

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

[X] Public or [] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Mr. Jonathan Clark

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

Official School Name Garfield Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1120 10th Ave NE

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

City Brainerd State MN Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 56401-2352

County Crow Wing County State School Code Number* 008

Telephone 218-454-6450 Fax 218-454-6451

Web site/URL http://garfield.isd181.org E-mail jonathan.clark@isd181.org

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. Stephen Razidlo E-mail: steve.razidlo@isd181.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Brainerd Public School District Tel. 218-454-6900

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

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mrs. Ruth Nelson
(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):
- 6 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 1 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 1 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 8 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. 4 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 45 | 31 | 76 |
| 1 | 40 | 41 | 81 |
| 2 | 38 | 34 | 72 |
| 3 | 41 | 36 | 77 |
| 4 | 49 | 30 | 79 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 213 | 172 | 385 |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 2 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 0 % Asian
 - 2 % Black or African American
 - 2 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 94 % 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: 8%

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 | 16 |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year | 13 |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 29 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 385 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.075 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 8 |

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: 56 %
 Total number students who qualify: 214

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: 20 %
79 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.

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 17 Autism | 3 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 0 Deafness | 7 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 10 Specific Learning Disability |
| 8 Emotional Disturbance | 22 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 Hearing Impairment | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 1 Mental Retardation | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 1 Multiple Disabilities | 10 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 | 15 |
| Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc. | 13 |
| Paraprofessionals | 22 |
| Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc. | 0 |

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 | 96% | 98% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| High school graduation rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

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

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

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

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

Yes No X

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

PART III – SUMMARY

Garfield Elementary School is located on the northeast side of Brainerd, Minnesota and services 388 students in kindergarten through fourth grade. Garfield is considered a mid-size, 3 section school. However, our students are drawn from the largest geographical boundary of the 6 district elementary buildings totaling 161 square miles. Garfield has a history of servicing a large special education population as it has been a district host site for students with Developmental Cognitive Delays (DCD). Over the past two years Garfield has added two more district-wide Federal Setting III special education programs, an Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (EBD) and Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) program. In 2013, Garfield serviced a population consisting of 17% special education. The northeast side of Brainerd is also deeply rooted in tradition. A once very vital and proud railroad and paper industry town that has fallen on hard economic times. In April, 2013 the Wausau Paper Mill closed its doors, adding to a high unemployment rate. Last year, Garfield had 55.6% of the students coming from homes of economically challenged families, with 214 students qualifying for Free or Reduced meals.

The student sub-groups of special education and economically challenged families have made tremendous gains over the past three years. In 2010, Garfield was classified as a Needs Improvement School in the sub-group of special education reading. Since then, Garfield has been recognized as a “School of Celebration” in 2012 performing in the top 25% of Title I schools, and improved upon this recognition by earning “Rewards School” status in 2013. Garfield made significant gains on the Multiple Measurement Rating (MMR) in gap closure of free and reduced lunch and special education subgroups. The programs and initiatives that helped Garfield Elementary School achieve “Celebration” and “Reward” status are not fancy, new or secret. They are comprised of hard work, team building, fidelity of instruction and data-driven decision making. The first area Garfield Elementary addressed was to rebuild a sense of a school-wide team to support the growth of all students. Garfield had a natural fit for this to occur as a new principal and teachers were hired. This was accomplished by eliminating the walls of separation between grade levels and programs, and replacing them with new healthy relationships and partnerships. Through framed dialogue and communication during staff meetings the teachers began to see the part everyone plays in the education of the whole child and our accountability to the process. Staff members started openly sharing struggles and concerns with curriculum, lack of interventions and misuses of assessment data. Teachers began to identify problem solving solutions. One of the greatest gains for Garfield was the creation of new dialogue between teachers. The renewed energy also involved our educational assistants and secretaries. Assistants began to feel part of the process and brought new ideas and programming strategies. Our media secretary started a new celebration and recognition to reading by monitoring the Accelerated Reader Wall of Fame. The “Wall of Fame” has motivated our students to leading the Brainerd School District with the number of books read for the past three years.

We have looked at our schedule and calculated actual minutes of instruction. This information was used in further discussions to determine if students were meeting grade level standards, and being prepared for the standards to come the following year. The fidelity of instructing the adopted curriculum became part of the discussion. Conscious effort was made to bring more uniformity to our grades K-2 and 3-4 curriculum as well as building bridges between the two.

The Brainerd School District adopted the tagline “Opportunity, Innovation and Success”, along with a vision that we will ensure all students achieve their individual potential by providing the highest-quality programs and resources to prepare learners. Garfield Elementary School and its diverse programs exemplifies this statement. Garfield is a family-centered staff that participates in professional learning communities, data-driven grade level meetings, Response to Intervention (RtI) collaborative team meetings to plan for instruction and interventions. In addition to providing our students access to highly qualified and well trained staff during the school day, this same staff makes itself available during after school and summer school programs focusing on areas of literacy and math skills.

Garfield Elementary School is proud of its diverse population and the success it has had in closing the achievement gap. We hold high expectations for all of our students and we encourage them to achieve to their fullest potential each and every day. We believe our school is a family and the nomination of Garfield as a Blue Ribbon Award School is a great honor. If we would be selected as a Blue Ribbon School, it would solidify the hard work and dedication put forth by the staff, students and families of Garfield.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCAs) are criterion-referenced tests that annually assess a student's and school's progress in the areas of reading and mathematics. Every spring all third and fourth grade students are given this test. These assessments help schools and districts measure student progress toward our state's academic standards. Student results are reported as measures of proficiency with students scoring in: exceeds standards, meets standards, partially meets standards, or does not meet standards. In 2012-2013, Garfield's MCA scores reflect a drop as a result of the state adoption of a new MCA reading assessment with new rigorous standards. Even though Garfield recorded a drop in percent proficient, we remained higher than the state average and closed the gap between grade level scores and the sub groups of special education and Free and Reduced lunch. This change can also be seen in the area of mathematics between the years of 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. During the change of these assessments the format in which the students were administered the assessments also changed. The assessment format went from a paper/pencil assessment to a computerized version. This change in testing protocol may also reflect a decrease in scores. Having identified the need for a predictive indicator of success on the MCA assessment the district originally chose the NWEA Measures of Academic Success (MAP) which is a nationally normed reference assessment. This assessment provided us good predictability feedback for student proficiency as well as being adaptive allowing for information at each student's instructional level. As we became better at disaggregating data we started looking for a more efficient tool that also allowed for progress monitoring and increased classroom instructional time. In 2012, we adopted the STAR Enterprise assessment for reading and math.

b) Demonstration of significant gains in student proficiency can be attributed to increased understanding of data analysis and improvement of student identification for interventions. In addition to data analysis and intervention processes, consistent assessment practices are being utilized.

Professional Learning Communities enable teachers to work collaboratively to better understand student information and strategies. These meetings happen across the district and include test taking strategies, implementation of interventions, and increased teacher understanding of testing processes and specifications. We are becoming more proficient at early identification of student needs using An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement and Benchmark Assessment System in K-2. We also offer all day every day Kindergarten to all students.

Staff have increased understanding of state standards and have aligned our curriculum processes, including our recent work on standards-based report cards and common assessments. Furthermore, the use of district-level pacing guides and mapping of curriculum have been critical for our success. For the past nine years, the Literacy Collaborative and coaching model has provided teachers with a framework that guides instruction and provides resources at each student's individual level.

Students who are identified for additional interventions will receive classroom support during the regular school day and supplemental Targeted Services programming. After school and extended year opportunities are available for our most at-risk students. Several technology resources, including IXL, FASTTMath and Accelerated Reader also supplement these grade level interventions. Lastly, each elementary building is provided support through the Crow Wing County Family Collaborative Service Worker program. These advocates assist students and families with resource needs by providing social, emotional and behavioral skills training.

Achievement losses may in part be attributed to community based factors such as unemployment rates that are higher than the state average. This has resulted in greater regional mobility rates of families, particularly those with with young children. Since Brainerd is the County Seat where various social services are more readily available, there is an influx of families qualifying for free and reduced lunch and/or special education services. Furthermore, there is an increase in limited parental support due to families having to work more than one job. In addition to community factors, achievement losses may be attributed to the school system,

such as the failed levy in 2007, which resulted in the closing of two elementary schools and a complete restructure and reassignment of students and staff. In some cases, this resulted in decreased instructional time due to building logistics and budget constraints.

Garfield is using the information obtained from the NWEA and STAR Enterprise assessment to help continue to reduce the gap between the sub groups. Special education teachers and Title I intervention teachers review the assessment results with grade level teachers to best determine the level of services, curriculum and interventions to meet the student needs. The combined team planning and assessment review has also developed a better understanding of the core standards expected at each grade level. The grade level expectations are routinely discussed during data retreats. These discussions revolve around how to meet the expectations for all learners not how to lower them.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Various assessments are used in a cyclical fashion to examine our district programming, provide staff development, inform instructional practice and provide intervention. The following list includes specific assessments utilized:

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (K, 1, 2),
Benchmark Assessment System (K, 1, 2),
STAR Enterprise (grades 1, 2, 3, 4),
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (grades 3, 4),
LEAD21 Benchmarking (grades 3, 4), and
Standards Based Common Assessments (K, 1, 2, 3, 4).

District data meetings are conducted three times per year allowing a team of district level administration, building administrators and literacy coaches to analyze current data, discuss staff development needs and determine intervention needs of student learners. Building data meetings are then conducted to analyze current data, discuss needs of the learners through increasing quality of core instruction and the best approach to intervene. The system is monitored through an orchestrated systemic approach utilizing district grade level meetings, professional learning communities, literacy coaching and peer coaching.

For example, once a testing cycle is complete the district literacy director analyzes each elementary school's data in conjunction with their Fidelity of Implementation Tool, prior data meeting notes and goals. While analyzing fall 2012 data the team noticed a need to clarify the components of fluency across the district in both assessing and teaching practices. This finding was confirmed at each building data meeting. Throughout the remainder of the 2012-2013 school year, professional learning community time was devoted to reading and learning how to instruct and assess fluency. Consequently, teachers were more aware and often requested assistance during their coaching opportunities to brainstorm how to teach and intervene with students in need of more fluent behavior. By the spring of 2013 our district data revealed an increased understanding in how to instruct and assess behaviors associated with fluency.

Another district trend revealed in our mathematics data was the lack of proficiency in the numbers and operations standard. As teachers in each of the six elementary buildings were studying STAR data, they noticed a need to supplement the core curriculum and create interventions around numbers and operations. Supplementation was crucial to success of all learners.

The district has many systems in place to communicate with a variety of stakeholders. Teachers inform each parent/guardian of the results of our standards based common assessments, An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement, Benchmark Assessment System and LEAD21 benchmarking through report cards delivered four times per school year. Classroom teachers are required to conduct at least one formal conference and are encouraged to conference when necessary by formal or informal data arises. Central office administration announce the results of MCA's through the community newspaper and the district system accountability report. District administration is required to post the results of the data of An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement and Benchmark Assessment System by completing and

posting the Minnesota Department of Education's Read Well By Third Grade Report data on the Brainerd Public School's website.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Brainerd Public Schools support highly qualified staff through shared building and district initiatives. Probationary staff receive orientation, mentoring, and on-going training. Our entire staff are provided time to meet regularly as grade level teams. Data retreats are conducted to analyze assessment results and identify students for interventions. We have a three tiered RtI process where staff plan interventions at the classroom, grade and building levels. Professional learning communities meet monthly to review data, address successful instructional strategies and analyze curriculum effectiveness. K-4 Literacy Coaches are assigned to each site to guide and coach all teachers in data-driven instructional decisions. Educational assistants are required to have a minimum of a two-year post-secondary education or the district provides state certification (Para elink). Assistants are also provided district and site level training throughout the school year in conjunction with the Special Education Co-op, Title I, and building level leadership offerings.

District grade-level meetings are scheduled three times annually to support curriculum, instructional practices, and student achievement. District level data retreats occur throughout the year to analyze trend results and identify successful instructional strategies and ensure alignment to state adopted standards. As part of a Special Education consortium, K-12 RtI successes are collaboratively shared across building levels. District Title I staff meet throughout the year to assess implementation and progress monitoring of student growth and gap closure. Frameworks of Poverty trainings are provided for staff to develop understanding for our low income families. The district selects several teachers for leadership and focused study in the areas of math, science, literacy, and gifted-talented. These individuals have leadership roles in regional and state affiliations. Best Practice strategies and programs are highlighted through extended year training opportunities. These courses align with site, district, and individual Quality Compensation (Q-Comp) professional development goals. District building leaders participate in several job-embedded leadership opportunities. The focus of these meetings is collaboration around district initiatives, a time for sharing progress toward long-range goals, and training opportunities.

Located away from a metropolitan area, Brainerd Schools have established a cohesive process of supporting and training staff. From all the previously mentioned initiatives, we also address our needs by securing nationally renowned presenters, providing best practice "train the trainer" models, and developing internal systems.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Garfield is committed to strong family and community partnerships. This partnership is witnessed in the great support we receive from volunteers. Our Parent Teacher Association (PTA) is also committed to promoting Garfield and the opportunities available to volunteer by hosting a Back to School Ice Cream Social, Book Fair, Family Fun Night activities including Bingo, Movie Nights, Fathers Reading Every Day (FRED), "I love to Read Month" activities, and by hosting a Spring Carnival every other year. The PTA is committed to bring one family activity per month to the students of Garfield. These activities have been very successful in getting families interested in the everyday activities of their children at school. The PTA also supports the students and staff at Garfield through its fundraising efforts. Each year the PTA makes a strong financial commitment to our Media Center and to one large project. One such project brought interactive boards to our third and fourth grade classrooms and short throw projectors to all classrooms.

Garfield also has community involvement as we work with Lutheran Social Services and the Foster Grandparent program. We have three Foster Grandparents working with our students. Area churches support Garfield through clothing donations for our needy students helping make sure they have warm jackets, hats, and gloves. Garfield also pulls in many volunteers from the business community through the Junior Achievement Program. We have 100% of our classrooms participating. This program is supplied through the National Alliance Joint Powers (NJPA). We are also in partnership with NJPA through our Collaborative Worker who assists staff, students and Garfield families in meeting their needs whether it be clothing,

housing, insurance or transportation to name just a few. We are also fortunate to have Central Lakes College in Brainerd as their students provide many service areas for our students as part of their education, such as the dental hygiene and nursing programs.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Brainerd Public Schools uses a seamless, articulated K-12 curriculum process whereby each curricular area is examined on a cyclical basis for alignment with state and national standards. Representatives from all levels of the system design core curricula around critical learning standards, research, best practice and differentiation. In order to ensure a system-wide approach, teams of teachers have worked to develop common summative and formative assessments aligned with Minnesota academic standards. At district curriculum meetings teachers examine student achievement data and the implications to local curriculum. This system-wide approach to curriculum development, delivery and assessment assures equity of instructional opportunity and learning for all students regardless of demographics.

Differentiated curricula for reading/English language arts were adopted after extensive study of both the Minnesota standards/Common Core State Standards and best practice literacy research. Kindergarten through grade four curricula provide daily reading and writing opportunities in phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, fluency and vocabulary in both literature and informational texts. A well-defined schedule of common formative and summative assessments, along with daily observations, provide teachers with the data they need to determine progress toward mastery for individuals and classrooms. A district literacy trainer/coordinator and a literacy coach provide professional development and support for classroom teachers in our continuous improvement model.

The mathematics curriculum focuses on the conceptual understanding of mathematical topics and the development of students' higher-order thinking skills. A strong emphasis is placed on hands-on activities, discovering multiple approaches to mathematical procedures and problem solving through a spiraling format. Multiple opportunities for reteaching and practice, along with strategic administration of formative and summative assessments, monitor progress and measure achievement of the Minnesota Academic Standards in Mathematics.

The science curriculum is research based and developed at The Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California, Berkeley. The science program is designed to meet the challenge of providing meaningful science education for all students and to prepare them for life in the 21st century. The district has been actively engaging students in the nature of science and engineering, physical science, life science and earth science through active participation in science experiences rooted in scientific inquiry.

After studying the Minnesota Academic Standards for Social Studies, the majority of the standards were embedded in the language arts curriculum. Additional materials were purchased to ensure teachers had the necessary resources for full implementation of the standards. Students learn to think critically about important issues, problem solve, engage in inquiry and communicate findings within the required strands of citizenship and government, economics, geography and history.

Media specialists and teachers work collaboratively to develop activities within the core curriculum using the National Education Technology Standards (NETS) for students. The focus is on digital citizenship, evaluating and selecting information sources, innovative thinking and guided inquiry. Technology experiences are offered throughout the day in labs and classrooms using a variety of devices. The visual and performing arts curriculum relies on research from the National Arts Standards and the Minnesota Perpich Center for the Arts. A formalized visual arts curriculum was developed and is delivered in all grades. Key essential learnings include elements of art, principles of design, perspective, history and culture, critical thinking, creative expression and media. The National Standards for Music Education were used to choose a performing arts curriculum that provides activities so students will learn foundations as well as the artistic process of creating, performing, and responding.

The physical education and health curricula is based on the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. The core standards promote physically literate students who have the knowledge, skills and confidence to enjoy a lifetime of healthy physical activity. The health curriculum develops knowledge of nutrition, safety practices and health promotion.

2. Reading/English:

In 1994 Brainerd Schools became a training site for Reading Recovery®, an intensive short term intervention for struggling first graders. Data generated from the implementation of Reading Recovery led to the recognition that substantial changes were needed to improve core literacy instruction for ALL students. Teachers and administrators spent a year researching best practice in literacy instruction. University affiliation engaged us with a national network bringing current research to teachers through a tiered coaching professional development model and allowed for common instructional language. In 2001, a K-5 literacy framework was piloted and subsequently implemented with assistance from a Comprehensive School Reform Grant. Professional Learning Communities and literacy coaching were established in 2003-04. This dynamic growth model informs and sustains literacy training in a continuous-improvement, capacity-building model. An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement, text leveling, common assessments, NWEA, MCA, and STAR Enterprise provide data for problem solving teams to:

Strengthen instruction for all learners through intensive inquiry based professional development. For example, a team of district administrators, school leaders and coaches analyzed data. A trend indicating a plateau in growth regarding long vowel patterns was apparent. This resulted in system-wide professional development around word study application to reading and writing.

Interventions have been provided for over- and under-performing students through individualized and small group instruction. For example, based upon results from the letter identification task, kindergarten learners were identified to receive intensive instruction that was progress monitored with a progressive teaching protocol.

Instruction is based on the gradual release model - whole group, small group to independent application. Data-informed decisions determine which strategic actions to teach during whole group mini-lessons in reading and writing workshop. Based upon running records of oral reading, a teacher observed readers decoding words but not reading fluently. A shared reading mini-lesson taught readers how to group words together in meaningful phrases.

Strategic actions are reinforced in small group guided reading and writing lessons. A guided reading lesson was designed to address dysfluent reading by adjusting text level and prompting for behaviors previously taught in the whole group mini-lesson.

Learners apply previously taught literacy behaviors independently. Phrasing strategies are encouraged in independent reading. The teacher confers with students to check for application.

Assessments facilitate a bridge between theory and instruction, based on Marie Clay's literacy processing theory. Teachers incorporate differentiated methods of instruction to teach complex strategic actions used by successful readers and writers.

3. Mathematics:

The mathematics curriculum at our school for the last 20 years has been the Everyday Mathematics series. This program provides conceptual understanding through activities and multiple approaches to mathematical problem solving through a spiraling format. The format allows students to practice concepts and skills throughout the year. Spiraling supports reteaching concepts a student may not have mastered. For students who have previously mastered concepts, this instructional method provides independent practice for higher level enrichment. A variety of teaching methods, questioning strategies and hands-on activities are used to teach skills at various levels. Students are asked to respond to questions orally, in written or picture form

and with manipulatives. Students are flexibly grouped to meet their academic needs - whole group, small group, and with one-to-one support..

Formative and summative assessments are administered frequently in order to measure mastery of the Minnesota Mathematics Standards and to monitor progress. In addition to classroom assessments, which are aligned to the standards-based report card, standardized tests are used to help determine the level of mastery towards grade level benchmarks. In the past, Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) tests were administered fall, winter and spring as the district benchmarking tool. Currently, the STAR Enterprise tests are used in that capacity. Students also take the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments in Mathematics. Computer based assessments give teachers immediate feedback for instructional planning, evaluating curriculum and measuring student achievement.

Students at all levels are provided opportunities for success. Within the classroom, students share and compare solutions through oral presentations, the use of marker boards and various technological platforms. Multiple interventions are employed to meet the individual needs of students not achieving at grade-level standards. Specific software provides additional support for fact fluency. Special Education teachers, Title I teachers and paraprofessionals work to support student success. Students with special needs who need additional math instruction are also given time in resource rooms where special education teachers modify and supplement instruction. Everyday Math, Saxon and Equals are the most common supplemental materials used. Targeted services are also provided after school and during summer to pre-teach concepts and close academic achievement gaps.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Garfield Elementary School provides and fosters opportunity, innovation and success in science education by fully implementing the Full Option Science System (FOSS). This program is dedicated to the improvement and learning of science and provides opportunities for students to increase their capacity to think critically. Scientific knowledge advances when students use observation skills, test ideas in logical ways, and generate explanations that integrate new information into an established order. Students discover what is known (content) and how it became known (process). Students are given opportunity to learn important scientific concepts, to be innovative, to think critically and construct new ideas and thoughts through inquiries, investigations and analyses. Students are engaged in these processes as they explore the natural and the man-made worlds.

Students are accountable for standards that focus on four main strands of science: Nature of Science and Engineering, Life, Earth and Physical Science. For example, a Kindergarten standard includes learning how living things are diverse with many different observable characteristics. The Trees Module is used to foster this learning. Each classroom is given a real tree, allowing students to observe its many characteristics. The classroom tree is planted at the district school forest. Learning continues as they observe its growth in subsequent years. In grade four, students study how rocks and earth materials may vary in compositions. The Earth Materials Module provides investigations allowing students to observe physical characteristics of earth material. Students focus on examining and dissecting earth materials using scientific tools to understand the physical properties of earth materials. A common assessment is given at the end of each module.

The district supported professional development by providing a teacher on special assignment who mentored teachers and assured resource allocation as the program was implemented. Additional professional development opportunities were provided. These initiatives have provided students with a solid foundational and comprehensive science education, supported staff and have ensured that all staff were given the necessary resources to deliver a premier elementary science program.

This additional curricular area was chosen because of the illustration of the alignment of a research-based, hands-on, inquiry driven curriculum, high quality staff development and exceptional levels of student achievement. The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments in Science are administered annually in grade five. The test is a culmination of grade three, four and five Minnesota Academic Standards for Science. On

the 2013 MCA Science test, district grade five students scored 84.5% proficiency, consistently scoring above the Minnesota state average of 59.7%.

5. Instructional Methods:

In core curricula areas differentiation is embedded in each program. In reading/language arts the use of guided reading is core to the instructional model and is enhanced through leveled materials and technology. Hardware was provided for each classroom to enhance differentiated skill development, assessment, and inquiry. A data warehouse is provided to track individual student achievement and result of interventions.

Students who qualify for Title 1 are provided research based programs. Programs are aligned with district curriculum and state standards. Delivery of services is determined based on student needs and abilities. Interventions vary from small group to one-on-one instruction and occur in both classroom embedded and pull out formats.

Special education teachers collaborate with classroom teachers to provide the necessary accommodations and modifications to maintain placement of students with disabilities in the core instruction. In addition, special education teachers provide supplemental instruction and monitor individual progress to meet student needs. Assistive technologies such as smart pens, scanning apps, talk to text and interactive books continue to allow more struggling learners to grow in the core.

Brainerd Public Schools most capable learners encounter numerous opportunities for differentiation beginning at the elementary level. Embedded in each curricula area are differentiation options for classroom teachers to implement. In addition, the district assesses all kindergarten students with the CogAT 7 screening form, an abbreviated cognitive abilities test. Based on the data gathered from this assessment, student academic need is addressed with a 4 Tier model. Tier I is general differentiation that occurs day to day as a student interacts with a variety of curriculum. Tier II allows for students that show ability in a certain unit of study to encounter a specific modification that challenges them further. Tier III provides regular opportunities in small cluster groups and is focused on reading and math. Identified curriculum might include Junior Great Books and M3 Math. Tier IV is defined by our AGATE Academy, a school-within-a-school model for grades 1-4. Students that qualify for this level of programming encounter opportunities for subject acceleration and enrichment on a daily basis.

6. Professional Development:

Brainerd Public Schools staff development approach is dedicated to providing opportunity through which educators acquire or enhance the knowledge, skills, attitudes and beliefs necessary to create high levels of learning for all students. The district employs a multi-layered approach and job-embedded staff development opportunities. A district-wide committee establishes a district direction. Site-levels enhance the district base and address unique needs of their respective buildings and teachers to support best-practice school improvement.

District staff development supports teachers becoming students of the profession by continually renewing and learning for professional growth; improved student learning and achievement. Summer training opportunities include training for all staff to support special education students, improving utilization of technology for instruction and assessment of student understanding, literacy instruction and data collection, curriculum alignment for all content areas and working with disadvantaged students. The staff development from these trainings transition into the individual school goals based on the diversity and challenges of their student demographics.

Special education leaders and teachers play vital roles in grade level and professional development meetings both at the building and district level. Special education professional development goals continue to focus on instructional strategies and approaches based upon each student's unique needs. There is more collaboration between general education and special education teachers than ever before; it is about building capacity in all learners. New and veteran special education teachers go through extensive learning prior to

the start of each school year. Assessment, differentiation strategies, executive functioning and classroom impact are covered.

The job-embedded staff development process is supported by Minnesota's Quality Compensation network. This job-embedded staff development program is centered around: site goals for improved student achievement, focused peer learning communities where data is analyzed and best-practice instruction is researched and individual peer coaching where individuals set personal growth goals and coaches observe lessons and collect instructional data.

Peer observation, and probationary teacher mentorship, has primarily focused on literacy at the K-2 level, while at grades three and four peer coaching is more general to best-practice instructional techniques and classroom management. In both cases however, observations and feedback are completed in the context of individual teacher goals. Teachers support one another toward improvement and achievement of individual and school-wide goals. Teachers use feedback from formal and informal peer observations, self-evaluations and student assessment data in choosing further professional development training.

7. School Leadership

Garfield Elementary lives behind the belief of data-based decision making. In 2010, a new principal and literacy coach were hired and shared in the responsibility of expanding the use of data to the everyday decisions made with curriculum, teaching and interventions. As the new leadership organized grade level data meetings and focused building wide staff development around data and instruction a new learning atmosphere took hold and a shared responsibility emerged. Several shared leadership committees were established including: a Site Team, Literacy Leadership Team, and a Response to Intervention Team.

Our building Site Team works to improve school culture and provide a safe learning environment for all. They oversee the school improvement process and work diligently to provide memory-making opportunities and celebrations of student successes. One of the biggest undertakings of the site team was the restructuring of the school schedule to ensure quality minutes of instruction in literacy and math, as well as to provide common planning time for grade level teams. Garfield established a Literacy Leadership Team to coordinate the needs and the transition between two literacy programs. The team expresses literacy "wonderings", establish goals, reviews data, and problem solves. The literacy team has brought unification to the literacy programs at Garfield. Our Response to Intervention (RtI) Team is the gateway to our Child Study Team. The RtI team consist of a very diverse group made up of classroom and intervention teachers, school psychologist, family collaborative worker, and principal. The team is responsible for reviewing data, establishing and tracking interventions before any further restrictive process can begin with the Child Study Team.

Shared leadership is also evident in the teacher-led monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). During the PLCs a focus is maintained on student learning and the professional development of best practices. Garfield has been very fortunate to have several teacher leaders and district trainers. Garfield was one of the pilot sites for the intermediate literacy program Lead 21. We have the district literacy trainer as our building level coach and the regional Reading Recovery (RR) trainer as one of our RR teachers. This year, Garfield had three teachers across grade levels pilot a new math curriculum.

Garfield's shared leadership is not just limited to teachers. We also share leadership with students. Garfield has a student ambassador program that runs similar to a student council. The membership is comprised of two representatives from each fourth grade classroom. These students make valuable input at their monthly meetings with the principal. The student ambassadors help plan activities for "I Love to Read Month" and provide leadership for our Grandparents' Day and Veteran's Day Celebration.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment III

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2011

Publisher: MN Department of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Jan | Jan |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 76 | 77 | 61 | | |
| % Exceeds | 24 | 16 | 23 | | |
| Number of students tested | 79 | 83 | 79 | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 98 | 100 | 94 | | |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 2 | 0 | 5 | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 2 | 0 | 6 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 67 | 66 | 55 | | |
| % Exceeds | 16 | 7 | 23 | | |
| Number of students tested | 49 | 44 | 40 | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 60 | 42 | 31 | | |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 8 | 15 | | |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 12 | 13 | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|--|--|
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 78 | 77 | 61 | | |
| % Exceeds | 25 | 17 | 23 | | |
| Number of students tested | 76 | 79 | 77 | | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2006

Publisher: MN Department of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Jan | Jan | Jan | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | 81 | 92 |
| % Exceeds | | | | 33 | 45 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 79 | 83 |
| Percent of total students tested | | | | 99 | 95 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | 1 | 4 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | 1 | 5 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | 71 | 89 |
| % Exceeds | | | | 17 | 53 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 41 | 36 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | 57 | 83 |
| % Exceeds | | | | 10 | 22 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 21 | 18 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----|----|
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | 82 | 91 |
| % Exceeds | | | | 34 | 46 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 77 | 79 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment III

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2011

Publisher: MN Department of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Jan | Jan |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 82 | 80 | 75 | | |
| % Exceeds | 39 | 25 | 40 | | |
| Number of students tested | 77 | 71 | 75 | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 95 | 99 | | |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 4 | 1 | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 5 | 1 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 75 | 80 | 54 | | |
| % Exceeds | 28 | 27 | 31 | | |
| Number of students tested | 32 | 30 | 35 | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 33 | 55 | 55 | | |
| % Exceeds | 0 | 18 | 20 | | |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 11 | 20 | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|--|--|
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 83 | 81 | 77 | | |
| % Exceeds | 41 | 26 | 41 | | |
| Number of students tested | 70 | 70 | 73 | | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2006

Publisher: MN Department of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Jan | Jan | Jan | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | 86 | 98 |
| % Exceeds | | | | 40 | 47 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 92 | 89 |
| Percent of total students tested | | | | 95 | 99 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | 5 | 1 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | | | | 5 | 1 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | 77 | 95 |
| % Exceeds | | | | 29 | 40 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 52 | 40 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | 67 | 91 |
| % Exceeds | | | | 17 | 29 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 18 | 21 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----|----|
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | 85 | 99 |
| % Exceeds | | | | 39 | 47 |
| Number of students tested | | | | 87 | 87 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment III

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: MN Department of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Apr | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 63 | | | | |
| % Exceeds | 10 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 81 | | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 98 | | | | |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 2 | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 2 | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 55 | | | | |
| % Exceeds | 4 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 51 | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 55 | | | | |
| % Exceeds | 0 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 11 | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|--|--|--|--|
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | 66 | | | | |
| % Exceeds | 10 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 77 | | | | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: MN Department of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Jan | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | 87 | 85 | 73 | 72 |
| % Exceeds | | 51 | 53 | 49 | 48 |
| Number of students tested | | 82 | 79 | 77 | 82 |
| Percent of total students tested | | 100 | 94 | 96 | 94 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | | 0 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | 79 | 85 | 58 | 74 |
| % Exceeds | | 44 | 60 | 30 | 54 |
| Number of students tested | | 43 | 40 | 40 | 35 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | 75 | 85 | 37 | 59 |
| % Exceeds | | 33 | 46 | 16 | 35 |
| Number of students tested | | 12 | 13 | 19 | 17 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----|----|----|----|
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | 86 | 85 | 73 | 73 |
| % Exceeds | | 53 | 52 | 51 | 49 |
| Number of students tested | | 78 | 77 | 75 | 78 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment III

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: MN Department of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Apr | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | 71 | | | | |
| % Exceed | 19 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 78 | | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | | | | |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | | | | |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | 63 | | | | |
| % Exceed | 9 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 32 | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | 29 | | | | |
| % Exceed | 0 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 7 | | | | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|--|--|--|--|
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | 73 | | | | |
| % Exceed | 20 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 71 | | | | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2008

Publisher: MN Department of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Jan | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | 80 | 79 | 75 | 80 |
| % Exceed | | 38 | 49 | 41 | 41 |
| Number of students tested | | 71 | 75 | 92 | 90 |
| Percent of total students tested | | 93 | 99 | 95 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | | 5 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | | 7 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | 80 | 71 | 69 | 73 |
| % Exceed | | 37 | 29 | 33 | 33 |
| Number of students tested | | 30 | 35 | 52 | 40 |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | 36 | 65 | 39 | 46 |
| % Exceed | | 27 | 30 | 17 | 9 |
| Number of students tested | | 11 | 20 | 18 | 22 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----|----|----|----|
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | 80 | 78 | 77 | 81 |
| % Exceed | | 39 | 51 | 41 | 41 |
| Number of students tested | | 70 | 73 | 87 | 88 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Exceed | | | | | |
| % Exceed | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: