Hawaii State Assessment/Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: American Institutes for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	83	88	85	73	71
% Exceeds	46	56	47	34	21
Number of students tested	59	59	55	59	48
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	98	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	2	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	64	83	89	65	63
% Exceeds	27	39	47	35	6
Number of students tested	22	18	19	17	16
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	96	90	93	78	88
% Exceeds	58	57	60	37	25
Number of students tested	24	21	15	27	16
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	68	92	79	65	57
% Exceeds	32	25	28	15	10
Number of students tested	19	12	29	20	21
9. White Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	86	80	100	63	50
% Exceeds	57	67	100	50	0
Number of students tested	7	15	4	8	4
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	75	89	100	100	80
% Exceeds	38	67	100	75	80
Number of students tested	8	9	4	4	5
11. Other 1: Native Hawaiian + part Hawaiian					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	68	100	81	65	63
% Exceeds	32	27	30	15	11
Number of students tested	19	11	27	20	19
12. Other 2: Disadvantaged Students + Students receiving Special Education + English Language Learners					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	61	75	79	52	48
% Exceeds	26	35	38	26	5
Number of students tested	23	20	24	23	21
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The Hawaii DOE's testing window extends from October through May.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Hawaii State Assessment/Hawaii State Alternate Assessment

All Students Tested/Grade: 6

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: American Institutes for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	94	90	84	73	72
% Exceeds	74	46	40	20	28
Number of students tested	54	52	58	45	57
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	98
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					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	88	90	70	60	47
% Exceeds	59	35	25	7	13
Number of students tested	17	20	20	15	15
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	94	100	93	88	88
% Exceeds	72	71	55	13	42
Number of students tested	18	14	29	16	24
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					

% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	80	82	67	53	38
% Exceeds	50	25	11	5	0
Number of students tested	10	28	18	19	13
9. White Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	100	100	86	67	86
% Exceeds	93	80	43	33	36
Number of students tested	15	5	7	3	14
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	100	100	100	100	60
% Exceeds	67	100	0	80	20
Number of students tested	9	2	1	5	5
11. Other 1: Native Hawaiian + part Hawaiian					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	80	85	71	50	38
% Exceeds	50	26	12	6	0
Number of students tested	10	27	17	18	13
12. Other 2: Disadvantaged Students + Students receiving Special Education + English Language Learners					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	84	83	69	55	44
% Exceeds	53	30	23	5	11
Number of students tested	19	23	26	20	18
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The Hawaii DOE's testing window extends from October through May.