

***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. Jeffrey Daniel Drake

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

Official School Name Battle Lake Public School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 402 Summit St West

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

City Battle Lake                      State MN                      Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 56515-4029

County Otter Tail County                      State School Code Number\* 240170

Telephone 218-864-5215                      Fax 218-864-8651

Web site/URL http://www.battlelake.k12.mn.us                      E-mail jdrake@isd542.org

Twitter Handle \_\_\_\_\_ Facebook Page \_\_\_\_\_ Google+ \_\_\_\_\_

Blog

YouTube/URL \_\_\_\_\_ https://www.blogger.com/home?pli=1                      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. Jeffrey Drake                      E-mail: jdrake@isd542.org

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Battle Lake Public School District                      Tel. 218-864-5215

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. Blaine Larson

(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):
- 0 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
  - 0 Middle/Junior high schools
  - 0 High schools
  - 1 K-12 schools
- 1 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. 11 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	30	16	46
K	16	14	30
1	10	8	18
2	14	13	27
3	13	17	30
4	15	21	36
5	23	13	36
6	14	18	32
7	23	21	44
8	21	16	37
9	23	17	40
10	27	22	49
11	17	22	39
12	21	13	34
<b>Total Students</b>	267	231	498

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
  - 0 % Asian
  - 0 % Black or African American
  - 2 % Hispanic or Latino
  - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - 93 % White
  - 5 % 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: 6%

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

<b>Steps For Determining Mobility Rate</b>	<b>Answer</b>
(1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	24
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	8
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	32
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	511
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.063
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	6

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: 37 %  
 Total number students who qualify: 182

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: 12 %  
60 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>7</u> Autism                | <u>4</u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>1</u> Deafness              | <u>9</u> Other Health Impaired                 |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u>17</u> Specific Learning Disability         |
| <u>4</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>13</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>5</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:

	<b>Number of Staff</b>
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	32
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	1
Paraprofessionals	14
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 16:1

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

<b>Required Information</b>	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	96%	96%	96%	94%	95%
High school graduation rate	96%	97%	100%	100%	100%

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

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

<b>Post-Secondary Status</b>	
Graduating class size	39
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	46%
Enrolled in a community college	21%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	25%
Joined the military or other public service	8%
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. 2011

## **PART III – SUMMARY**

---

Our Mission: Striving toward educational excellence in a safe, respectful, accepting environment: preparing all students to meet the challenges of a changing world.

Battle Lake Public School is a small, rural district in Western Minnesota. We are a pre-K-12 school with 500 students. Demographically, we are approximately 94% white with a free/reduced lunch rate of approximately forty percent. Once driven by an agriculturally-based economy, our community is now largely supported by tourism. The county is a destination place for vacationers as well as those seeking a place to enjoy their retirement years.

While it might be a stretch to refer to Battle Lake in “Lake Wobegon” terms, in many respects, we do enjoy the idyllic characteristics of small town American life. We believe that through encouragement, nurturing, high expectations, and uncompromising standards, each of our students can indeed be, “above average” and successful. We develop a vision for how we want things to be. We establish goals that support our vision with accompanying strategies, tactics, and timelines to ensure we are making progress. We employ creative solutions. This is our story....

Six years ago, our district embarked on a journey to transform our school from good to great. The process culminated in a fifty-page strategic plan that was adopted by our school board in June of 2008. The plan involved input from virtually every constituency group in our community. The heart and soul of this work is embodied in our commitment to offer a world class liberal arts education built upon a foundation of math, science and language arts. This goal not only reflected the beliefs of our school, it represented the values and beliefs of our community. We revised our strategic plan again in 2012 as we had accomplished many of the goals outlined in the 2008 plan. The revision incorporated feedback we received through students and parents. The district’s strategic plan serves as a complementary document to the district-wide literacy plan created in 2011 and the World’s Best Workforce Plan that will be finalized in 2014.

All of our students receive exposure to both the arts and technical/vocational education. We believe that this approach provides students with a wider context of the world of work and a deeper understanding of how their interests, skills, and aptitudes provide a framework for career decision-making.

Our school is rich with tradition. Our students experience a unique learning opportunity tailored to our local ecology by extending our classroom to nearby Glendalough State Park. This experiential learning model has fostered a greater connection and understanding of our ecosystem as well as an appreciation for the natural resources of the area.

Advanced Biology students take an annual trip to the International Wolf Center in Ely, Minnesota where they study wolves, dog sled, and ride in a plane utilizing radio telemetry to track wolves. The elementary fifth grade students spend several days at the Long Lake Conservation Camp each spring.

For nearly ten years now, we have enjoyed a partnership with the Boy Scouts of America. We utilize Boy Scout curricula and resources to expose our juniors and seniors to leadership training. The team-work, communication and leadership skills learned culminate in a spring service-learning project for our community.

We offer a robotics course and recently added a 3-D printer making us one of the first schools in the region to make this technology available to students. Our vocational students are currently completing projects commonly assigned to second and third year college students.

We are very proud of our school and its traditions. The work being done by our staff and the success attained by our students has been remarkable. In 2009, Battle Lake was the only K-12 district in Minnesota to be recognized by the Minnesota Academic Excellence Foundation’s Spotlight on Schools Award. We followed that up in 2010 by being one of only two K-12 districts in Minnesota to receive this honor. Battle

Lake Elementary was recognized as a National Blue Ribbon School in 2011 and a Minnesota Reward School in 2012. Since our Blue Ribbon School designation, our school has undergone a significant realignment administratively. We now have a single administrator who is the K-12 principal and district superintendent. We continue to have all of our programs located in a single facility.

The high school has received several regional Star of Innovation awards and is routinely recognized by U.S. News and World Report as one of America's Best High Schools. Battle Lake Secondary was named a Minnesota Reward School which places it among the state's top 15% of schools that receive federal title support for three straight years (2011, 2012, 2013). Battle Lake High School is the only traditional public high school in the state to receive this recognition.

Why is Battle Lake Public School worthy of National Blue Ribbon status? We have demonstrated success in increasing student achievement and designing an educational experience that is world class. While we are very proud of our test scores, we hope that we have conveyed that our school is more than that. We challenge students to excel and we are not afraid of taking risks. We believe Battle Lake Public School is a very special place - we hope that you agree!



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

---

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

a) Our primary source for student achievement data comes from our Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) results. The tests have been revised over the years as the state began with the MCA, then the MCA-II and now the MCA-III. The exams have been produced by multiple vendors. Individual student scale scores are translated into the broader general categories of: Does Not Meet Proficiency, Partially Meets Proficiency, Meets Proficiency, and Exceeds Proficiency.

We also utilize the Northwest Evaluation Association assessments (NWEA) in the elementary. Additionally, Accelerated Reader allows us to assess comprehension while Aimsweb timed-reading probes evaluate reading fluency. We will initiate a reading intervention if the child is not grade-level proficient.

Due to our small school size, we approach testing results with some caution. Circumstances involving a very small pool of students can skew our data – especially with grade level results.

Our student demographics do not provide us with a large enough sample size to compare subgroups with the exception of Free/Reduced Priced Lunch.

Minnesota Department of Education provides schools with several test analysis reports. We can examine five year proficiency trends and review achievement levels in any given test year across grade levels and by specific grade level. Another excellent feature are reports on student growth. Students are divided into “Proficient” and “Not Proficient” categories. From there, percentages of students who demonstrated Low, Medium, or High growth are provided. This is an excellent resource to review efforts to move students to the top proficiency categories as well as assist students who we are trying to move from Not Proficient to Proficient.

The district’s goal is for all students to attain proficiency on these tests and to move a high percentage of our students to the Exceeds Proficiency category. The same expectations hold true for student growth rates. We want 100% of our students attaining medium to exceptional growth.

### b) Reading

#### District Overview

The Battle Lake School District saw a stable trend in reading proficiency rates from 2009 to 2012. Proficiency rates ranged from 82.2% in 2009, 85.6% in 2010, 85.5% in 2011 and 83.5% in 2012. In 2013, the district saw a significant drop that was mimicked throughout the state. For Battle Lake, we saw our proficiency rate drop from 83.5% to 71.1%. The state average proficiency dropped even more with an average of 75.3% in 2012 down to 57.6% in 2013. This was due to the introduction of a brand new reading assessment that proved to be much more rigorous and a new online testing format verses the former paper/pencil format.

#### Elementary School Closing the Achievement Gap

In 2013, 66.2% of our students were proficient in reading. The percentage dropped to 50.9% among our students who qualify for free/reduced lunch for an overall gap of 15.3%. The state average achievement gap among the same demographic category is 19.7%, however, only 38.1% of the free/reduced lunch students were proficient across the state. Due to the confidential nature of family income, we do not select students for intervention to improve skills based on socio-economic status. We do identify skill deficits in our students and specifically target those areas for intervention until grade level standard mastery is attained. As the student growth information will show, we have had great success with our interventions.

#### Elementary School Student Growth

During the 2013 testing year, 80% of our elementary students had medium or high growth in reading. Of the students who were not proficient, 12 out of 13 or 92% had medium or high growth.

## Secondary Closing the Achievement Gap

As we examine the achievement gap data between our Free/Reduced Lunch vs. Non-Free/Reduced Lunch students over a five year period, we see a pretty consistent average difference in proficiency of approximately 13%. The gap closed to 11% in 2012 before widening considerably in 2013 with the new test and the online testing format. With the exception of 2013, our FRPL students were averaging about 77% proficiency. Given the one year drop, it is difficult to reach any firm conclusions for the results in 2013. The new testing format with computerized testing may have inadvertently been more advantageous to students in higher income homes.

## Secondary School Student Growth

During the period from 2011-2013, 83% of our students averaged medium to exceptional growth in reading. Overall, 78% of secondary students from the 2013 testing period showed medium to exceptional growth. The same 78% of medium to exceptional growth was also true of students that were proficient. Of the secondary students who were not proficient, 11 out of 15 showed medium to exceptional growth. This indicates that classroom instruction and supplementary interventions are effective.

## Math

### District Overview

The five year analysis on our district's math proficiency rates show upward trending from 2009 to 2010 with a significant drop in 2011 and upward trending again from 2011 to 2013. Our proficiency rates beginning in 2009 and ending in 2013: 68.9%; 77.2%; 64%; 74.8% and 77.2%. The state saw a similar decline in scores in 2011. The state's proficiency rates were 62.3%, 64.7%, 56%, 61.3%, and 60.2%. The drop that districts experienced was caused by the introduction of the MCA-III and its new online testing format in 2011. We are very pleased that after this initial drop, we have not only continued a positive trend, but have equaled our best percentage preceding the implementation of the new assessment.

## Elementary School Closing the Achievement Gap

The 2013 testing data shows that 80.9% of our elementary students were proficient in math. For students who qualified for free/reduced lunch, that percentage dropped to 65.4% for an achievement gap of 15.5%. The state average for meeting proficiency was 62.6% with their free/reduced lunch students dropping to 43.6% for a gap of 19%. Battle Lake Elementary free/reduced lunch students outperformed the state proficiency average by nearly 22%. Due to confidentiality, we do not administer interventions based on socio-economic status. In addressing student learning deficits through targeted interventions where needed, we have enjoyed strong success in boosting student learning growth as seen in the following data.

## Elementary School Student Growth

In 2013, 82 out of 95 students tested or 86% showed medium to high growth. Of students who were not proficient, 15 out of 18 students or 83% had medium or high growth.

## Secondary Closing the Achievement Gap

The proficiency trend for Free/Reduced Lunch students has been on a steady upward climb. In 2009, only 43% of our students in the secondary school were proficient, each consecutive year has seen improvement with our highest percentage of students demonstrating proficiency at 65 in the FRPL group in 2013. What started out as a difference of between 19% - 23% for FRPL students vs. Non-FRPL students now stands as 12% for the 2013 testing year. Given the positive trending, our district's plan is to continue with our current curriculum. We are getting strong results with our classroom instructional practices and supplemental instruction that takes place for students who are below proficiency standards.

## Secondary Student Growth

Data from years 2011-2013 show that, on average, 81% of our students attain medium to exceptional growth in math during the school year. The percent of students who were not proficient and those that were proficient showed nearly the same percentage for medium to exceptional growth (78% vs. 81%) during that same period. In 2013, medium and exceptional student growth rates stood at 80% for proficient students and 73% for non-proficient students. The 73% growth rate for non-proficient students is lower than we

would like. Additional instruction through Title I support and practice problems from a resource like Study Island should help to address this gap.

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

Our district approaches assessment and intervention from a pre-K-12th grade perspective. As we addressed difficult choices in the face of financial pressures, we placed more resources to target the needs of elementary students. This practice is supported by research and our results suggest that it has been a highly effective approach.

We use a combination of standardized assessment data and classroom assessment data to improve student performance. Each school year begins with a data retreat and involves English/reading, math and science teachers at both the elementary and secondary level.

At the elementary level, students in grades three through six take the MCA-IIIs (Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments.) We also use Aimsweb which stresses phonics in kindergarten, phonics and fluency in 1st grade, and fluency in grades 2–6. A Star Reading assessment for reading comprehension is in grades 2 – 6. The NWEAs occur in kindergarten through sixth grade. An RTI model (kindergarten through fourth grade) is used to support students who are reading below proficiency standards. They receive supplemental instruction until they are reading at grade level.

The following assessments form the core of our high school analysis: MCA-III scores, OLPA (Online Practice Assessment) and ACT scores. We also have all tenth grade students take the PLAN and all juniors take the ASVAB. We examine attendance, graduation rates, senior post-high school plans, and results of the Minnesota Student Survey.

When we analyze data, we utilize the following approach: 1) If appropriate, we compare our data to national norms; 2) We compare our results with the results attained in our state; 3) We examine our results in our region and among schools with similar demographic profiles; and 4) Individual student results are examined.

As we analyze data, we look for longitudinal trends. Are our results improving or going down? Are we above the state, local and/or national average? We examine individual scores to see if they are in line with what we expected to see based on classroom grades.

How has our use of data brought changes to instruction or curricula at the high school level? Teachers use the Online Practice Assessment results as a guide for re-teaching specific standards to mastery. It serves as another check and balance to classroom assessments to ensure that students are learning the standards. We also began utilizing Study Island as a math and reading supplement. We found that the extra practice helped students reach proficiency. We have made adjustments to some curricula to better align with the ACT.

We share results directly with both students and parents and we provide explanations on what the scores mean. Results and trending information is shared with staff each August. In addition, we present a report on curriculum and instruction which includes test data along with analysis to our school board and community. This is done in October. The report is attached to our district website for the public to access. We publish a summary in our local paper and also include it in the community education mailing which reaches a wider audience.

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

Our district has been very open about sharing our experiences. We also continue to learn from colleagues in other districts. Our administrator is active in professional organizations and holds a position on the Executive Council for the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP). We regularly network with other professionals and it is quite common to share ideas that are working well – or brainstorm solutions to the challenges many of us face. This may be done at monthly division meetings, through

professional organizations, or via email and phone conversations. MASSP has created an online list of principals who are willing to share their expertise in specific areas. Our district has indicated that it is available to communicate what we have learned among several categories.

The building principal presented on the topic of strategic planning at the summer conference for principals in June of 2010 and is active in writing newspaper articles and press releases promoting the educational innovation that is taking place in the district.

We host visits from area schools interested in learning about our programs and educational model. We provide them with a tour of our school and sit down with them to explain our programs and educational philosophy.

The building principal worked with area school leaders on a project called, "Connecting for HS to Postsecondary Success." The program was sponsored by the Minnesota Department of Education and NCREL Corporation based out of Colorado. The dialogue and problem-solving strategies were excellent. Each principal shared a targeted learning intervention their school developed called a fractal. At the conclusion of the year-long learning sessions, each principal shared what worked well and what they would change about the intervention in the future. A school administrator participated in a round-table discussion of work accomplished and shared results at the 2011 Winter Conference for principals in Minneapolis. Our administrator also presented with a school board member at the Minnesota School Board Association's Winter Conference in 2013.

Our faculty has become very active in seeking advanced degrees in education. The delivery of these programs in our rural location typically entails establishing cohort groups. Our teachers share information about our programs as well as learn about the initiatives being undertaken by other schools through these cohorts.

Through multiple channels of communication and exposure to other systems and ideas, we have all prospered. We are proud that our networking efforts have allowed us to continue improving our service to our students and community.

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

We are fortunate to work with an amazing generation of students. Our goal is to put our students out into their community volunteering time and building relationships. The result is a synergistic partnership with our community that has been transformational.

Our families are wonderful about attending all of our co-curricular activities and are quick to volunteer when needs arise.

The school has a unique partnership with Glendalough State Park. In part, because of the school's involvement, the park was able to secure funding for a five-mile bike trail. We help them on their annual Walk for Glendalough fundraising campaign. In turn, we utilized the trail for a nature walk last fall and use the park for ecological study.

We host Veteran's Day and Memorial Day programs for our community. It is an opportunity to showcase our talented musicians while showing respect to those who have given so much for our country. Our musicians also travel to the local nursing home to perform for the residents. Our local Lion's Club donates money to allow students to attend a performance trip to New York. For several, it will be the first time they have traveled outside their local community.

Network Battle Lake (NBL), a group of civic-minded residents, organized a huge initiative to landscape our school. Students and community members pulled weeds, trimmed trees and bushes and hauled mulch together. The results were spectacular!

The NBL group is supporting a CEO program to debut next fall. Selected students will tour area businesses and hear from CEOs. Students will write their own business plans and launch a business. Grooming students to become future entrepreneurs is critical for our long-term economic viability.

Due to the success of our agriculture and FFA program and strong relationships with local farmers, we received grants from Monsanto and DuPont/Pioneer. These grants enabled us to purchase a 3-D printer as well as scientific testing equipment broadening our curriculum.

Our local sportsman's club supports our Advanced Biology students' trip to the International Wolf Center each year and our students report on the highlights of the trip to the club.

A group of students volunteered to help with a local food drop to serve the needs of hungry families this fall. The event was organized by the United Way. The kids learned teamwork and civic responsibility.

We are truly blessed to have the support that we do – it takes a village!

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

---

### **1. Curriculum:**

We utilize the Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards as our primary source for curricular alignment along with national and local standards to ensure college and career readiness. We take a holistic view of the student and create a strong foundation of core knowledge with college/career readiness skills - time management, study skills, and taking personal responsibility for learning. Students need excellent critical thinking skills – the ability to analyze and synthesize information, knowledge of the scientific method, and creativity. Students use inductive and deductive reasoning to solve real-world problems. We stress strong speaking, writing, and listening skills. We prepare students to be civic-minded leaders.

#### English/Reading/Language Arts

Reading is the cornerstone of our elementary instruction. We focus on the development of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. We also include spelling and grammar. As students reach 4th grade and beyond, we introduce students to novels as the primary means of literature study. Our district has adopted the 6 + 1 Traits writing model which gives us a common language to frame student writing. All high school students take the same set of English courses through tenth grade. Juniors and seniors follow one of two paths. The college credit path includes college writing followed by world literature and emphasizes high level writing and research. The non college-credit path includes a year of technical writing/American literature and a year of advanced composition/world literature. Our focus is on building highly effective written and oral communication skills.

#### Mathematics

At the elementary level, Everyday Math emphasizes problem-solving skills. This has been key in developing critical thinking and analytical skills among our students. We supplement this curriculum with Accelerated Math to ensure that our students have a strong base of core knowledge of mathematics and computation. As students move on to the high school, Our instructors teach rigorous classes while collaborating with teachers from other fields. Instructors use real-life applications for concrete understanding and as motivation for career exploration. Battle Lake offers mathematics classes such as trigonometry and college algebra to further prepare students for the demands of college and career. Our math curriculum prepares students for college success in math intensive fields of study such as engineering while also providing the necessary applied math skills for a variety of vocational programs and careers.

#### Science

Much of the introduction to science in the elementary is contained in our reading series. As students reach the upper elementary grades, the focus shifts to physical and ecological science. Students are exposed to environmental study through our partnership with Glendalough State Park and a trip to the Long Lake Conservation Camp. In junior high, students take life science and earth science. Students at the upper elementary and junior high are encouraged to compete in a regional science fair. In high school, students study physical science, biology, and advanced earth science. We offer college-credit courses in chemistry and physics as well as chemistry in the community where the curriculum focuses on applied concepts such as water quality. Advanced biology has an ecology focus and offers an opportunity to visit the International Wolf Center. Science courses are designed to provide fundamental knowledge about organisms, geology, and the principles of chemistry and physics. Scientific inquiry and applied analytical skills are emphasized.

#### Social Studies

Elementary students have in-depth units on Native Americans, the states, the presidents, and study local and state geography. This culminates in a trip to the state capitol for sixth graders each spring. As students move to junior high and high school, they take history, geography, civics and U.S. history. As juniors and seniors, students have the following options: College Credit 20th Century History, College Credit World History, non college-credit 20th Century History, Psychology, and Sociology/Anthropology. The curriculum is designed to provide students with core knowledge in U.S. and world history, an understanding of our Constitution and American government as well as an appreciation for the responsibilities of civic involvement that is inherent to an effective democracy.

## Visual & Performing Arts

Art students acquire knowledge of elements and principles of design, styles of art, artists, art history and art vocabulary. Students use various art materials, media, tools and techniques. Music courses focus on performing a wide variety of music including both secular and non-secular compositions from a wide variety of periods and cultures. Students study rhythms and styles and express their creativity through original composition and choreography.

## Physical Education/Health/Nutrition

Our program emphasizes setting personal goals in the areas of strength training, physical fitness and fostering healthy life choices. Students learn a variety of team-oriented activities as well as activities that can be pursued as part of an active, healthy lifestyle through adulthood. Our health curriculum stresses sound nutrition. We also address mental health, drug education, and some components of sex education. All of our students become certified in CPR and first aid.

## Vocational

Junior high industrial technology exploratory courses introduce students to the shop equipment and basic skills. High school courses include cabinetry, robotics and construction trades. In the Agriculture Department, students participate in exploratory courses as eighth and ninth graders. Electives include wildlife management, small engines and metal fabrication. In the Business Department, all students take keyboarding, Microsoft Office and economics. Elective offerings include accounting and web page design. Our vocational courses offer practical, hands-on approaches to learning and provide a bridge from school to the world of work.

## Foreign Language

We are a racially and culturally isolated district. Mandarin Chinese provides our students with greater awareness and appreciation for the world. These experiences enrich our students by developing understanding and sensitivity towards other people and cultures.

## **2. Reading/English:**

a) The reading curriculum for grades K-6 utilizes the 2009 MacMillan McGraw Hill Treasures series and is aligned to the 2010 ELA Academic Standards; specifically addressing all benchmarks at each grade level. This series offers an inclusive program that teaches the six basics of reading instruction: print awareness, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

As the students learn the foundational concepts of reading, they are exposed to a wide variety of genres: including numerous non-fiction pieces, award winning literature, and multi-cultural selections. This reading series provides our teachers with resources they need to help the students become successful readers and writers.

In the primary grades, an emphasis is placed on phonemic awareness and phonics instruction. Kindergarten and first grade teachers model print awareness and provide phonemic awareness lessons that provide students with an auditory learning experience. Through the use of rhymes and chants set to music, our students learn to isolate phonemes and identify and blend sounds. First grade teachers' use guided reading groups to provide practice with phonics skills using text related to the theme of study. Second grade students combine vocabulary learning with writing instruction to reinforce word meaning in context.

Students in grades 2 through 6 are provided with reading material at their reading level through the use of Accelerated Reading. Fluency is achieved when reading text that is at an appropriate level for each reader, which is especially helpful for struggling readers. As they work at their levels, the teacher is able to monitor and respond to a struggling student's progress with individualized reading conferences, 1:1 reading with an adult, and duo-log reading.

Grades 4-6 supplement the MacMillan-McGraw Hill program with the Reading Renaissance method.

Reading Renaissance is taught by having the students follow along in their individual copies of the chosen class text, thus not only hearing correctly modeled fluency, but also being guided through the comprehension skills that good readers employ: use of background knowledge, predicting, the modeling of asking questions as they read, making connections, and inferring.

To insure that each student is having their learning needs met our Title I staff provide additional support for struggling students with small, flexible, work groups and individual pullout as directed by the classroom teacher.

b) Battle Lake's English teachers believe that success in education lies in the development and implementation of curriculum and, of equal importance, knowing the individual students in the classroom. Battle Lake has two English teachers working together to cover all 7th-12th grade English classes, and the department has been together for seven years. This allows for steady instruction that blends from school year to school year. Despite teaching different classes, the teachers both have a strong awareness of what the other is teaching, and meet often to discuss lessons, presentation, assessment, and student learning in general. The 6+1 Traits of Writing are a part of this curriculum, and the English teachers have presented the 6+1 Traits to the faculty as a means of incorporating and encouraging writing throughout the entire school, with the goal of giving writing and writing assessment a common language for all teachers and students.

Students in grades seven through ten alternate every other year between the two teachers. Consequently, our teachers are better able to track growth in language arts skills. Juniors and seniors have a varied curriculum, with college level courses being offered for those who qualify academically. Both teachers incorporate small groups, activities, and general movement into their classrooms. Using the state standards as a guide, instruction encompasses many forms, and has students drawing, creating, discussing, acting, and giving speeches and presentations. All of this blends well into the reading and writing that is taught on a daily basis. Combining and implementing real-life stories and situations into the works that are covered allows students to connect to the lessons, and the variety of instruction is designed to benefit students of all learning styles. It is not uncommon for assignments to be open-ended, thereby allowing students to connect to the assignment in their own ways.

The English department works together to improve student reading skills, and meets frequently to discuss different preparation techniques. Teachers analyze data to determine students who may be at risk of falling behind, and offer extra help in before and after school study sessions. Study Island and Learning Point Navigator supplement direct instruction. Accelerated Reader encourages independent reading tailored to a student's interests and ability.

In closing, Battle Lake's English Department believes that incorporating a varied, yet stable curriculum paired with consistently building strong rapport among students and teachers throughout the years fosters learning and creativity in reading, writing, and beyond.

### **3. Mathematics:**

The foundation for Battle Lake's curriculum and instruction is the Minnesota K-12 Academic Standards in Mathematics.

Following careful consideration, Battle Lake Elementary School made a decision to systematically improve our elementary math program. To achieve this goal we used a three pronged approach. We selected the Everyday Math curriculum by Wright Group/McGraw-Hill, transitioning into the new materials incrementally over a two year period. Next, we began a shift in our teaching perspective from the traditional method of math instruction where teachers are just delivering information, to a more innovative approach which celebrates and challenges students' thinking.

Specifically our curriculum allows students to develop and share their own thinking strategies both verbally and in written form. We accomplish success with our students by balancing practice of basic skills common to each grade level with more challenging problem solving. On a daily basis our students are analyzing,



exploring, making connections, and extending their knowledge by working on activities with partners or in small groups as often as possible. Engaging lessons that stimulate students' thinking and interests create the foundation for our classrooms to be filled with wonder. Students are also encouraged to set personal goals which challenge them to reach their full potential. For example; helping students focus on and accomplish measurable improvement in grades 4-6, we use the supplemental Accelerated Math program along with our core curriculum. This program helps the teachers and students manage each student's progress through a specific set of objectives based on our state standards.

If a student is struggling a variety of differentiated strategies are implemented. In grade four for example, pre-teaching lessons to struggling students has improved students' self confidence and interest in math. Grades five and six participate in an after school math practice club. Small group and 1:1 sessions with students who are not mastering standards are a regular practice. Inspiring students to take risks when trying to solve problems, individualizing instruction, practice and/or assessment to meet each students needs and learning style, all help our school build mathematics confidence and creative thinking.

This practice continues at the high school. Students that struggle with mathematics are taught the standards in classes that reflect their pace and interests. Supplemental aides such as Title I instructors give additional individual help to struggling students and we use Study Island to provide extra practice. The state's TIDE site has also been used for further individual assistance. For every student, instructors are available before and after school for individual help and encouragement.

All classes are taught with rigor and teachers adapt their pace and methods based on the class and individuals. Students that show exceptional mathematics ability are challenged with additional higher level mathematics and in some cases take independent classes supervised by the mathematics instructor. Because of the number of students that excel in mathematics, an additional class of trigonometry/algebra III was created. This course serves as an effective bridge to our college-credit algebra course.

Math knowledge and skills are applied outside the math department through the physical sciences, robotics, architectural drawing, construction trades, and other vocational courses.

In addition to the curriculum, Study Island, MCA prep, and ACT preparation are routinely taught during the school year. Students that challenge themselves by taking as many math classes as possible find that they not only earn college credits while attending Battle Lake School but are also prepared to go straight into calculus when entering the university.

Mathematics instructors teach with differentiated instruction such as traditional lecture, kinesthetic learning, pairs, small groups, and labs. Professional development activities are utilized to expose instructors to new techniques and as timely reminders of proven effective teaching practices. Instructors communicate with parents/guardians when students are struggling and have Infinite Campus as a tool to keep parents/guardians and students in touch with academic progress.

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

a) We pride ourselves on offering an outstanding variety of courses for a school our size. Through the College in the Schools program our students have the opportunity to earn up to 30 college credits without leaving the building. In addition to our core subjects, our school offers many options in the fine arts and vocational areas. Our students have the ability to study Mandarin Chinese with an in-house instructor made possible through a generous grant from the Confucius Institute.

Battle Lake's vocational program includes the Agriculture Science and Industrial Technology Departments. Both are highly respected within our community and are led by outstanding instructors who uphold high standards. Our industrial technology program begins with rotation classes for both seventh and eighth grade students. These are exploratory courses that introduce students to the shop equipment and basic skills. The high school courses include traditional electives like cabinetry while also addressing options like robotics. All juniors take a semester course from the industrial technology department. The department utilizes

AutoCad software for architectural drawing and students study design utilizing Google Sketch-Up. The recent edition of a 3-D printer now affords students a broader learning experience. As an example, in the robotics course, students can now conceptualize and design a part for their robots using available software, the part can be manufactured utilizing the 3-D printer where its functionality can be tested as part of the actual machine.

This allows students to analyze strengths and weaknesses in their designs, make modifications and create a new and better part. Students in the program may also build a house which is sold by sealed bid every other year which alternates with the construction of ice fishing houses. Student feedback indicates that our students are entering vocational programs with the skills most students have after one year of post-secondary study.

Our Agriculture Department also blends the traditional with cutting edge curricula. All students participate in an agri-science semester exploratory course as eighth and ninth graders. Students then choose among traditional electives such as Wildlife Management, Small Engines and Metal Fabrication. Students also use various testing equipment to study energy efficiency and next year we will offer a Food Science course with embedded chemistry concepts. The curriculum is extended through student participation in the FFA. The program has produced Minnesota's FFA Star Farmer and a Star Farmer Finalist within the past ten years. This is the highest honor the FFA bestows.

Our Science Department offers a well-rounded curriculum. All students are required to have four years of science to graduate. In junior high, students take Life Science as seventh graders and Earth Science as eighth graders. All freshmen take Physical Science which is an introductory course to physics and to a lesser degree chemistry. Biology is required of all sophomores. We offer college-credit courses in chemistry and physics as well as a Chemistry in the Community course where the curriculum focuses on chemistry as it pertains to issues like water quality. The advanced biology class has an ecology curriculum that incorporates research projects that can be used by local environmental agencies. Water quality testing is incorporated. We received a grant that enabled us to purchase a Sonde unit which can test many different aspects of the water including pH level, dissolved oxygen, temperature and nitrates. The class also learns how to operate equipment used to track and monitor wolves. They use radio telemetry from both the ground and the air for this purpose.

The Social Studies Department affords students curricular options designed to meet the state standards. All students take History as seventh graders. In eighth grade, students take Geography. Civics is taken by all students as freshmen and U.S. History is taken by all sophomores. As juniors and seniors, students have the following options: College Credit 20th Century History, College Credit World History, non college-credit 20th Century History, Psychology, and Sociology/Anthropology. The curriculum ensures that our students graduate with knowledge of the history of the world and of the events that have occurred and shaped the United States. They have knowledge of the geography of the world. Students also leave understanding how our system of government is structured, knowledge of our Constitution, and a deeper appreciation for our place in the world. Highlights in our curriculum include a guest presentation by a local Civil War expert that operates a local museum and a visit by students from Somalia that attend a nearby school.

Our curriculum supports a liberal arts philosophy that is central to our school's mission statement. Our goal is to ensure our graduates have a well-rounded education, can communicate effectively, act as leaders in the school and community, adapt to change, and recognize our civic responsibility. We also want them to be aware of their place in a diverse world and global economy.

b) Our district joined a newly formed Pre-K-3rd Grade Leadership Institute sponsored by the Minnesota Department of Education this spring. Participation was by invitation only and we are pleased to be on the ground floor of this exciting endeavor. This work will build upon the success we have experienced with our current model while strengthening a seamless educational experience from school readiness through third grade.

Prior to the recent work with the Leadership Institute, our district had established literacy benchmarks for

students in our pre-school programs to ensure that incoming students are developmentally prepared for kindergarten. Target Scores are used to indicate proficiency in kindergarten-ready skills. We use the following benchmarks:

Big 5 Area	Screener	Measure	Target Score
Phonemic Awareness	IGDI	Rhyming	12
Phonemic Awareness	IGDI	Alliteration	8
Phonics	AIMSweb	Letter Name	14
Phonics	AIMSweb	Letter Sound	8
Vocabulary	IGDI	Picture Naming	26

Our school readiness program incorporates the Brigance Screens III during a child's first year in our program. The use of this assessment tool has allowed us to address early childhood student needs more quickly and efficiently within the classroom. It has also been a very valuable source of information in our communications with a child's family.

Curriculum for the three and four year old programs follows the "Creative Curriculum for Preschool" published by Teaching Strategies. This program includes the core curriculum areas: Literacy, Math, Science and Social Studies, which are integrated into the classrooms to offer a developmentally appropriate program focusing on the education of the whole child. The curriculum addresses fine and gross motor skill development and the social and emotional growth of each child as we prepare them for kindergarten. The Pre-K classroom environment is also evaluated by the Early Language & Literacy Classroom Observation Pre-K Tool (ELLCO) which is designed to assess and promote positive literacy growth. In the 2014-2015 school year, we will be adding the Teaching Strategies Gold assessment which is correlated with the Creative Curriculum.

Our kindergarten program has participated in the Minnesota School Readiness Study hosted by the Minnesota Department of Education for the past decade. We gather and analyze assessment data of student performance and readiness as they leave Pre-K and enter kindergarten. This participation has supported the alignment of the Pre-K and kindergarten standards, expectations and curriculum. The kindergarten classrooms use the Brigance Early Childhood Developmental Inventory tool as the school readiness assessment tool.

The K-3 programs work with the Minnesota Reading Corps to address the literacy needs of emergent and beginning readers. Our district uses the AIMSweb assessment system to identify at-risk students early and we use our Title I staff to provide literacy interventions daily and monitor student progress weekly.

Convincing evidence suggests that several key factors play a role in narrowing achievement gaps and creating the essential knowledge base within young children as a foundation for future learning success. 1. Schools successfully engage families in the education of their child. 2. Schools use a data-driven decision-making process. 3. Schools emphasize quality curricula and instruction carefully aligned to standards. 4. Schools operate under the guidance of effective leadership. We have made many changes in the design and delivery of our school readiness programs over the past five years. Our work will continue to focus on best practices that support the developmental growth of our young children.

## 5. Instructional Methods:

As a very small school district, differentiated instruction plays a critical role in ensuring all of our students achieve strong learning growth. Examples of differentiated instruction in the classroom are numerous. We embed technology into the study of our academic standards to enhance the quality of our lessons by making learning more interactive and engaging. Teachers differentiate instruction through the modification of content, process, and products. All three of these areas are effectively employed due to a clear understanding of student needs gathered through data collection and discussed at regularly scheduled grade level and staff meetings.

Content is modified in several ways. In language arts classes, students are provided with text at their individual reading levels. Students are given leveled readers as part of core curriculum and use the Accelerated Reader program which provides appropriate level content and student choice - a key strategy in differentiation. Language Arts/English teachers are aware of students' various learning styles and purposely craft assignments and assessments to take these into consideration. In our classrooms, assessment is conducted in a variety of formats. An example is the monitoring of comprehension of a play or story that is first read and then acted out in small student groups. Vocal and instrumental music utilize Smart Music software that enables students of all abilities to practice and receive feedback on instrumental pieces matching their skill level.

Accelerated math is also used with students working at their own level and pace. Students above grade level are provided opportunities to pursue advanced standards both individually and in small groups as well as compete in the Math Masters program and Science and Math Expo. Online tutorial sites such as Wolfram Alpha and Kahn Academy are utilized as an extension of classroom instruction as are Title I study groups. Elementary students may also qualify for Project Challenge, which meets once weekly for academic enrichment in all subject areas. Learning centers and free choice time, including such features as books on tape and tactile tables, provide additional opportunities for individualized learning. Finally, adjustments in the learning environment; working inside a small tent, on the floor, at tables, soft furniture, or even sitting on exercise balls, helps meet those learning styles as well.

Smart boards are one of the many tools our teachers use to differentiate process. All elementary classrooms and nearly all high school classrooms are now equipped with this technology. The boards allow students to manipulate text, graphs, etc. through actual touch or the use of a keypad. Color and sound can easily be manipulated as well. Teachers use varied graphic organizers such as T-notes and Venn diagrams and provide individual and small group learning opportunities. Qualifying students receive supplemental support through the use of Title I instructors and paraprofessional educators. In health, the use of a pair and share techniques and the jig-sawing method allows for the stronger students to assist/teach the less skilled students. Business classes use student response systems (clickers). When questioned, the entire class can click a response allowing the instructor to immediately gauge the degree of student understanding and modify instruction.

Staff also differentiates products – how students show they have mastered an objective. Students in fifth grade social studies may type a research paper or create a visual representation - accompanied by an oral presentation - on specific standards. Assignment length is varied depending on skill sets. For example, certain students may choose ten of the twenty spelling words to focus on while others may be given additional challenge words. In art, the size of the project and the media used are adapted. This allows us to accommodate students with limited motor skills and particular tactile and sensory concerns. Students problem-solve and provide feedback important for the evaluation of artwork. Industrial Technology may assign students the task of building a robot that will perform specific functions. Students use Google Sketch-Up to design parts, print them with the 3D printer, incorporate them into their robot and test them for functionality. While the learning objective is the same, the process students take from design to manufacture to build varies greatly. Finally, many of our teachers use the R.A.F.T. strategy, allowing students to choose the Role, Audience, Format, and Topic while meeting appropriate lesson objectives.

## **6. Professional Development:**

Our district follows a professional development plan supporting teacher and district growth.

The first component to our approach is data analysis. Each August, we host a data retreat to review testing data and other pertinent information. Results are shared among all school district staff and among all district residents. We look for longitudinal trends in the data that may suggest adaptation to curricula or the need to address specific instructional practices.

The second component of our plan emphasizes instructional improvement. This involves utilizing content specialists to work with us on specific strategies, group study of selective literature, focused learning on

differentiated instruction, technology integration strategies, Response To Intervention, and other topics.

The third component consists of license renewal components in Minnesota. 1. Positive Behavioral Intervention Strategies. 2. Accommodation, Modification, and Adaptation of Curriculum, Materials, and Instruction. 3. Key Warning Signs for Early-Onset Mental Illness in Children and Adolescents. 4. Reading Preparation. 5. Technology.

The fourth component is group learning and sharing. Reflection on how to integrate new information or practices into daily performance and creating a plan to carry out this transformation is an essential expectation.

What impact have these changes brought?

1. We devoted an entire year preparing to implement a Response To Intervention model in our school. We continue to support its practice with targeting professional development activities. This was a major shift for both teachers and Title I personnel, but resulted in great student achievement results.
2. Last year we read, *The Fundamental 5: The Formula for Quality Instruction*. This brought increased focus on teaching to the objective, utilizing purposeful small group discussion, and incorporating daily writing activities. Although somewhat unconventional, teachers were assigned to small study groups – each containing both elementary and high school level teachers. One component of *The Fundamental 5* was read, discussed and incorporated each month. The entire focus was on instructional improvement. Teachers wrote and submitted reflection papers on what they had learned and how it had changed their teaching at the end of the year.
3. This year, we are reading, *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success* by Carol Dweck. It is providing greater recognition of how powerful viewing student potential through a growth-mindset can be in helping students reach their potential.

Our professional development activities are meaningful and purposeful. We use professional development as a tool to increase organizational skill and capacity and a means to reach student learning goals.

## **7. School Leadership**

The school leadership model in our district has undergone several transformations in recent years due to severe financial pressures on our district. Our district presently has one administrator with a role of K-12 principal and district superintendent. Our priority in utilizing resources is to maintain an outstanding faculty and offer a wide array of program options for our students.

The present administrative configuration brought the need to develop the organization's internal leadership capacity. Site-team leadership and committee leadership ensures that the school continue to be progressive and responsive to changing needs. The following committee structure exists within the school: Site Council, Staff Development Committee, Safety Committee, Technology Committee, Wellness Committee, Continuing Education Committee and RTI/Curricula & Instruction Committee as well as ad hoc committees.

Our model challenges staff members to grow in new roles with new responsibilities. We have truly found that having the right administrative "model" is far less important than having the right people with the right skill sets in place to carry out the work that needs to be done in a high performing school.

We view the educational experience we are providing holistically from a pre-K-12 perspective. One of the distinct advantages of a school our size is that we recognize the work that is being done at all age levels.

The principal plays a key role in gathering information, soliciting ideas on how to improve the school and being a conduit between ideas and committee structure. Recent examples show the wide-range of decision-making employed. We have adjusted our master schedule to accommodate instructional priorities. We became a Ramp-Up-To-Readiness school to better provide our students with the skills and knowledge they need to make career decisions. We have a curriculum review cycle and a process for making curricular

decisions. We have a system to collect and analyze data and our results are discussed and shared across the district. All of these initiatives started because the principal and staff have established relationships built on trust, respect and a common interest in providing an excellent education.

When school leaders demonstrate that they are not afraid of growth, change, and challenge - it establishes a school culture where innovation and risk are promoted and celebrated. The district's test results are a tangible way of demonstrating that the shared decision-making model we employ is working and that we are putting the best interests of our students as our highest priority.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: MCA II

All Students Tested/Grade: 11

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: American Institute for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	50	47	37	41
% Advanced	29	21	19	15	14
Number of students tested	28	34	36	41	49
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	1	0	1	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	3	3	0	2	2
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	33	29	25	18
% Advanced	29	13	14	6	6
Number of students tested	7	15	14	16	17
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	25	0	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	1	4	1	5
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100		0	0	0
% Advanced	0		0	0	0
Number of students tested	1		1	1	1
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		50			
% Advanced		50			
Number of students tested		2			
<b>7. American Indian or</b>					

<b>Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	50	49	38	42
% Advanced	30	19	20	15	15
Number of students tested	27	32	35	40	48
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** In 2012-2013 we used the MTAS (Minnesota Test of Academic Skills) as an alternative assessment for one special education student who is Developmentally and Cognitively Delayed. In 2011-2012 we used the MTAS as an alternative assessment for one special education student who is Developmentally and Cognitively Delayed. Areas left blank are "Not Applicable"



**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** MCA III & MCA II

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research or Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	86	77	64	93	97
% Exceeds	57	29	29	66	58
Number of students tested	35	31	28	44	31
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	67	67	54	94	92
% Exceeds	47	8	23	63	54
Number of students tested	15	12	13	16	13
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	20	50	0	50	75
% Exceeds	20	17	0	25	0
Number of students tested	5	6	3	4	4
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0
% Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	100	0	0	0	100
% Exceeds	0	0	0	0	100
Number of students tested	1	2	0	0	1
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	0	100	0	0	0
% Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	100	0	0	0	0
% Exceeds	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	0	1	0	0
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds	85	81	67	93	97
% Exceeds	61	33	30	66	58
Number of students tested	33	27	27	44	30
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Meets plus % Exceeds					
% Exceeds					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** In 2011-2012 we used the MTAS as an alternate assessment for a special education student with Down's Syndrome. Blank spaces means "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	73	79	92	85
% Advanced	29	30	33	54	49
Number of students tested	34	30	42	37	33
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	3	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	43	64	61	88	70
% Advanced	7	14	22	41	50
Number of students tested	14	14	18	17	10
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	0	40	33	100
% Advanced	17	0	40	0	100
Number of students tested	6	3	5	3	1
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0			50	
% Advanced	0			100	
Number of students tested	1			2	
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50				50
% Advanced	0				0
Number of students tested	2				2
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		0			
Number of students tested		1			
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	72	79	91	87
% Advanced	32	31	33	54	52
Number of students tested	31	29	42	35	31
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** In 2012-2013 we used the MTAS (Minnesota Test of Academic Skills) as an alternate assessment for one child who has Down's Syndrome. Blank spaces indicate "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	70	58	78	68
% Advanced	26	16	8	43	46
Number of students tested	27	43	40	37	44
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	47	45	63	61
% Advanced	20	12	5	25	33
Number of students tested	10	17	20	8	18
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		0	67	50	50
% Advanced		0	33	50	0
Number of students tested		4	3	2	2
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			50	100	0
% Advanced			0	0	0
Number of students tested			2	1	1
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				50	
% Advanced				0	
Number of students tested				2	
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0				
% Advanced	0				
Number of students tested	1				
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					100
% Advanced					100

Number of students tested					2
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	70	58	80	68
% Advanced	27	16	8	47	44
Number of students tested	26	43	38	34	41
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Blank spaces indicate "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 6

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	83	64	93	81
% Advanced	48	34	33	52	43
Number of students tested	40	35	36	44	37
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	69	46	80	69
% Advanced	31	25	27	27	19
Number of students tested	13	16	11	15	16
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	0	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	1	1	2	3
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100	0	100	
% Advanced		100	0	0	
Number of students tested		1	1	1	
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			0		100
% Advanced			0		0
Number of students tested			2		1
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				100	
% Advanced				50	

Number of students tested				2	
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	82	70	93	81
% Advanced	48	32	36	54	44
Number of students tested	40	34	33	41	36
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Blank spaces indicate "Not Applicable"



**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 7

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	76	68	77	73
% Advanced	22	37	38	39	21
Number of students tested	36	38	40	39	33
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	58	75	53	53	64
% Advanced	21	38	18	20	9
Number of students tested	19	8	17	15	11
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		0		0	25
% Advanced		0		0	0
Number of students tested		1		4	4
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100		67	100	
% Advanced	0		0	100	
Number of students tested	1		3	1	
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		50		0	0
% Advanced		0		0	0
Number of students tested		2		1	2
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			100		

Number of students tested			1		
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	78	67	78	77
% Advanced	23	39	39	38	23
Number of students tested	35	36	36	37	31
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Blank spaces indicate "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** MCA III & MCA II

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 8

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	93	68	70	59
% Advanced	51	37	35	18	23
Number of students tested	35	43	37	33	44
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	2
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	83	60	67	52
% Advanced	36	17	13	8	17
Number of students tested	11	18	15	12	23
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		0	0	25	0
% Advanced		0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	0	1	3	4	3
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100	0		
% Advanced		50	0		
Number of students tested		2	1		
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50		0	50	
% Advanced	0		0	0	
Number of students tested	2		1		
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					100
% Advanced					50
Number of students tested					2
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100		100	
% Advanced		100		0	

Number of students tested		1		1	
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	93	69	70	57
% Advanced	55	35	34	20	21
Number of students tested	33	40	35	30	42
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Blank Spaces mean "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** MCA III & MCA II

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 10

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research or Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	90	91	87	82
% Advanced	36	43	54	32	53
Number of students tested	36	30	35	37	45
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	1	0	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	3	3	0	2
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	100	84	80	77
% Advanced	17	50	37	20	64
Number of students tested	12	10	19	15	22
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	67	100	33	0
% Advanced	0	33	100	0	0
Number of students tested	1	3	2	3	2
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100			
% Advanced	100	0			
Number of students tested	1	1			
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	50		100	100
% Advanced	0	100		0	100
Number of students tested	1	2		1	1
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			100		
Number of students tested			2		
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100		100	
% Advanced		0		0	

Number of students tested		1		1	
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	92	91	86	82
% Advanced	35	46	52	34	52
Number of students tested	34	26	33	35	44
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** In 2011-2012 we used the MTAS (Minnesota Test of Academic Skills) as an alternative assessment for one special education student who is Developmentally and Cognitively Delayed. In 2010-2011 we used the MTAS as an alternative assessment for one special education student who is Developmentally and Cognitively Delayed. Blank Spaces mean "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63	83	86	93	94
% Advanced	6	49	50	80	71
Number of students tested	35	31	28	44	31
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	3	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	75	92	94	92
% Advanced	7	33	31	81	54
Number of students tested	15	12	13	16	13
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	20	83	33	50	50
% Advanced	20	17	0	25	25
Number of students tested	5	6	3	4	4
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	50			100
% Advanced	0	0			100
Number of students tested	1	2			1
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		100			
Number of students tested		2			
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0		0		
% Advanced	0		0		
Number of students tested	1		1		
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	85	89	93	93
% Advanced	6	52	52	80	70
Number of students tested	33	27	27	44	30
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** In 2011-2012 we gave the MTAS (Minnesota Test of Academic Skills) to a special education student with Down's Syndrome. Blank spaces indicate "Not Applicable"



**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	37	87	86	84	85
% Advanced	9	40	41	51	55
Number of students tested	34	30	42	37	33
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	3	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	21	79	78	71	70
% Advanced	0	14	39	35	50
Number of students tested	14	14	18	17	10
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	17	0	40	33	0
% Advanced	0	0	40	0	0
Number of students tested	6	3	5	3	3
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0			50	
% Advanced	0			50	
Number of students tested	1			2	
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100				50
% Advanced	0				50
Number of students tested	2				2
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		0			
Number of students tested		1			
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	45	86	86	86	87
% Advanced	10	41	41	51	55
Number of students tested	31	29	42	35	31
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** In 2012-2013 we used an alternate assessment called the MTAS (Minnesota Test of Academic Skills) for a special education student who has Down's Syndrome. Blank spaces indicate "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	81	95	97	77
% Advanced	29	44	48	46	39
Number of students tested	28	43	40	37	44
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	71	95	88	67
% Advanced	18	35	20	38	28
Number of students tested	11	17	20	8	18
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	25	67	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	33	0	0
Number of students tested	1	4	3	2	2
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100	100	0
% Advanced			0	0	0
Number of students tested			2	1	1
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				100	
% Advanced				0	
Number of students tested				2	
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100				
% Advanced	0				
Number of students tested	1				
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					100
% Advanced					50

Number of students tested					2
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	81	95	97	78
% Advanced	30	44	50	50	39
Number of students tested	27	43	38	34	41
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Blank spaces indicate "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** MCAII & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 6

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	86	89	84	92
% Advanced	43	63	53	46	46
Number of students tested	42	35	36	44	37
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	3	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60	81	73	80	88
% Advanced	40	50	27	27	31
Number of students tested	15	16	11	15	16
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0	100	100	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	3	1	1	2	3
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100	0	100	
% Advanced		0	0	0	
Number of students tested		1	1	1	
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			50		100
% Advanced			0		0
Number of students tested			2		1
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				100	
% Advanced				50	

Number of students tested				2	
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	85	94	83	92
% Advanced	43	65	58	46	47
Number of students tested	42	34	33	41	36
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Blank spaces indicate "Not Applicable"

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 7

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	85	70	74	82
% Advanced	19	49	48	44	56
Number of students tested	37	39	40	39	33
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	3	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	58	79	59	53	82
% Advanced	11	33	29	33	46
Number of students tested	19	9	17	15	11
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	0		0	25
% Advanced	0	1		1	1
Number of students tested	1	2	0	4	4
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0		67	100	
% Advanced	0		0	100	
Number of students tested	1		3	1	
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		50		100	50
% Advanced		50		0	0
Number of students tested		2		1	2
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			100		

Number of students tested			1		
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	87	69	73	84
% Advanced	19	49	50	43	55
Number of students tested	36	37	36	37	31
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Blank Spaces indicate "Not Applicable"



**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** MCA II & MCA III

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 8

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2012

**Publisher:** American Institute for Research & Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	72	74	84	79	68
% Advanced	25	51	54	49	41
Number of students tested	36	43	37	33	44
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	2
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	61	67	75	57
% Advanced	18	28	47	58	30
Number of students tested	11	18	15	12	23
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	0	0	25	0
% Advanced	0	0	0	25	0
Number of students tested	1	1	3	4	3
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100	100		
% Advanced		0	100		
Number of students tested		2	1		
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50		100	50	
% Advanced	0		0	50	
Number of students tested	2		1	2	
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					100
% Advanced					100
Number of students tested					2
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		0			

Number of students tested		1			
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	73	83	80	67
% Advanced	27	55	54	50	38
Number of students tested	34	40	35	30	42
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Blank Spaces mean "Not Applicable"