

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

[X] Public or [] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Mrs. Kathy Knudsen

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

Official School Name Lakeridge Junior High School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 951 South 400 West

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

City Orem State UT Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 84058-6733

County Utah County State School Code Number* 406

Telephone 801-610-8134 Fax 801-227-2416

Web site/URL http://lakeridge.alpineschools.org/ E-mail kknudsen@alpinedistrict.org

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

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

Date _____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Vern Henshaw E-mail: vhenshaw@alpinedistrict.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Alpine District Tel. 801-610-8400

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. John C. Burton
(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):
- 53 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 12 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 9 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 74 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. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0
K	0	0	0
1	0	0	0
2	0	0	0
3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	0
7	219	216	435
8	186	192	378
9	196	193	389
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	601	601	1202

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 2 % Asian
 - 1 % Black or African American
 - 17 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 2 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 76 % White
 - 1 % 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: 9%

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

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	Answer
(1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	51
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	55
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	106
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	1215
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.087
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	9

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 8 %
94 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 14
 Specify non-English languages: Burmese; Cantonese; Chinese; Creole; English; Korean; Mandarin; Pohnpeian; Portugese; Punjabi; Russian; Samoan; Spanish; Tongan
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 48 %
 Total number students who qualify: 578

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: 11 %
137 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.

10 Autism	0 Orthopedic Impairment
3 Deafness	12 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	82 Specific Learning Disability
2 Emotional Disturbance	8 Speech or Language Impairment
3 Hearing Impairment	1 Traumatic Brain Injury
8 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
4 Multiple Disabilities	0 Developmentally Delayed

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

	Number of Staff
Administrators	3
Classroom teachers	38
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	10
Paraprofessionals	6
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	4

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 32:1

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

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	94%	0%	0%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

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

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

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

Yes_ No X

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

PART III – SUMMARY

Lakeridge Junior High in Orem, Utah, serves 1,200 students in grades 7 through 9. In 2002, it was one of the lower performing schools in the state of Utah, with only 55 percent of its students demonstrating proficiency in Math and 63 percent demonstrating proficiency in Language Arts on the end of level state assessment. The staff was frustrated with a shifting demographic that was changing from a predominantly middle to upper middle class Caucasian school, to a population with greater economic and ethnic diversity. Today nearly 50% of our students are on free or reduced lunch and 30% are minority.

In 2004, Lakeridge adopted the tenets of Professional Learning Communities as its school wide improvement model. The Lakeridge Junior High School Community Council and faculty adopted the mission to create high levels of learning for all students. Teachers and staff members worked together to create a positive learning culture with the belief that all students can learn. Our vision is to improve the capacity of adults through the processes and culture associated with Professional Learning Communities. We specifically focus our vision in the following areas: creating a collaborative culture, having a focus on student learning, and oriented to results. The following is a summary of how we have focused our efforts in these three areas.

Collaborative Culture: In 2004, we began to designate time for teachers to meet in teacher teams. The focus of our teacher team efforts was to collaborate and answer five questions: 1. What is it we want students to learn? 2. How are we going to know if they have learned? 3. How do we respond when students do not learn? 4. How do we extend students learning that have demonstrated mastery? 5. What is the best way to teach the curriculum?

We began by meeting once every two weeks for two hours and it evolved over time to meeting once a week for one hour. Over the years we have found that one hour a week was not enough and we began to search for other ways to have teams of teachers meet. We put a premium on the collaborative work of teacher teams. We pay teams of teachers to work over the summer for up to 5 days. The school also designates resources to pay for teacher substitutes if teams need a day to get together to analyze data. Our collaborative efforts focus on getting extremely clear on the standards and creating team developed common formative assessments on each skill we expect students to learn. The collective creation of these two products allows us to have productive conversations on students who are not learning and modify instruction based on learning results.

Focus on Student Learning: Lakeridge has created a systematic school-wide approach to intervention focused on students demonstrating proficiency on skills-based formative assessments. In 2005 Lakeridge moved from a seven period day, to an A/B eight period block schedule. This allowed us to give students struggling with school an extra period. For several years the focus of this time was homework related. Through the years this block of time has evolved to address specific learning gaps in student learning.

In 2007, we changed our schedule by reducing each period to 80 minutes and created a 30 minute block of time we call FLEX. This 30 minute block of time is a Tier 2 intervention for students that have not demonstrated proficiency on a team created, skill-based formative assessment. Every Tuesday through Friday, from 11:00-11:30, students who have not demonstrated proficiency return to their teacher to master a skill that they are not proficient in. Students who have demonstrated mastery on all skills are given a chance to enhance their learning through activities and extensions.

Results Orientation: Lakeridge puts a premium on effective Tier 1 instruction and highly values data from their own assessments. In 2006 Lakeridge began using a data specialist to help teams of teachers analyze data. For the first three years the focus of our data analysis was end-of-level state assessments. Two thousand nine marked a critical year for the Lakeridge faculty because we changed from using end of level assessment data to analyzing data from our own assessments. Our data specialist now helps teams of teachers gather data from their assessments and delivers them in an easy-to-understand graph form. By analyzing data from our assessments we can determine where our students are not learning and improve

teacher instruction based on the specific skills that are low. We analyze data, by the teacher and by the skill, to set goals and improve instruction.

Recognition: Lakeridge faculty and staff have received many honors for the work that resulted in increased learning for the students we serve. Lakeridge received the “Best of State” award for K-12 public and private schools in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2012, and 2013. Lakeridge was designated a national model school for professional learning communities by Solution Tree. We were highlighted in a chapter of the book, *Raising the Bar and Closing the Gap: Whatever it Takes* by Richard DuFour and others. Lakeridge regularly hosts visitors from 111 schools and 17 different states who come to learn the Lakeridge way. Faculty members regularly present at national conferences associated with Professional Learning Communities.

Lakeridge has built a system of coherence aimed at the success of each individual student. We are in a mode of constant learning and improvement. Although the success of Lakeridge is evident in the data, we are constantly in a cycle of improvement by analyzing our data to determine where we need to improve next.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Lakeridge Junior High School has increased proficiency in Language Arts and Math over the past five years. Proficiency is defined as students passing state end of level tests. Lakeridge Junior High School has met state standards for No Child Left Behind in each of the past five years. Traditionally the state accountability system was based on pass rate of the end of level state assessments. In order to pass NCLB the school had to maintain or increase proficiency rates in forty separate categories. Lakeridge has met their School Improvement goals in each of the last five years.

During the last decade, Lakeridge has been involved in a change process and we have adopted the principles and processes associated with Professional Learning Communities. As we increased our capacity to function as a PLC, we have seen significant and continuous increases in proficiency. At the beginning of the change process, Lakeridge experienced dramatic increases in proficiency, and we continue to see steady increases as we get better and better at PLCs. This can be attributed to the strength of our grade level teams, the effectiveness of collaboration, the ability to focus on the data and quickly intervene for students who need additional time and support, and the willingness of our staff to make instructional changes based on data.

In the beginning of our school improvement efforts, Lakeridge saw dramatic gains in Language Arts proficiency rates, experiencing over 20% increase. Over the past five years we have continued to see consistent increases in overall proficiency and now have 93% of our students proficient. The recent growth is mostly due to increases in the proficiency of our Hispanic students (increased from 74% to 87%) and Special Education students (increase from 52% to 69%). The most significant increases over the past five years took place with our 8th grade team which saw an increase in their overall pass rate move from 88% to 96%. The 8th grade team also experienced an increase in Hispanic proficiency (78% to 93%) and Special Education proficiency (57% to 82%).

The data associated with our math department exhibits the strength of the collaborative process at Lakeridge Junior High School. During the initial years of the change process, our math department saw an increase of over 20% in student proficiency, raising our mathematics pass rate to 81% in 2008. In 2009, the State of Utah implemented a new, more rigorous, standard for passing the end of level assessment and our pass rate dropped to 63%. Lakeridge collaboratively addressed the new standards and focused on adjusting our rigor and instructional practices. Over the past four years, Lakeridge has experienced the same rate of increase that we experienced in the early years. This past year, Lakeridge produced our highest pass rate in school history when 92% of our students passed the end of level state math assessment. Significant to note is the increase of our Hispanic pass rate over the past five years going from 40% to 83%, and our Special Education students from 51% to 69%.

An event that had a significant impact on student achievement was the implementation of an intervention system called FLEX. This 30 minute daily block of time has empowered teachers to intervene in a timely way if students are experiencing difficulty learning specific concepts, as determined through teacher created formative assessments. The FLEX period has also empowered students to take control of their own learning and build academic confidence.

Collaboration throughout the school is focused on student achievement and growth. Teachers are becoming experts in using the data to guide instruction. Collaboratively analyzing data has allowed the faculty to reflect on school and teacher practices associated with increasing student learning. These reflective practices have resulted in dramatic increases in teacher capacity. We have found that our students' ability to demonstrate proficiency is dependent on our teachers' ability to learn and change practices.

In 2012 the state instituted a new accountability model, the Utah Comprehensive Accountability System (UCAS), which awards schools up to 300 points for proficiency and an additional 300 points for student

growth. Lakeridge has since scored a 567 and 546, making it the highest scoring middle level school in the state. This past year the state also instituted a school grading system, and Lakeridge received an A grade.

Although Lakeridge is pleased with the results we have experienced over the years, we are constantly improving. While we have seen significant improvements in the percentage of our Special Education students demonstrating proficiency, there is still a gap we are addressing through more targeted and purposeful interventions.

The increases we have experienced are the result of a focused collaborative culture, an effective use of skills-based common formative assessments, an intensive intervention system, and the increase in teacher capacity through analyzing data and making changes. All of these elements have contributed to the improvements we have made, and will continue to make.

2. Using Assessment Results:

At the heart of the systemic approach to data analysis at Lakeridge Junior High School is our data specialist. The data specialist has three primary responsibilities: gathering data from our six feeder elementary schools, analyzing data from state end of level assessments, and gathering and analyzing data from teacher team's own formative and summative assessments. Her role is to get data in the hands of groups in the school, who utilize the data to identify strengths and areas in need of improvement.

Data screened from our incoming feeder schools is used to identify students missing the prerequisite skills necessary to be successful at the junior high school, specifically in Language Arts/Reading and Math. Students found to be missing significant prerequisite skills are given additional time and support within the school day to close the gaps in their learning.

We use the elementary schools' Direct Reading Assessment scores and the end of level state assessment scores in Language Arts to determine those students who need additional support. Students below level are brought in over the summer to have five consecutive days of summer school followed by a once a week session throughout the summer. At the beginning of the school year we administer another reading assessment. We also utilize state Direct Writing Assessment scores to determine which students need help in writing. Students found to be below level in reading or writing will be given an additional reading/writing course targeted at getting students on level with their peers.

We use end of level state assessment scores in Math to determine which students are missing prerequisite skills. Students found below level will be given an additional math class focused on remediating those prerequisite skills that are necessary for the student to be successful and on grade level.

Our data specialist also gathers data from our own formative and summative assessments. A technology tool (MasteryConnect) is utilized by the data specialist to access results from our assessments in a very timely way. Data is used to determine which students have mastered a skill and which students did not. Students who failed a formative assessment in any class are given additional time and support during our Tier 2 FLEX intervention period.

Data gathered through MasteryConnect is put into simplified terms and graphs so it is easily analyzed by teams of teachers during Monday collaboration periods to determine areas where Tier 1 instruction needs to improve. Once the teacher teams identify skills they need to improve on, they redesign instructional methods to enhance their instruction. Goals for improvement are created with a focus on improving instruction for the identified skill. Data is tracked from year to year to determine if learning goals were met on identified target skills.

Data from our own assessments is also disaggregated by subgroups. This allows us to constantly monitor how our low income, Special Education, Hispanic, and English Language Learners are doing in comparison with the rest of the school.

Our data specialist utilizes data from our end of level state assessments in Math, Language Arts, Science and Writing. Data from the end of level state assessments is primarily used to make sure that our curriculum is in alignment with the state core and that we are teaching to a proper level of rigor throughout the year. If areas of concern are identified on any of the end of level state assessments, adjustments are made to give additional support to teachers in the identified areas. Extra efforts are made to continually monitor the learning gaps that may exist in all of our students and those students classified in the areas of low income, Special Education, Hispanic, and English Language Learners.

End of level state assessment data is the primary source we use when showing accountability to our stakeholders. A Stakeholder's Report is compiled annually to report our school data to parents, business owners, politicians, and the Board of Education. In the Stakeholder's Report we help school community understand our areas of strength and weakness and communicate to them how we intend to improve on our identified areas of concern.

Parents receive feedback on their students formally at our Student Led Conferences twice each year. Parents and students also have access to Skyward, our student information system, which allows access to grades and progress at any time. Teachers are required to regularly update the information in the system and students receive report cards every Tuesday through Friday in conjunction with our FLEX intervention model. Receiving their reports cards daily helps students to continually be aware of their own learning and where additional time and support is needed.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Lakeridge has become a state and national model for school improvement through the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process. We have been very charitable with our time to share the lessons we have learned over the years. Lakeridge has been visited by 111 schools from 17 states over the years and schools from 31 of Utah's 41 school districts have visited. We feel it is a privilege and honor to share what we have learned with others. We endeavor to share in three ways: hosting schools, putting our work in writing, and presenting at conferences.

Lakeridge offers three days a year when schools are invited to visit. On these occasions we share our vision of PLC's, invite visitors to meet with faculty members to observe collaborative work, help them understand our approach to intervention, show our Tier 2 intervention (FLEX) in action, and present our system for gathering and analyzing school data to improve instruction and set goals.

In addition to hosting schools, we shared our work on the webpage allthingsplc.info, we were featured in a chapter in the book, *Raising the Bar and Closing the Gap: Whatever it Takes by Solution Tree*, and our work has been highlighted in several magazine publications.

Members of the Lakeridge faculty have presented at many conferences, both locally and nationally. Our teachers are regularly used in district training as examples of great teams. Our science department has presented at state conferences demonstrating how to conduct successful student led conferences. Our Math Department has been invited to demonstrate their work in many district trainings throughout the state, as well as showing their work in PLC summits hosted by Solution Tree. Administration has presented regularly at national PLC conferences, highlighting Lakeridge's approach to formative assessment, intervention, data analysis, and goal setting.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Our School Community Council is a group of parents and educators that have been elected to oversee our school improvement plan and address our greatest areas of academic need.

The school's approach with the council is that of shared governance. The council analyzes the school's academic data and oversees around \$60,000 in funds that are employed to support the school improvement plan in addressing our critical academic needs. The council has designated funds for summer

collaboration, conference attendance, a data analysis system (MasteryConnect), team leader stipends, an aide to gather data and run our intervention model, and other projects as identified through the data analysis process.

The Community Council creates a yearly stakeholders report to inform parents of the school data, areas of need identified by the data, and how money will be spent to help address areas of academic concern.

We have a strong PTSA that encourages volunteerism. The PTSA takes on the stewardship of social and emotional safety. They head up the work on such events as Red Ribbon Week (drug and violence free), White Ribbon Week (anti-pornography), career days in conjunction with our university partners, and creating partnerships with business organizations. The PTSA also puts out a monthly e-newsletter to keep parents informed about what is going on at the school and how they can get involved.

An area of focus our community has put special efforts into is engaging is our Hispanic parents. We are 25% Hispanic, but found little involvement from our Hispanic students and parents. To address this, we hired a diversity specialist to bridge the gap with our Hispanic Community. This led to the start of a Hispanic parent group where we do trainings on the United States Education System and hear specific concerns these parents have. This group elects a representative to attend PTSA and Community Council meetings. We have seen great success come from our efforts in engaging our Hispanic Community.

Our Hispanic students were also underrepresented in school leadership and a group called Latinos in Action was created to address this need. This group is enrolled in a leadership class with a focus on service. We train our students how to lead others, then bus them to our elementary feeder schools to read to our younger Hispanic students and be examples for them. Results of these efforts with our Hispanic students have been incredible.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The curriculum taught at Lakeridge Junior High School is based on the Utah State Core Curriculum. Lakeridge values both core classes and electives as essential courses in education. Lakeridge highly values Career and College Readiness Standards and provides a wide variety of course offerings in both the core and elective areas to provide access to the skills necessary for college entrance or skill certification. The teacher team for each subject area unpacks the state standards to create student friendly targets. Teacher teams take those learning targets and create common formative assessments that meet the desired rigor level.

Reading is taught within the Language Arts courses for all students with an emphasis on requiring students to demonstrate competency in skills that have been determined to raise reading ability. Tiered levels of supports are provided for students that are not highly proficient in reading. Historically, those students that were considered proficient, but not highly proficient, were provided with a general reading class that has put an emphasis on gaining academic reading skills. Students scoring below proficient are provided with a reading/writing course aimed at teaching students how to read.

About forty students each year test into our Gifted and Talented course. This is an integrated course with a curriculum addressing language arts, history, art, and reading. Our Gifted and Talented course serves students in 7th and 8th grade. Many of the students enrolled in the Gifted and Talented course will also enroll in our 9th grade honors English course and our 9th grade AP World Geography course. Our AP Geography course has teams that compete for Model United Nations and Mock Trial. The AP class also puts a heavy emphasis on sustainability by holding an annual two day sustainability conference.

Students not involved in the Gifted and Talented course will take a 7th grade Utah History course which we have integrated over the years with a junior high Success and Leadership course. This course puts an emphasis on teaching students how to be successful in junior high school and teaches them basic leadership skills with an emphasis on working in groups. US History is working in conjunction with English 8 to improve reading, writing, and content knowledge. All 9th graders take World Geography and World Civilizations. In the middle of the year all 9th graders participate in a school wide Model United Nations day integrating history, speech, debate, and writing.

We have found that English Language Learners (ELL) are successful with grade level curriculum, when given the appropriate accommodations. English Language Learners have access to all accommodations associated with the school wide intervention system. In addition, ELL students are provided with four levels of support for language acquisition.

The state has adopted the international integrated approach to Math. Seventh graders take Intermediate 1; Eighth graders take Intermediate 2; Ninth graders take Secondary 1. An honors track is also within this curriculum putting an emphasis on students taking AP Calculus in their later high school years. Science courses include 7th grade Integrated Science and 8th grade Physical Science. Ninth graders have two science courses to choose from, including Earth Systems and Biology. The science curriculum places an emphasis on hands-on activities and labs which require both basic science skills and higher level processing skills.

The Lakeridge foreign language department has a curriculum that offers Spanish 1, 2, 3, and 4. Many of the Lakeridge students in Spanish 4 challenge the AP test their 9th grade year. We also offer French 1, 2, and 3.

Each 7th grade student at Lakeridge is enrolled in four quarter courses to introduce them to Career and Technical Education (CTE). These students rotate between Basic Computers, Business, Family and Consumer Sciences (FACS) and Technology (pre-engineering). Our 8th grade students can choose elective courses that extend their 7th grade learning in any of four areas listed above, along with a Digital Literacy. 9th grade students are required to complete a computer course for high school graduation. They may choose between Exploring Computer Science, or Computer Technology. Each student at Lakeridge Junior High

takes a Physical Education course during 7th, 8th, and 9th year. Every 8th grade student is also enrolled in health.

The students at Lakeridge also have a wide variety of courses they can take in the area of the arts. These include three years of drama highlighted by a school musical and school play. Three levels of Orchestra and Band. We also have many different choir options for students to be a part. We also offer beginning, intermediate, and advanced art courses.

2. Reading/English:

The Lakeridge English Department is ensuring that all students master core concepts. They teach each concept and use a system of assessment-based interventions to ensure learning and growth. The department works methodically to progress students through Bloom's Taxonomy with a gradual release of responsibility. If students fail to demonstrate mastery of any skill, teachers give them additional time and instruction until they achieve mastery. As a result, the English department has consistently ranked in the top of the district despite having the second lowest socioeconomic population, one of the largest Hispanic populations, and the highest percentage of Special Education students. They have topped the district in annual improvement scores.

Teachers focus on writing, giving feedback through machine and human scoring. Automated essay scoring gives students formative feedback allowing them to revise and resubmit until they meet class and team goals. The teacher sets whole-class benchmarks and then allows teams to set additional team goals. After students meet their goals, they help struggling team members. The human grader uses a diagnostic rubric to provide students actionable feedback on specific rubric requirements. Teachers then transcribe those scores into histograms where they compare student performance skill by skill to improve instruction. This focus on writing has led Lakeridge students to the highest pass-rate, the smallest achievement gaps, and the highest scores in all six categories of the state Direct Writing Assessment district-wide.

If students fail to demonstrate competency in literacy, teachers assign them an extra reading class with a highly qualified teacher. The teacher identifies literacy skills students lack and then provides focused instruction to help students improve and demonstrate proficiency. This focused intervention has improved student performance from a 6% to an 86% pass-rate, and students who have completed this program continue to pass for years ahead without additional intervention.

Last, every Special Education student is guaranteed access to highly qualified and successful English teachers in addition to Special Education teachers. Special Education students receive instruction from a mainstream teacher in a co-taught setting. Then they receive additional supporting instruction from the Special Education teacher during a separate class. Every 8th grade Special Education student receives co-taught instruction in an inclusion setting. Over the past five years the Special Education pass-rate has improved from 52% to 69%.

3. Mathematics:

The State of Utah adopted the Common Core Standards in 2012. These standards are leveraged by the Lakeridge Junior High math team to develop fundamental learning targets as the basis of curriculum and assessment. The math team works collaboratively to establish core-based learning targets in each grade level course. The team uses these targets to build a series of formative and summative common assessments that are given to students to guarantee the curriculum taught in each classroom and ensure that each student is able to demonstrate learning for each of the targets outlined by the team.

The data from common formative assessments is used to identify students that do not meet proficiency in the learning targets, and to inform the teacher on the quality of Tier 1 instruction. If a student is not able to demonstrate proficiency for each target, the teacher will intervene in the learning process by providing more time and instruction for the student. If less than 80% of the class does not demonstrate proficiency on a

formative assessment, the teacher alters Tier 1 instruction by re-teaching the target and re-assessing for learning.

The math team ensures that each math student has a solid foundation in the mathematical skills required in each course. The teacher then progresses students through higher level thinking problems that are assessed through rubrics and student presentations. This is achieved by requiring students to explain and justify their reasoning.

We have created two tiers of additional support classes that address the different needs of our struggling students. In the first tier, students who lack support structures at home, for activities such as homework, are given an additional class period with a math aide who can answer questions and provide practice time to move the student to mastery. The second tier is for students lacking foundational skills. They are provided an additional class with a highly qualified math teacher who provides additional math instruction to close learning gaps and provide support for learning in grade level courses.

Students who demonstrate above grade level aptitude in mathematics are given the option to take math courses that move at accelerated rates. These courses provide more rigorous curriculums that challenge the high performing math student. Ultimately students can be advanced a full grade level above their peers. AP courses are then available earlier, and more frequently, providing greater access to college and careers upon graduation.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Several years ago the Lakeridge Community Council, in conjunction with our counseling department, had a conversation about what students need to be competitive on college applications. Three areas of emphasis were highlighted: challenging academic courses, leadership opportunities, and service opportunities. As we looked at what we offered, we felt our academic offerings were quite strong, but very few students were getting opportunities for leadership and service. Our Hispanic students in particular were underrepresented in this area. This led us to creating a specific curriculum emphasizing and providing real experiences for our students in the areas of leadership and service.

In 7th grade all of our students take a course called Success and Leadership. This course puts an emphasis on helping students be successful in junior high school, and developing leadership skills of their own by having them work in teams to achieve academic success. Each course places a 9th grade mentor in the class to be an example for the students.

In 8th grade students that have demonstrated an ability to lead can apply to be part of our leadership course. This course teaches students how to lead one person. The curriculum is focused on teaching students how to listen, love, and invite. Mentor students are then matched up with at-risk 7th grade students in an attempt to guide them to success.

Utilizing the skills they have gained through their 8th grade leadership course, 9th grade students can enroll as academic mentors for one of our at-risk courses, or as support to our regular core area teachers.

We also put a heavy emphasis in leadership for our Hispanic students. Ninth grade Hispanic students have the opportunity to enroll in Junior Latinos in Action. This course has a curriculum that teaches qualifying Hispanic students leadership skills, which they demonstrate as they work with students in reading.

Students are then bussed to feeder elementary schools to mentor English Language Learners and other Hispanic students, specifically in the area of reading. Latinos in Action also participate in several community service projects throughout the year, and have the opportunity to attend a conference each year that educates them on how to access college.

Part of our leadership and service emphasis has also been our National Junior Honor Society in which approximately 175 students enroll each year. Students must have a 3.8 GPA to be eligible. The National Junior Honor Society completes several community service projects during the school year.

5. Instructional Methods:

Lakeridge Junior High School teachers work together to differentiate and provide comprehensive curriculum for all students. Teachers collaborate each week comparing results of student learning. By comparing data, teachers have been able to have conversations about the best instructional methodology to increase student learning. Teachers modify instruction based on what they learn through the collaborative process. This focus on data analysis has improved Tier 1 instruction across all curricular areas. It has brought an awareness to needs of students who are at-risk and we subsequently differentiate our approach to their learning needs.

Our system of intervention has allowed us to differentiate instruction at a very personal level. Students found below level in math and language arts are provided a daily course which allows for prerequisite skills to be addressed. The goal of this intervention is to fill in learning gaps so students can be successful in Tier 1 instruction. We have found great success by differentiating instruction for the learning needs of these students.

One of the best things that Lakeridge implemented to help differentiate for the individual learning needs of students was FLEX time. Through our system of frequent formative assessments teachers are able to quickly identify students that need additional time and support on specific learning targets. Students found not proficient on a learning target return to their teacher for additional time and support until the target is reached. We have found that each of our 1200 students will need additional time and support on certain learning targets. This 30 minute block of time has allowed us to differentiate instruction based on individual student needs.

Special Education students receive a daily course in math and language arts. Students with learning disabilities are expected to learn at the same level as all other students in the school. We differentiate for their needs through the same processes as above (formative assessment and FLEX), with an emphasis on accommodations identified in the IEP. Regular core area teachers and Special Education teachers consistently collaborate together, teach together, and analyze data together in an effort to differentiate for the learning needs of our Special Education population.

6. Professional Development:

We, as a group of educators, are committed to working collaboratively in an ongoing process of collective inquiry and action research in order to achieve better results for the students we serve. We operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job embedded learning for educators. The center of job embedded professional development is the collaborative conversations at the team level. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) are the driving force behind our professional development.

Each department has a collaborative team leader (CTL). This group of leaders collectively make up our leadership team. The leadership team regularly meets to discuss how effective our PLC is operating. We specifically discuss how our teams are doing in the following four areas: 1. Identifying the essential standards students must learn; 2. Creating skills based common formative assessments based around the essential standards; 3. Discussing students that are not learning and intervening for them by the student, by the skill; 4. Analyzing the data from our formative assessments, to identify areas, by the teacher and by the skill, where instruction can improve and goals are set.

Every year we send a group or several groups of teachers to national PLC conferences to deepen our understanding of how to improve our processes aimed at improving the capacity of adults through collaborative conversations. We then pass that information on to our teachers during one of our three professional development days. Our focus on those three days is to deepen our understanding of PLC's

faculty wide so that continuous job embedded professional development takes place daily throughout the school year, instead of only on professional development days appointed by the district.

We have found that the conversations associated with unpacking standards and creating assessments aligned with those standards, are the best tool for increasing our capacity to deliver quality, concentrated instruction. We have learned that having conversations centered around intervention for students who are not learning has increased our capacity to differentiate instruction and develop school-wide systems of support that meet the needs of all students. We have found that analyzing and comparing data from our own assessments has the pinpointed areas where we can improve instruction in a purposeful and meaningful way. This approach to professional development has been critical to the overall success of the school. Students learn differently at Lakeridge because the capacity of the adults is continually increasing.

7. School Leadership

The leadership of Lakeridge Junior High School consists of the principal and two assistant principals who work together to assess and oversee the overall culture of our school and keep the focus on student learning. This team also incorporates and supervises four key teams: the Community Council, the Leadership Team, Teacher teams, and the Intervention Team.

The school community council oversees the school improvement plan by monitoring student data and distributing financial resources aimed at improving areas the deemed in critical need. The community council consists of 10 parents and 8 faculty members. Team leaders report yearly to the community council on their collaborative work.

The Leadership Team consists of the principal and the Collaborative Team Leaders of each department in the school. This team oversees the culture of the school and makes sure it is focused on student learning. They work to help staff members reach consensus on issues related to school improvement. This group is also over professional development in the school and makes sure that teacher teams receive the training, time, and resources necessary to have high levels of conversation aimed at increasing student learning. The leadership team also analyzes the effectiveness of Tier 2 intervention in the school and looks to modify interventions where needed.

The teacher team carries out the work of Professional Learning Communities (PLC). We view them as leaders of learners. They focus on getting clear on their learning targets with aligned formative assessments. They are responsible for high level Tier 1 instruction and analyze data to ensure quality instruction. Teacher teams are also responsible for providing effective Tier 2 interventions.

The fourth team is the Intervention Team. This team consists of all administrators, counselors, attendance secretaries, and tracking aides. Their key responsibility is to discuss students related to the Tier 3 issues of attendance, behavior, reading, writing, numeracy, and language learners. They track the data on these students and the effectiveness of Tier 3 interventions. They make sure the proper support is available to each of these students.

The leadership of each of these teams in the school creates a coherent system of support for teachers to increase their capacity to help students be effective. We have been on the cutting edge of the work associated with Professional Learning Communities and have seen dramatic increases in student learning. Much of this has come through the leadership of these four teams.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

All Students Tested/Grade: 7

Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Test: Math 7 / Intermediate 1

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	82	80	58	32
% Advanced	73	38	41	18	19
Number of students tested	397	158	157	72	32
Percent of total students tested	46	15	15	7	3
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	80	81	58	31
% Advanced	73	38	41	18	19
Number of students tested	198	104	106	47	16
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	59	60	47	32
% Advanced	63	37	39	15	25
Number of students tested	58	44	55	34	31
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	77	78	56	33
% Advanced	57	28	39	19	25
Number of students tested	90	57	49	32	12
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or					

Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	87	84	62	33
% Advanced	79	43	44	19	17
Number of students tested	280	83	95	37	18
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 7
Publisher: Utah Office of Education

Test: Pre-Algebra / Math 7
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	87	83	67	61
% Advanced	68	65	59	40	29
Number of students tested	404	382	335	375	433
Percent of total students tested	47	35	31	34	39
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	83	79	57	51
% Advanced	57	58	52	28	19
Number of students tested	168	197	188	206	229
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	34	53	43	31	33
% Advanced	22	24	14	17	11
Number of students tested	32	55	49	48	46
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	80	66	50	41
% Advanced	46	52	38	24	17
Number of students tested	81	83	92	104	120
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	91	89	75	69
% Advanced	76	71	68	47	35
Number of students tested	291	279	226	249	286
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: In 2012 Pre-Algebra was not a grade level test. It was discontinued after the adoption of the common core state standards. In 2013 the State of Utah implemented the 7th grade math test which is a grade level test. This test is the closest comparison to the Algebra 1 test.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 8
Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Test: Algebra 1 / 8th Grade Math
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	95	92	82	52
% Advanced	68	77	56	39	14
Number of students tested	404	299	322	351	407
Percent of total students tested	47	28	30	32	37
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	92	89	75	42
% Advanced	57	70	52	27	10
Number of students tested	168	132	128	142	153
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	34	80	89	67	24
% Advanced	22	40	11	27	4
Number of students tested	32	5	9	15	25
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	85	88	63	32
% Advanced	46	64	38	13	9
Number of students tested	81	55	64	63	65
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	98	93	87	57
% Advanced	76	80	61	45	14
Number of students tested	291	220	242	263	322
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: In 2012 Algebra 1, not grade level test, was discontinued after the adoption of the common core state standards. In 2013 the State of Utah implemented the 8th grade math test, a grade level test. This test is the closest comparison to the Algebra 1 test.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 8
Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Test: Geometry
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		98	99	95	91
% Advanced		84	80	66	60
Number of students tested		186	214	242	236
Percent of total students tested		17	20	22	21
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment		0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		96	100	94	84
% Advanced		71	74	67	43
Number of students tested		52	66	69	61
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		83	100	100	100
% Advanced		83	83	67	80
Number of students tested		6	6	6	5
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		95	95	100	72
% Advanced		53	60	62	28
Number of students tested		19	20	21	18
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		98	99	95	94
% Advanced		88	82	66	64
Number of students tested		156	181	208	195
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The geometry test was discontinued after 2012 when the integrated model of Common Core State Standards was adopted.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 9
Publisher: Utah Office of Education

Test: Algebra 2
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	98	91	
% Advanced	86	71	57	20	
Number of students tested	46	54	50	57	
Percent of total students tested	5	5	5	5	
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	94	93	60	
% Advanced	93	81	78	46	
Number of students tested	7	17	14	15	
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	100	100	
% Advanced	86	71	50	50	
Number of students tested	1	1	2	2	
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	98	84	
% Advanced	93	86	78	47	
Number of students tested	43	50	46	45	
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The State of Utah implemented a state-wide Algebra 2 test in 2009. When the integrated model of CCSS was implemented, the State of Utah did not test 9th grade students. However, the one exception is our accelerated 9th Grade Math students. Students took the Algebra 2 test which is normally administered to grade 10-12 students.

Also, there is no data for 2008-09 because this was the first year of the test.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 7
Publisher: Utah Office of Education

Test: Lang 7
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	93	87	87	89
% Advanced	67	62	67	65	64
Number of students tested	398	425	383	375	403
Percent of total students tested	33	36	33	32	35
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	90	80	81	84
% Advanced	55	50	54	52	56
Number of students tested	196	201	202	183	182
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	61	64	56	52	55
% Advanced	33	20	24	22	33
Number of students tested	57	50	59	46	49
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	83	76	73	76
% Advanced	43	40	45	41	40
Number of students tested	89	86	74	93	88
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	96	91	92	93
% Advanced	76	69	73	74	72
Number of students tested	282	306	286	265	287
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 8
Publisher: Utah Office of Education

Test: Direct Writing Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	96	89	90	96
% Advanced	75	61	37	37	58
Number of students tested	412	378	370	390	363
Percent of total students tested	98	96	96	94	97
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	93	84	75	92
% Advanced	56	31	31	51	51
Number of students tested	171	192	177	177	112
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	78	62	74	63
% Advanced	34	24	10	14	17
Number of students tested	38	41	39	43	24
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	94	80	82	86
% Advanced	66	51	25	28	33
Number of students tested	76	72	93	80	60
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	96	92	91	98
% Advanced	77	62	41	39	62
Number of students tested	305	280	261	281	276
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 8
Publisher: Utah Office of Education

Test: Lang 8
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	95	96	93	88
% Advanced	83	82	78	76	69
Number of students tested	417	386	372	394	395
Percent of total students tested	35	32	33	34	34
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	93	94	90	83
% Advanced	73	72	72	67	56
Number of students tested	176	195	178	176	161
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	70	79	67	57
% Advanced	43	38	32	36	29
Number of students tested	44	47	47	39	35
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	95	93	87	78
% Advanced	71	68	60	59	49
Number of students tested	84	81	86	82	72
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	96	97	95	91
% Advanced	86	86	85	82	74
Number of students tested	300	276	261	283	297
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 9
Publisher: Utah Office of Education

Test: Lang 9
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93	95	93	87	90
% Advanced	72	74	73	55	64
Number of students tested	380	378	389	401	366
Percent of total students tested	32	32	34	34	31
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	93	87	77	92
% Advanced	62	63	61	40	43
Number of students tested	168	181	165	164	129
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	65	73	53	40	39
% Advanced	27	37	20	17	14
Number of students tested	37	41	30	42	28
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	90	94	70	67
% Advanced	55	50	55	30	26
Number of students tested	78	92	82	70	58
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	96	96	90	94
% Advanced	78	73	79	61	71
Number of students tested	272	267	281	300	283
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: