

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 Mrs. Mindy McGinn

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Voyager Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1450 Byron Road

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Howell State MI Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 48843-1032

County Livingston County State School Code Number* 08624

Telephone 517-552-7500 Fax 517-552-7519

Web site/URL http://www.howellschools.com/Voyager.cfm E-mail mcginnm@howellschools.com

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*Mr. Ronald Wilson E-mail: wilsonr@howellschools.com
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Howell Public Schools Tel. 517-548-6234

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. Michael Witt
(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):
- 7 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 1 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 10 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city
 - Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - Suburban
 - Small city or town in a rural area
 - Rural
3. 6 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	17	5	22
K	40	38	78
1	41	26	67
2	46	38	84
3	44	41	85
4	48	40	88
5	43	45	88
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	279	233	512

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 2 % Asian
 - 0 % Black or African American
 - 2 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 96 % White
 - 0 % 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: 4%

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 <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	8
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	10
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	18
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	512
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.035
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	4

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 0 %
0 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 0
 Specify non-English languages:
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 30 %
 Total number students who qualify: 156

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: 10 %
49 Total number of students served

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

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>10</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>8</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>11</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>19</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</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>1</u> Developmentally Delayed |

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

	Number of Staff
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	19
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	8
Paraprofessionals	5
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	2

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 27:1

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	96%	96%	97%	98%	97%
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

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award. 2005

PART III – SUMMARY

The staff members at Voyager Elementary are driven by the ideas in our school's mission and vision statements.

Mission Statement: Voyager Elementary School, in partnership with families and the community, seeks to inspire all children to achieve academically, to be their personal B.E.S.T. and to become enthusiastic life-long learners. (B - Be Bucket Fillers; E - Give our Best Effort; S - Be Safe; T - Take Responsibility)

Vision Statement: Voyager will be an exemplary school fostering higher-level thinking and respect for individuality, thus preparing successful citizens for the 21st century.

We believe:

- All students can learn and be successful.
- All students have something to contribute.
- Relationships foster learning.
- In holding high expectations.
- In educating the whole child.
- ..In collaboration.
- In joyful learning.

Teachers and students live this mission each day at Voyager by setting goals, tracking student progress, and then celebrating successes together. Teachers set high expectations for all learners and differentiating instruction so that each child rises to meet those high expectations. Teachers work collaboratively to learn and perfect research-based practices so that instruction is strong and engaging. The collaborative spirit of the staff extends out to the families of the students as staff members seeks to develop relationships that foster teamwork, because with teamwork, each child can truly be reached. There is a family feeling when folks walk through the doors, whether attending an academic event like parent conferences, a grade-level program, or even a family social event, like Family Game Night. The school community is indeed a family of learners.

Voyager Elementary School sits in the heart of Livingston County in southeastern Michigan. Howell is the county seat and is nestled between Detroit and Lansing. Most families who live here commute outside of Howell to work. It is a suburban community with a rural atmosphere; a big town with a small-town feel which seeks to inspire community pride. Howell sits on the National Registry of Historic Places and was established as a village in 1863. Community events, like our popular Michigan Challenge Balloon Festival, bring our community together. Howell Public Schools is the largest school district in Livingston County. The district has seven elementary schools, two middle schools and a high school that has about 700 students in each graduating class. Voyager Elementary School has 512 students of which 30% receive free or reduced lunch. Voyager Elementary School is a school of choice. Voyager, in addition to other district schools, offers unlimited access to students who prefer to attend in this district.

The staff members at Voyager are determined to meet each individual student at his/her level and guide them to excel to the next level. The staff believes it takes a village to make a difference in the life of a child. The teaching staff is dedicated to working collaboratively in teacher-to-teacher teams to plan and strategize. Peer mentoring groups and buddy classes help to bring learning to the mastery level, both academically and socially. The Instructional Consultation Team meets regularly and is actively involved in the school, working side by side with classroom teachers, collecting data on struggling students, developing strategies to meet each child's needs, and then monitoring student progress. The Data Team works to collect and organize data from classrooms in all subject areas so that data can be analyzed and used to impact daily instruction. This data is also used to develop building-wide goals each year. The support staff at Voyager is a dedicated and powerful team of people. The At-Risk staff devote hours into analyzing data to find learners in need. They work closely with classroom teachers, develop individualized and evidence-based small group lessons, and track student success. The ancillary staff members, including our special education teachers, speech therapist, occupational therapist, social worker, physical therapist and counselor, work to

meet student needs in general education and special education classroom settings. They help accommodate and differentiate instruction for individual students. They also collaborate with classroom teachers to develop intervention plans and provide small-group instruction that focuses on what each learner needs to make progress within the general education classroom. Their support and hard work is evident in the students' achievements.

In accordance with the belief statement, Voyager Elementary School nurtures the whole child. Voyager offers multiple opportunities to help students succeed socially, behaviorally, artistically, physically, and technologically. Students participate daily in one of the following unique classes: Art, Music, Physical Education, and Technology. Voyager offers weekly enrichment class in a real-life setting, through Music and Motion, two-hour Clay Workshops, Art Appreciation, or Student Experiences in Technology. Students are given opportunities to foster their leadership abilities through Safety Patrol, musical performances, Field Day, student council, student-led morning announcements, and community support events.

Voyager Elementary School is an exemplary school that is driven to reach each child!

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Voyager Elementary School is an At-Risk school with 512 students. The school uses Michigan's Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) as a means for assessing student academic performance and growth in third through fifth grades. Our School Improvement Goal states all learners will gain a full year's academic growth in reading and mathematics. Students take the MEAP in October, and their achievement scores are reported in January or February of the following year. Students are considered at or above benchmark if they received a score of 1 or 2 on the MEAP. State proficiency benchmarks are as follows:

Score of 1 = Advanced

Score of 2 = Proficient

Score of 3 = Partially Proficient

Score of 4 = Not Proficient

Data analysis plays an integral part of the ongoing success of Voyager Elementary School students. Upon looking at the results over a five-year period, steady, positive trends have been achieved. Eighty to 90% of students are at or above benchmark on state reading assessments. In 2009, 79% of our third graders scored proficient to advanced on the MEAP. In 2010, that score increased to 86% of students who were proficient to advanced. In 2011, 87% of the cohort met the benchmark on the MEAP. Two subgroups are present in the building: students who receive free or reduced lunch and students who receive special education support. These two subgroups had MEAP scores that were proficient to advanced in the reading section of the MEAP. When we isolated the subgroups from the general population, there was a mirrored positive trend.

During that time period, growth was attributed to changes implemented in the building. In the 2011-2012 school year, an instructional coach was added to the building. The instructional coach supports teaching practice and achievement by working closely with classroom teachers. In collaboration with our instructional coach, teachers analyze the educational trends of students. The identified trends helped teachers differentiate instruction in order to meet individual student needs. Students began owning and graphically representing their achievement growth. We also established an enrichment period during the school day where the students were given targeted intervention and enrichment opportunities based upon their achievement.

In addition to the instructional coach, the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) has had an effect on student achievement. The PTO funded web-based practice and progress monitoring tools for all students, and a leveled-book library for upper-elementary students. The library had a direct effect on student achievement, as it placed books into the hands of students at their individual reading levels. Students monitored their reading comprehension by taking online assessments upon completion of reading. Students charted their growth based on these tools.

However, the data showed an achievement gap between the percentage of all learners and the percentage of learners in the subgroups that pass the MEAP. Students who receive free and reduced lunch represent about 30% of our total population. In the data period of 2009-2011, students within the subgroups showed an increased trend of achievement from 64% in third grade, 71% in fourth grade and 69% as fifth graders. Our subgroup of students who receive special education services represented 10% of our population. Thirty-two percent of students were proficient or advanced in 2009, 43% in 2010, and 60% in 2011.

In mathematics, following the same population of students and years tested, there has been between a 7-10% increase in the proficiency of students. In 2009, 70% of learners were proficient or advanced. In 2010, that score jumped to 79% of students who scored proficient or advanced. In 2011, 77% of the cohort scored proficient or advanced. Students who received free or reduced lunch scored 64% proficient or advanced as third graders. As fourth graders, 71% of students scored proficient or advanced. These students scored 69% proficient or advanced as fifth graders. Students who received special education support scored respectively 37%, 43%, and 60% proficient or advanced. The growth was attributed to the intentional instruction used to

teach the mathematics curriculum. The district created common assessments to ensure concepts were taught and mastered. During enrichment time an emphasis was placed on math games that reinforced the curriculum.

Differentiated instructional practice will address the discrepancy between all students and the subgroups.

2. Using Assessment Results:

At Voyager Elementary School, a wide range of assessment data is used to analyze our students' reading performance and yearly growth. The goal is to use data to show growth and areas of need in order to reach all students.

One systematic process has proven to be very successful. Following formal assessments, teachers meet in grade-level teams to use data to divide their class into thirds reflecting the Response to Intervention model and cut scores. Data from Kindergarten through second grades is analyzed using a composite score comprised of data from DIBELS, the Michigan Literacy Progress Profile, and the Developmental Reading Assessment. Data from third through fifth grades is analyzed using a composite score comprised of data from the Michigan Educational Assessment Program and the Scholastic Reading Inventory. These thirds are then color-coded based on a student's achievement and intervention needs. Each student is visually represented with a magnet according to where he or she is achieving. The magnet includes past and present data for each student. The magnets are then placed on a data wall as an illustration of where students land according to achievement. Within grade-level teams, teachers are then able to use the data to collaborate and prepare for future instruction.

The stakeholders involved in these meetings include the principal, instructional coach, teacher consultant, special education staff, ancillary staff and classroom teachers. Discussions at these meetings focus on how individual students are achieving, what intentional instruction is needed to move each student forward to achieve at least one year's growth, and closing the instructional gap.

Voyager Elementary School also uses the Data Director Assessment management system to compile data into specified reports. These reports include data from progress monitoring, district benchmarks, curriculum assessments, and universal screening. These various reports are then used formatively and summatively to assist with student placement, adjust instructional delivery, guide instruction, and create targeted intervention.

Based on data, targeted instruction includes push-in and pull-out At-Risk reading support which is offered for 45 minutes daily, four days a week. This is in addition to general education instruction. Other students may then be referred to the instructional consultation team for targeted intervention. Higher-achieving students are involved with enrichment opportunities with their classroom teacher.

The meaning and purpose of assessment is communicated to parents and stakeholders through a variety of ways. A valuable component is that students monitor their progress themselves in order to own their data and goals. Teachers collaborate and share this data through our data wall, grade-level meetings, and faculty meetings. Parents are involved through a web-based grade book, report cards, and parent-teacher conferences. The community is involved through District Administration meetings and School Curriculum nights that address schools' current standings. Assessment data is also available on an extensive district and school website. Involving all stakeholders is a way to ensure we are working together to show growth and to allow all students to be successful.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

To best meet the needs of all learners, Voyager Elementary School houses many well-trained staff and teaching specialists. The visible collaboration shared among teachers permeates the culture of the school. Staff members take an active role in sharing ideas and instructional strategies during faculty meetings, grade-level meetings, district professional development, and at the county level through the Livingston

Educational Service Agency (LESA) and the Washtenaw Intermediate School District (WISD).

For instance, on professional development days, colleagues gather by grade levels as a district to unpack the Common Core, develop lessons based on priority standards, and create common assessments. Colleagues within our building have taken on leadership roles by participating with Assessment Literacy through LESA and WISD. This group of educators is learning to deconstruct the Common Core State Standards and create formative and summative assessments. The products created from this collaboration are shared with colleagues throughout the district and other educators within the region.

In addition to collaborative work with building educators, the instructional coach partners closely with the district and county. At the district level, the instructional coach takes a leadership role through school improvement, intervention teams, and achievement trends. The coach facilitates meetings to insure quality practices are implemented district-wide. Quality practices include phonics instruction, guided reading support, comprehension strategies, and mathematics support. At the county level, the coach is a member of the Study of Early Literacy. This group of educators from neighboring districts and counties come together to collaborate on the newest best-practice research and design of Early Literacy. From this research, our school piloted a reading and writing instructional integration professional development program.

At the administrative level, the principal also reaches outside the building to district and county colleagues. The principal is involved in sharing lessons learned at district and county principals' meetings, the district school improvement committee, the district curriculum council, and at teacher evaluation meetings. The principal is a part of the LESA-WISD Science Workgroup Steering Committee. As a member of this committee, the principal plans and facilitates the professional development network endeavors for the two counties. The workgroup is studying A Framework for K-12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas (2012), which leads to the implementation of the Next Generation Science Standards.

The staff as a whole believes that all learners, including teachers and administrators, learn best through collaboration and the sharing of ideas.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Voyager Elementary School's Mission Statement is lived out daily within the walls of Voyager by its community of learners. It is best practice to help students create connections to the world around them. By creatively involving local businesses, the various faculties throughout the district, and parents, staff members are truly instilling positive and purposeful learning.

The relationships held with the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and the parents who sit on the Voyager School Improvement Team are some of the school's greatest assets. In addition to providing an opportunity for parents to have an active role in our school and their children's learning, the PTO enables our school and families to come together as a cohesive unit. The parents in these two groups support student achievement during the school day and organize social events at night, fostering family and school relationships. The parents are active in organizing volunteers to be a part of working in classrooms and workrooms. PTO purchased books for a leveled library for upper grades. This has become the core of enrichment for third through fifth grade students. These parents have also allocated funds yearly to support the reading libraries. It is a true representation of the partnership happening between families and school.

It has been beneficial to be involved with the community through business partnerships. We currently have a partnership with the LOC Federal Credit Union where students have the opportunity to work at a functioning credit union based within our school walls. Outside of the school, many Voyager classrooms create real-life persuasive or narrative pieces of writing that are distributed at some of the local businesses. For example, students have prepared public service announcements as a product from a unit of study and made them available to visitors at a local grocery store and doctor's office. Great value has been found in helping create real-life connections for the students. It helps the students look beyond themselves and helps

to support areas of need within our community. Students have been givers through the Heifer Project, Gleaners Food Bank, and the Red Cross.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are the driving force behind Voyager Elementary School's core curriculum in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Michigan curriculum is followed for Science, Social Studies, Visual and Performing Arts, Physical Education and Technology. Teachers approach the curriculum with rigor and persistence while providing differentiated instruction to meet the academic needs of students.

The English Language Arts curriculum at Voyager encompasses reading, writing, speaking and listening. Foundations focus on reading widely and deeply among genres using high-quality text in narrative and informational forms. Within the Common Core, there is an emphasis on metacognition, comprehension, reading attitude, word recognition, word study, fluency, phonemic awareness, text type, text structure, and author's purpose. In writing, students are taught skills needed to create, revise, edit, and publish a piece. In addition, students are taught how to compose specific opinion, informative, explanatory, and narrative types of writing.

In the area of Mathematics, Voyager has begun the transition of switching from Michigan's Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs) to CCSS. Teachers seek to develop in their students the eight levels of mathematical practices found within the mathematical strands of the CCSS:

- Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them.
- Reason abstractly and quantitatively.
- Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.
- Model with mathematics.
- Use appropriate tools strategically.
- Attend to precision.
- Look for and make use of structure.
- Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning.

In Science, Voyager follows the GLCEs. Our curriculum is taught through inquiry and exploration. The science curriculum is rich in content and supported through investigation. The curriculum addresses areas of Physical Science, Earth Science, and Life Science. Each grade level has three to four science kits that are used to support instruction. Science topics are supported by an increased effort to supply high-interest, content-specific informational texts. Teachers are in the process of obtaining guided reading texts that support the reading and learning process within this core area.

In Social Studies, teachers follow the Michigan GLCEs. Students are taught a curriculum that starts with how families live and work together and then builds outward (families to school to community to region to world). Students explore the relationships in students' lives with their families, friends, teachers, and neighbors, and then move on to how people live uniquely in different places around the world. Students learn the essentials of geography, economics, and citizenship in the context of learning about their local community. The subject is based on the instructional practice that allows students of all abilities to truly experience history through a considerate expository text structure.

In Visual Arts, our specialist follows the Michigan Visual Arts Grade Level Standards. In this program, the student population as a whole receives 25 class hours of Visual Arts weekly. Students receive one weekly art making class with an extended opportunity on Fridays for Clay Workshop or Visual Thinking activities.

Voyager's performing arts program follows the Michigan Performing Arts Standards. In the music portion of the curriculum, there is a strong emphasis on reading, on writing, and on performing music. All students participate in grade-level musical performances each year. They are active participants, whether by singing solos, providing dialogue, dancing, assisting with props, or helping with scenery. Voyager offers an extension opportunity for fifth graders called the Voices of Voyager.

In Physical Education, the Michigan Physical Education Standards curriculum is taught and supported. The early elementary grades focus on fundamental motor skills. These lessons include skipping, throwing, galloping, and tossing; the building blocks of motion are taught in isolation. In upper elementary, skill development is embedded in a modified game environment.

In Technology, the Michigan Education Technology Standards are used to create learning goals while also supporting core subject instruction. In this curriculum, the learning goals drive the instruction to raise the level of engagement. Students learn technological skills by solving a problem or completing a task that asks them to use computer programs and Internet websites. To tie into the technology factors presented in the CCSS, Voyager is bring technology tools into the classroom to increase students engagement, support curriculum, monitor students' progress and build technologically literate students.

2. Reading/English:

Reading instruction is a high priority and crosses all curricular areas. Students receive 90-120 minutes of uninterrupted ELA instruction daily. Instruction is prepared based on efforts to align the district's Essential Skills to the Common Core State Standards. It is flexible in that each teacher tailors instruction to meet the needs of individual learners.

Teachers incorporate best practices that are research-based and of high quality. Beginning in lower elementary, students learn the foundations of reading, including concepts of print, phonemic awareness, decoding skills, and comprehension. In upper elementary, the foundations are built upon and learners are encouraged to develop a dialogue of their metacognition and higher-level thinking.

Based on assessments and observations, students are grouped according to their needs. Small, flexible guided-reading groups meet with the classroom teacher daily where reading strategies are practiced and new skills are taught. Students are challenged with reading practice tasks aligned with their skills and interests. Students are often paired with a younger peer in order to increase student engagement and reinforce reading strategies. Students who need extra support meet with At-Risk assistants four days a week for 30-45 minutes of targeted instruction. If needed, these students also receive additional time with the instructional coach. Interventions are provided during enrichment time. This prevents students from being pulled out of the classroom during core curriculum instruction.

Three times per year, data from district reading assessments is compiled and analyzed. The grade-level teachers, principal, instructional coach, teacher consultant, ancillary staff and special education teachers meet to look at students in a visual display on a whiteboard. Discussion leads to next steps for all students, and teachers discuss ways to help students take ownership of their achievements by recording and articulating their own data. Students often set goals to reach and exceed benchmarks. Students in Kindergarten through second grades chart their Directed Reading Assessment level. Students in third through fifth grades chart their reading Lexile level to ensure that they are growing as learners and thinkers. They reflect on their scores through one-on-one conferencing with their teachers, and ideas are generated on how they can continue to grow.

The School Improvement Plan has placed an emphasis on reading instruction. As a result, teachers observed other instructors and participated in book studies, one by Lori Ozkus and the other by Dr. Robert Marzano. As a result, teachers collaborated and shared practices used in their classrooms.

3. Mathematics:

In the area of Mathematics, Voyager Elementary School has begun the transition of switching from the Michigan Grade-Level Content Expectations to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Mathematics instruction is taught for a minimum of 60 minutes every day. This 60-minute block is one of two "sacred time" sessions where students have intentional, uninterrupted contact with the curriculum. Voyager teachers seek to develop in their students the eight levels of mathematical practices:

- Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them
- Reason abstractly and quantitatively.
- Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.
- Model with mathematics.
- Use appropriate tools strategically.
- Attend to precision.
- Look for and make use of structure.
- Look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning.

Each grade addresses critical areas within the Common Core State Standards using the mathematical strands:

- Counting and Cardinality
- Operations and Algebraic Thinking
- Number and Operations in Base-ten
- Number and operations—Fractions
- Measurement and Data
- Geometry

Teachers use the CCSS when creating lessons and differentiate lessons based upon prior mastery of learning objectives. Students are given and can articulate learning goals before and after instruction. Students own, chart, and can articulate their mathematical achievement. Students often chart their Scholastic Mathematics Inventory mathematical levels to ensure they are learning and growing as thinkers of mathematics.

Teachers use student data to determine if students need additional learning opportunities in reading and mathematics. If so, students may receive additional support by the At-Risk assistants or Special Education support team. Learners who demonstrate mastery of a learning objective are given enrichment opportunities to stretch their thinking and application of such knowledge.

During the core-curriculum mathematics time and during our enrichment time, instruction is delivered in order to help students access higher-level thinking skills, and students are given the ability to articulate thinking while solving real-life mathematical problems. Concepts are reinforced through mathematical games and the use of manipulatives.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

The Music and Visual Arts programs are past winners of the Michigan Association of School Board's Excellence in Education program. Because of this, the team chose the performing arts as Voyager's unique instructional curriculum.

The art program is grounded in a studio-centered approach in order to facilitate decoding and the understanding of visual imagery. Instruction begins with Kindergarten procedures that ask early learners to visually interpret picture books as the catalyst for the day's art-making lesson. Visual Thinking lessons build in intensity as students move from one grade to the next. Voyager students connect to the Common Core as they learn to deconstruct imagery through speaking and listening. Visual Thinking and Thinking Portfolios require students to support their views and inferences with evidence found in art work. Visual Thinking has an impact on students' ability to think critically and support arguments with evidence. This is a life-long skill students need to be successful across the Common Core curriculum. Learning this Visual Thinking process is a stepping stone to future learning.

The heart of the program is creating art. Students explore media, making application of these experiments, which allow them to create new knowledge from their unique perspectives. The program spirals across

grades using the Michigan's Visual and Performing Arts Standards. Rubrics and scales guide the students through deeper understanding of expectations, as well as self-reflection of performance.

In addition to the visual arts portion of the curriculum, Voyager students experience unique music and performing arts opportunities. This curriculum places a strong emphasis on reading, writing, and performing. Games and manipulatives are often used to deepen knowledge, providing intrinsic learning with practical application.

Students participate in grade-level musical performances each year. Every student participates in singing solos, providing dialogue, dancing, assisting with props, or helping with scenery during the music programs. Recorders are beginning instruments used to enhance students' music reading and performance skills as they learn to read notation and write music. A system of receiving colored ribbons as they progress provides students with ownership and a sense of pride in individual accomplishments.

The Voices of Voyager choir offers fifth graders extended opportunity enrichment with 98% participation. The Voices of Voyager perform at a variety of events within the Howell community and throughout the state including professional sporting venues and Howell School's recognition ceremonies. The choir annually honors local military men and women at the spring concert.

5. Instructional Methods:

Teachers prepare for instruction by deconstructing the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to determine what students need to know. Once teachers have an understanding of the curriculum, they use a variety of assessments to determine each student's prior knowledge. Teachers may choose from pre-tests, informal assessments, and district assessments. Should a student prove to have mastered the benchmarks assessed, enrichment opportunities are provided to stretch the student's thinking. Using an understanding of the student's prior learning, learning goals are set. Teachers use the deliberate practice of turning learning goals into "I can..." statements to focus the student's attention to the expected outcomes. Students are aware of their learning goal at the beginning of the lesson and revisit it at the end. Students reflect and rate their level of understanding on a four-point scale.

To deliver instruction, teachers have access to district-purchased resources, high-quality web-based supplements, mathematics games, manipulatives, and ELA materials. For example, instruction may include the use of a mathematical interactive notebook where students are responsible for taking notes, defining unknown mathematics vocabulary, practicing skills with assignments and "flippables," studying for assessments, and keeping track of their individual data. Students are regularly asked to reflect and respond regarding their learning and their understanding of the instruction. This encourages meaningful discussion and helps to provide students with the cooperative skills that are necessary for real world experiences. As part of the lesson planning process, teachers purposefully consider the assessment to gain an understanding of the learning that has taken place. Teachers continually plan for informal and formal assessments.

A weekly class in the computer lab is taught by a technology instructor. The Michigan Education Technology Standards are used to create learning goals while also supporting core subject instruction. The learning goals drive the instruction to raise the level of engagement of students in a meaningful way. All lesson web links are organized on our technology website. Students can access the website from home as well as during class instructional time and enrichment time. One technology class application uses an online math competition with other district elementary schools. The number of correct answers for each school is averaged for a school score. A list of the top performers also motivates the students. CCSS math problems are differentiated by grade level and by individual student ability. The contest engages students to take more responsibility for their own learning.

6. Professional Development:

Voyager Elementary School believes that teachers need to continue to grow professionally in order to meet the needs of all students. Voyager teachers also believe that education is a blend of science and craft. The

science rests upon best-practice research delivered with deliberate, targeted, and flexible instruction.

The Howell Public School district provides five professional development days per year. In the last few years, the teachers have been enriching their craft by developing themselves professionally through the Marzano Institute. Establishing and communicating learning goals, creating essential questions, teaching vocabulary-building skills, tracking of student progress, and celebrating successes have been focuses of the district-provided professional development. Using brain research, teachers have learned how to help students effectively interact with new knowledge through discussions with individual students and discussions with small groups. To add to this learning, the staff received professional development to help create opportunities for students to generate and test hypotheses based on previous learning. Teachers learned how to teach children to think metacognitively about their learning by using learning scales and rubrics. These allow the students to assess their learning in relationship to the learning goals. Learning to help students think about their own metacognition during instruction was also addressed through a professional development based on Lori Oczkus' book, *Interactive Think Alouds*. Through this study, teachers learned skills and instructional practice to model the following reading strategies: predicting, making connections, drawing inferences, questioning, clarifying, summarizing, synthesizing, and evaluating their thinking.

For additional professional development, Voyager teachers meet weekly in grade-level teams where different areas of focus are discussed. Teachers collaborate on lessons, share successes and struggles, and develop interventions for students as needed. Ideas on enriching, challenging, and re-teaching students are shared. Together, teachers analyze results of state and district assessments. The data is used to drive future instruction. Teachers discuss grade-level goals and school improvement goals for the year. Strategies are created to help meet the goals. School leadership joins the grade-level meetings bi-weekly. Professional learning communities collaborate outside the classroom by brainstorming ways to address challenges within the classroom and facilitating student growth. The staff embraces the belief that when teachers grow collectively as a unit, they also grow as individuals.

7. School Leadership

Voyager Elementary School values relationships above all. The principal in the building works together with all stakeholders to foster a love for learning. The philosophy of the school is that leadership does not lie in the hands of the principal alone, but resides throughout the school. This is supported by the principal, and it is embedded within the philosophy of the district's superintendent. Teachers are given autonomy to practice their craft while being student-centered, curriculum-focused and data-driven. The building leader manages staff with a macro mentality. This shared-leadership approach to learning provides opportunity for all stakeholders to invest in the students' learning at Voyager Elementary School.

The principal has been successful in distributing leadership throughout the building. The teacher consultant supports teaching practices and students who receive special education. The teacher consultant facilitates the Instructional Consultation Team and the Response-to-Intervention team, and provides resources for teachers to increase instructional practice and meet the needs of all learners. In addition, Voyager has an instructional coach who assists the teachers and staff in monitoring student achievement. The instructional coach has been given the responsibility of facilitating enrichment opportunities using differentiated instruction for those learners who are below benchmark in reading and mathematics. This approach to learning cements the educational family. The leadership team believes in shared responsibility among stakeholders. One example of this can be found in the Voyager School Improvement Team. This committee is comprised of parents, teachers, and support staff. The School Improvement Team identifies academic trends, uses multiple data sources, and creates school improvement goals to meet the needs of all learners.

The leadership in the school creates an environment of collaboration and achievement. One such avenue of achievement comes into play through the building's visual data wall. Student achievement is plotted in thirds and the data team members meet to discuss academic achievement of all learners. This process allows teachers to look at learners and assess their practice to ensure a full year's growth. It empowers them to make sound instructional decisions for their students. Taking a whole-learner approach for every child gives

credence to the belief that at Voyager Elementary School all learners achieve. The leadership team allows and encourages grade-level freedom to create instructional decisions, analyze student growth and celebrate successes.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education and Measurement Incorporated

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	47	66	49	70	67
% Advanced	1	5	4	15	23
Number of students tested	87	76	79	103	89
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	39	69	30	64	74
% Advanced	0	4	0	14	30
Number of students tested	28	26	23	28	23
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	38	25	30	37	44
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	11
Number of students tested	8	8	10	19	9
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

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

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education and Measurement Incorporated

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	68	79	57	69
% Advanced	24	17	17	10	12
Number of students tested	79	78	110	88	83
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	1	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	1	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	67	71	58	50
% Advanced	28	10	17	8	9
Number of students tested	18	21	24	26	20
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	17	55	43	14	57
% Advanced	0	9	5	0	14
Number of students tested	6	11	21	7	7
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

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

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education and Measurement Incorporated

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	77	66	55	69
% Advanced	5	13	9	7	11
Number of students tested	85	110	86	82	90
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	1	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	52	69	65	44	73
% Advanced	10	16	10	4	20
Number of students tested	21	32	20	25	15
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	60	14	13	25
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students tested	11	20	7	8	16
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

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

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education and Measurement Incorporated

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	87	71	79	80
% Advanced	13	26	8	19	23
Number of students tested	87	76	79	103	89
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	85	70	64	83
% Advanced	11	31	4	14	26
Number of students tested	28	26	23	28	23
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	39	50	32	78
% Advanced	13	13	0	11	11
Number of students tested	8	8	10	19	9
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

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

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education and Measurement Incorporated

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	83	86	83	80
% Advanced	7	10	20	11	10
Number of students tested	81	78	110	88	83
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	1	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	1	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	81	71	81	45
% Advanced	5	10	8	15	9
Number of students tested	20	21	24	26	20
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	57	36	43	57	57
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	7	11	21	7	7
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

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

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education and Measurement Incorporated

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	87	83	77	82
% Advanced	20	15	19	18	22
Number of students tested	85	110	86	82	90
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	1	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	69	75	64	80
% Advanced	10	9	0	16	27
Number of students tested	21	32	20	25	15
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	36	60	43	63	50
% Advanced	9	0	14	13	6
Number of students tested	11	20	7	8	15
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

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

NOTES: