

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 Dr. Lynette Riggs

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

Official School Name Lincoln Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 90 South Center Street

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

City Hyrum State UT Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 84319-1222

County Cache County State School Code Number* _____

Telephone 435-245-6442 Fax 435-245-4411

Web site/URL http://www.ccsdut.org/Lincoln.cfm E-mail lynette.riggs@ccsdut.org

Facebook
Page www.facebook.com/pages/Lincoln-Elementary-School/162109643818369 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. Steven Norton E-mail: Steve.Norton@ccsdut.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Cache District Tel. 435-752-3925

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. Bart Baird
(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):
- 16 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 6 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 3 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 25 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. 8 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 | 46 | 34 | 80 |
| 1 | 38 | 32 | 70 |
| 2 | 38 | 39 | 77 |
| 3 | 31 | 30 | 61 |
| 4 | 38 | 37 | 75 |
| 5 | 44 | 36 | 80 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Students | 235 | 208 | 443 |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 1 % Asian
 - 1 % Black or African American
 - 26 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 71 % White
 - 0 % Two or more races
 - 100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 16%

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 | 39 |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year | 26 |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 65 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 417 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.156 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 16 |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 15 %
62 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 2
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish
Burmese
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 56 %
 Total number students who qualify: 249

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: 16 %
72 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.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 0 Autism | 0 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 0 Deafness | 3 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 31 Specific Learning Disability |
| 2 Emotional Disturbance | 32 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 Hearing Impairment | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 0 Mental Retardation | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 1 Multiple Disabilities | 3 Developmentally Delayed |

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

| | Number of Staff |
|---|------------------------|
| Administrators | 1 |
| Classroom teachers | 16 |
| Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc. | 7 |
| Paraprofessionals | 29 |
| Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc. | 1 |

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 28:1

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% | 96% | 95% | 95% | 96% |
| High school graduation rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

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

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

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

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

Yes_ No X

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

PART III – SUMMARY

Mission Statement:

Lincoln Elementary School’s mission is to prepare students to function effectively in a global, technological society as competent, productive, caring, and responsible individuals. To function effectively, students must

- Master fundamental academic, technological, and social skills
- Demonstrate problem-solving skills
- Develop a strong sense of self-efficacy
- Become self-directed, creative, lifelong learners

Motto:

Lincoln leopards are RESPONSIBLE, RESPECTFUL, RESILIENT, and REMARKABLE!

Traditions, milestones, and nature of the community and students served:

Lincoln Elementary School has a long, rich heritage. In 1882, an “Old Academy” building, an edifice first meant to house an LDS (Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints) school, was planned and built. It was a large sandstone rock structure located midway through the block on the east side of the Hyrum City Square. The school housed both grade school and high school students until 1911. That year, the younger students received a building of their own on the same lot. A red brick, three-story school was completed with eleven classrooms to serve grades one through eight. The building was officially dedicated on February 12, 1912 and named “Lincoln School” after Abraham Lincoln.

In 1916, the teenage students moved from the Old Academy to a grand, new building, South Cache High School, which was located farther west at the end of Main Street where South Cache Middle School’s campus is located today. Though the Old Academy structure was eventually torn down, it continued to serve. The townspeople repurposed the beautiful old rocks to create foundations for new homes and businesses throughout the area.

Much has changed since 1911. Classroom wings were added and the original three-story core was razed. We now have a turquoise hall, orange areas, and mauve wings. Inside that cacophony of color, thousands of children have grown up in Lincoln’s arms, and hundreds of teaching careers have begun and culminated here.

Even the face of the community has changed. No longer is Hyrum a self-sufficient town comprised mostly of LDS pioneers, pioneers whose names often began with “Mc-“ or ended in “-sen” or “-son.” The farming/ranching community has morphed into a community of hourly-paid workers who commute elsewhere for jobs. A local meat packing plant has attracted a diverse population of workers; the older homes have become rental units; and property values have dipped. Hyrum’s once-stable population now ebbs and flows--or jolts dramatically, as when the meat packing plant was raided by ICE (Immigration and Customs Enforcement) on December 12th, 2006.

School strengths and accomplishments:

No Child Left Behind and AYP accountability was created just in time for Lincoln. Though the histories and needs of Lincoln’s children had changed, many educational practices had not. Far more children began kindergarten unprepared; far more came needing to learn English; far more came from impoverished homes. The educational status quo did not work anymore for Lincoln’s new children.

A series of changes resulted, which involved district revisioning, changes in school leadership, changes in staff, and a resultant turnaround in school teaching/learning paradigms. In an approximate eight-year period, Lincoln has become student-focused, data-driven, and bent on success. In eight years, the Lincoln staff has found ways to put aside differences, to unite as an educational family, and to aggressively go after the needs of every individual child in this school. The school functions as a single organism now--aligned and articulated. The ESL teachers teach the English language AND reading, writing, and math proficiency. The speech teacher teaches articulation AND language, reading, and writing; the Special Educator teaches basic skills AND supports the core curriculum of every grade level. Highly trained aides assist with reading, writing, language, and math. Teachers teach the Utah core--reading, writing, math computational skills, curriculum content—AND they teach speech/language, ESL, basic skills, and support the curriculum content of other grade levels. The adults support each other as teachers of children; each child is supported and taught, individually, by many teachers.

Data shows Lincoln's personal ownership of children works. In 2007 Lincoln didn't pass AYP, but it has every year since. During this span of years the school has unified and learned to work together as an effective learning community. We are acknowledged as a Utah High Performing Title I School. We received an "A" grade from the Utah Board and scored in the top 11% of Utah schools on last year's end-of-level tests. We have been nominated to receive a National Blue Ribbon School award.

What makes the school worthy of National Blue Ribbon status? As noted above:

- capacity for united, efficacious change
- data know-how and an appreciation for the role of formative assessment
- use of sound research-based principles and practices
- maximization of school people-power
- a personal focus on each child
- results: steady improvement in student proficiency

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) Performance levels on standardized assessments - Our district/school uses two main standardized assessments to measure student growth: DIBELs Next (K-5) and the state end-of-level criterion-referenced tests. The state tests were formerly known as CRTs (Criterion-Referenced Tests), but this year, in May, Utah will implement the new, still-evolving SAGE (Student Assessment for Growth and Excellence) which is designed to align with the new state core.

DIBELs: Last year, 54% of our incoming kindergarten children scored proficient on our September DIBELs administration. (Note: 77% left kindergarten proficient--a 23% rise--and kindergarten is the year many of our students learn to speak English.) This year, only 43% of our incoming children scored proficient on that initial test. It will take a 34% rise in proficiency to equal that same 74% end-of year score. Our strength lies in what we are able to do for each individual child year to year—not in static non-cohort data. Nonetheless, last year, for example, our fifth graders left Lincoln scoring 2% higher in proficiency numbers than the district average.

CRTs/SAGE: A total-point School Performance score (600 points possible) was determined by subsets of All Student Growth Points (200 possible), Below Proficient Growth Points (100 possible), and Schoolwide Achievement Points (300 possible). Utah's average score was 434/600. Lincoln's School Performance score was 532/600 (98 points above the state average). We scored 157/200 in All Student Growth Points, 99/100 in Below Proficient Growth Points (YAY!), 256/300 total growth points (state: 189/300), and 276/300 Achievement Points (state: 246/300). Despite Lincoln's challenging demographics, we were deemed an "A" school because of this performance level. We ranked in the top 11% of ALL Utah schools, Title I and non-Title I schools combined.

b) Performance trends found in data tables -Schoolwide -----Math: 2009 = 83% proficiency; 2010 = 84% proficiency; 2011 = 96% proficiency; 2012 = 90% proficiency; 2013 = 95% proficiency.

Over a span of five years, we have made a steady climb from 83% proficiency to 95% proficiency in math.

Reading/LA/Writing: 2009 = 89% proficiency; 2010 = 87% proficiency; 2011 = 92% proficiency; 2012 = 88% proficiency; 2013 = 96% proficiency.

Over a span of five years, we have made a steady climb from 89% proficiency to 96% proficiency.

In about 2004-2005, Lincoln Elementary School was teetering on the cusp of NCLB/AYP Program Improvement. The school was overwhelmed by the town's not-so-gradual change in demographics and NCLB's new accountability system. A radical change in teaching practices and a curriculum alignment/articulation with the core was needed.

This change has been gradual, sometimes painful. It has taken courage, but this school is now demonstrating that it has the capacity to "do right" by every child. Several things have happened over the past few years that have contributed to Lincoln's success. Speaking generally, there has been a change of leadership and focus at both the district and school levels. This has resulted in . . .

- Changes in curriculum and a dedication to core curriculum alignment/articulation.
- An increased focus on writing.
- Serious data analysis and a reliance on formative assessment.
- An emergence of Effective Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and a resultant altered school climate.
- A focus on student engagement strategies.
- A focus on systematic, explicit/direct instruction.

- A reliance on research-based practices.
- Staff changes and the maximization of school people-power.

Speaking to the data more specifically, there was a spike in 2011 and a dip in 2012 in both Language Arts and Math. In both cases there were significant changes in Lincoln’s teaching staff (veteran retirements and new hires) that impacted school productivity. In 2011 we spent a lot of time as an intact faculty working on core-teaching, test alignment, and engagement strategies (which produced results). Post-2012, we realized there was a correlation between the number of students taught by new teachers and the number of student scores falling just under the “3” proficiency mark.

All of our subgroups are doing well. For example, last year our free/reduced lunch = 95% proficient; SpEd = 94% proficient; ELL = 90% proficient, and Hispanic = 94% proficient. This has not always been the case. (Over the last 5+ years, the subgroup proficiency percentages have steadily risen, as noted in the data section.) All of the above-mentioned reasons apply. If one single aspect could be highlighted it would be the efficacious way Lincoln’s staff takes ownership and collaborates to determine and meet the needs of each child. Years ago, there were THOSE children—unteachable bad “blueberries.” Not now. If children aren’t learning, then WE, as educators, aren’t doing our job.

2. Using Assessment Results:

a) Examples of systematically using data to improve instruction and student learning - As soon as the tri-annual DIBELs results are in, Lincoln teachers meet in whole group and grade-level PLCs, and we carefully examine the data. Individual student achievement, success/failure trends, and DIBELs skill category outcomes are discussed. Tier I interventions are considered and proposed. (Tier I interventions are the realm of the classroom teacher: What can the classroom teacher do to enhance their students’ reading fluency and retell?) The principal and school reading facilitator then conduct Tier II Individual Learning Plan meetings (ILPs) with each teacher. In this meeting, a data folder is constructed for struggling students, and the three discuss the reading/learning challenges each child is experiencing. A plan of intervention is agreed upon which may include actions such as a supplementation or change in instructional materials, a change in Tier II level placement (small-group reading instruction with Highly Trained Title I Paraprofessionals), and/or closer monitoring with assessments such as the DAZE test. The school Tier III professionals (Special Education and ESL teachers) are also a part of this ILP process. They are significant partners in the teaching of Lincoln children and it is important for them to understand their students’ overall data and how their teaching interventions fit into the school’s larger intervention plan for each child.

The school’s reaction to CRT/SAGE data is similar. The school is hungry for the results and, as soon as we have access, we contemplate the scores individually, as grade level groups, and as a whole school family. We are frustrated that this data has to come at the end of the year (or summer, or at beginning of the next year), but it does provide valuable insight as to how well the children did. Even more significant at that point in time, however, is the insight it gives us into the effectiveness of both the school’s instructional capacity and individual teacher efficacy. The teachers are careful to look at the cumulative data concerning student success rates with particular state standards. This information provides a base and focus for further instructional honing, curriculum adjustment, and Professional Development (PD) content the following year.

Student DIBELs and CRT/SAGE scores, in addition to other school-based curriculum testing data, provide foundational information for our weekly Student Assistance Team (SAT) meetings. This team is comprised of grade level teachers, ESL teachers, the principal, the counselor, the after-school program facilitator, the reading facilitator, and the school’s special educators. Teachers submit names of students who are struggling (despite many interventions) and their data to the SAT team for consideration. As a group, we search for others ways we might provide additional interventions. The student is tracked and more data is collected. If sufficient progress is not made, the SAT meetings become a gateway process for referral to Special Education and counseling services.

Test data collection, tracking and discussion by our Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM) committee is also the gateway to the school’s Gifted and Talented program for students.

Our School Improvement Plan (SIP), Title I Plan, and Utah Land Trust Plan for the following year are all designed and built upon the needs made obvious by comprehensive data collection/interpretation, which includes the data from DIBELs and the CRT/SAGE tests.

b) Sharing achievement results with stakeholders – This sharing of achievement data takes place in several ways. District and school-level achievement data is printed in the local newspaper (The Herald Journal). It is posted on the State Board of Education, district, and school-level web pages. It is shared with parents during our annual reading celebration—Literacy Night—and it is talked about during Time Together pre-kindergarten workshops for parents, parent parent-teacher conferences (SEPs), School Community Council meetings (SCCs), Special Education IEPs, and PTA meetings. It appears in the PTA newsletter. The principal discusses the school’s academic achievements during monthly student/community assemblies, yearly student award assemblies, and she enters the classrooms to discuss achievement results with the students. Teacher-student classroom data discussions are routine. (How can students set achievement goals without a baseline?)

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

We are a rather humble bunch and do not seek opportunities to present, nor are we recognized often--other non-Title I schools in our district can produce higher test scores. (Schools/principals from other districts do call us, however, and ask to discuss our achievement and do walk-throughs.) We recognize that part of our success is our district-level PLC capacity. We have capable leadership at the district level, and all district schools/principals/teachers/paraprofessionals meet together regularly for Professional Development. We are on the same page—we are an extended community of learners who share and help each other—and that is important to our success.

We have excellent teachers and reading facilitators, though, and they routinely have the opportunity to lead out and teach their/our practices to their cohorts in district and state settings. In particular, our teachers have spearheaded many math committees and piloted much math curriculum.

The principal has had the opportunity to share Lincoln practices at both district and state levels. Writing instruction and the reading-writing connection has been a primary presentation topic. She has chaired accreditation teams that traveled throughout the state, guiding other K-12 schools through data analysis and the school improvement process. In that context, she often has the opportunity to share "lessons learned."

4. Engaging Families and Community:

As a Title I school in a community with diverse demographics and pressing socio-economics, this particular indicator of academic success—engaging families and community—is one of our challenges. Many of our parents, culturally, don’t see themselves as peers and partners with the school. Many struggle with illiteracy. Many are homeless, single, and/or incarcerated. Too many are busy just trying to survive.

Despite this, we have a wonderful, functioning parent core—a PTA and School Community Council that provides many hours of service. Their volunteer hours are remarkable: They help proctor reading tests and make-up work; they help check papers; they make copies and do bulletin boards; they read with children; they assist children one-on-one with math; and they help with math fluency activities. They sponsor and conduct an A+ Science Fair and supervise the Book Fair. They raise money and pay for field trips and bus tabs. They donate time and money to support the principal’s Birthday Book program.

The Lincoln PTA chooses to conduct a spring carnival each year as a fund raiser. There are certainly easier ways to raise money, but none so successful as this in involving the entire community. Hyrum, Utah is a little town, and the school is located in the middle of the town square. The entire community does come to eat treats, dabble with Arts and Crafts, dunk people in water, run relay races, play on the playground, and slide down giant blown-up venues.

Teachers work hard to involve parents, and they are relentless. It is our goal to have 100% attendance at Parent-Teacher Conferences (SEPs). It is not uncommon to see teachers reschedule and reschedule certain parents, sometimes holding the meeting at very early or very late hours, just to accommodate the families. Most teachers actively recruit parent help during the day. Many have created web connections and all use email as their communication of choice.

We are most successful in getting parents into our school via awards and performances. Once a month a different student grade level will plan and perform an assembly that teaches one of Stephen Covey's success/ happiness/leadership traits. Also during that performance, other students are acknowledged for their demonstration of the previously taught trait. We send out notification, and whole extended families attend. This happens with our yearly talent show and awards assembly, as well. The annual Literacy Night is planned and structured (student performances and free giveaways) so almost the entire studentbody shows up with family members. It is a great night of family fun and celebration, a celebration of teaching and learning.

Lincoln certainly has many "business" partners. In order to provide a deep and rich education, find resources, and provide community support, we do "business" with the following (to list a few):

- Hyrum City – We share their town square and its facilities. They use our playground. (They help us pay for our playground.) We use their library, their museum, and their places of business. In case if a serious evacuation and need for shelter, the school will use their city office building.
- Bear River Health Department/Bear River Mental Health (Logan, Utah) – Through grant money we are able to access their therapists to help some of our children.
- Cache County Sheriff's Department – They make routine walk-throughs and many drive-bys. They help us with safety training, and provide school resource officers. We especially appreciate the NOVA program, and the valuable lessons it provides our many at-risk kids.
- And . . . Logan City (Storm Water curriculum support for 4th grade), Head Start, various local youth sports teams, Mountain West Strings (orchestra), Girl Scouts of America, Kawanis Club, Utah State University, Living Aquarium, Jensen Historical Farm, Good Touch/Bad Touch, Angel Flight, Old Ephraim Mountain Man Rendezvous, etc.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Reading/Language Arts : Being a Title I school, Lincoln has long focused on reading as a skill. Phonemic/phonological awareness, concepts of print/alphabetic principles, word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension are staples in our daily reading foci. Retell is also a skill—being able to extract main ideas w/ supporting detail. The K-5 core now takes us farther into text awareness and comprehension, and we are focusing more on close reading at all grade levels.

We've done much professional development with close reading and shared our expertise with other schools. Even yet, however, this concept tends to be rather nebulous in nature. How long do you persevere with a text? So much literary element/concept background knowledge is required. How much can we expect from these elementary school students? Our Language Arts standards direct us to the background knowledge needed to read closely.

The core standards and the pressing needs of our school's studentbody demand that we spend much time on the conventions/concepts of standard English and vocabulary acquisition. This directive is a "given," and we work continuously to teach these core concepts. Also as directed, we continue to work on the identification of key ideas and details, craft and structure, integration of knowledge and ideas, and rigor/text complexity. We now utilize far more informational text. We also focus on reading like a writer, and the rich texts we are reading should also inform our students' writing.

Writing: Lincoln has carefully dissected the state K-5 writing standards, and conducted much professional development concerning its requirements. In past years, writing was a schoolwide weakness—little writing was happening--and we knew we had to show real improvement in this area. We looked carefully at types and purposes of writing, production and distribution of writing, research to build knowledge, and ranges of writing. We refreshed our knowledge about the 6+1 Traits. We became more acquainted with the three primary types of writing mentioned in the core, namely: narrative, opinion/argument, and informative/explanatory/expository. Each grade level is assigned to create prompts for each type, then take their classes through the writing process. A grade-level notebook has been created that contains all related artifacts and examples of student work. Because writing has also been a renewed focus for the district, Lincoln's combined notebooks have served as how-to examples for many other schools. We have continued to hone our practice, and we are trying to radically increase the amount of writing done by our students. Right now, we are focusing on research, note-taking, and expository writing.

Math: We love the Mathematical Practice Standards:

- Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them
- Reason abstractly and quantitatively
- Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others
- model with mathematics; strategically use appropriate tools
- attend to precision
- look for and make use of structure
- look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning

These standards identify the difference between teaching students to memorize math and teaching them to think like mathematicians. The impact of these standards on math teaching pedagogy/methodology has been amazing! (Although parents are feeling a little vertigo.) We have some teacher-leaders in math at Lincoln who have helped everyone make incredible change at the school, district, and state levels.

The state standards for mathematical content are designed to be a combination of procedure and understanding—points of intersection that are weighed toward central and generative concepts in the curriculum that merit dedicated time and resources. They're/We're after true foundational mathematical significance in the larger math picture. This honing and shifting of content has caused our teachers to look

closely at their grade-level cores and teach accordingly. It's been a healthy and productive reorientation process.

Science: Utah's science core is on the cusp of change. (Content-wise, it has remained very much the same since 1984.) All grades (K-5) take bites out of 4 main standards/topics:

Standard 1: Process, communication, and the general nature of science

Standard 2: Earth and Space Sciences

Standard 3: Physical Sciences

Standard 4: Life Sciences

Because these standards are so time-established, Lincoln's teachers are very aware of the science content they are supposed to teach. What has changed with the new core is the emphasis on science reading/writing literacy; we need to be reading, writing, and speaking like scientists. There has been a huge shift in teacher-chosen supplementary reading material at Lincoln; many more science standard-related books are the fodder of general literacy instruction at all levels and in all three tiers. (We have no adopted science textbooks.)

Our huge stumbling block is time. Though science is the third major content area tested in the state of Utah, Lincoln's major focus is getting our many at-risk students reading, writing, and doing mathematics proficiently. The state/district expects a daily three-hour block of language arts and a one and one-half hour of math. Minus lunch and some recess time, that leaves about one hour of instructional time to do science, social studies, art, music, computers, media, physical education, etc. We have to rotate certain content areas (just mentioned) throughout the week and be stubborn about dedicated science time. Three ways we maximize science instructional time is to 1) use core science materials in teaching reading/LA; 2) rotate classes through weekly science and social studies blocks, and 3) bring in science "experts" for hands-on demonstrations and schedule field trips that are science core-related. We have several parent "experts" who are great demonstrators and indispensable organizers of the PTA Science Fair. We mine Utah State University's science department for help with STEM related on-site demonstrations. In addition, we utilize the generous expertise of Logan City, Stoke's Nature Center, and USU's Natural Resource Lab by sending our students there for science core fieldtrips.

Social Studies: Our long-standing social studies core is also one we are very familiar with. The K-2 curriculum is organized by three grade level themes:

-kindergarten – self, family, and classroom

-first grade – self, school, and neighborhood

-second grade – self, school and community

Our third grade social studies curriculum, however, looks deeper at our physical area/place as the foundational location for teaching social studies concepts; fourth uses the State of Utah as the basis of inquiry; and fifth grade examines the United States. Each grade is structured around four strands: culture, citizenship, geography, and financial literacy (a newer component). The state now emphasizes a literacy component, however, and much reading, writing, and research addresses social studies core content. Our lack of available time deeply affects our social studies instruction, but we try to be creative. As mentioned above, we utilize a core rotation system that works for us. We also schedule field trips to the Mountain Man Rendezvous, Hyrum City Museum, Hyrum Cemetery, the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers Museum, and USU's 1917 era Jensen Historical Farm. We enlist our PTA and other local "experts" and conduct a 4th grade Pioneer Day.

At the end of the year we hold a wonderful Wax Museum Day. All fifth graders research a significant historical figure and "become" that person. They adorn costumes and stand motionless beside a button. When the button is pushed they come alive and tell their memorized biography. Lincoln's other students visit the Wax Museum and learn much from the "wax" speakers. Fifth graders also strive to earn the Great American Award. To do this they must know all the states and capitols and be able to recite the Gettysburg Address, the presidents in order, the Pledge of Allegiance, the first verse of The Star Spangled Banner, and the Preamble to the Constitution. They must also know all the answers to the U.S. citizenship test questions.

School Prep Rotations: Art, music, physical education, and keyboarding instruction are also accomplished through a rotation system. School specialists deliver instruction while Lincoln's K-5 teachers utilize some much-needed preparation time. Each of these content areas has a state core, and these instructional periods are built into the daily schedule rotation for protection.

We do a good job of teaching the K-5 visual art core which focuses on line, shape, texture, color, and design. Our PTA sponsors an annual art competition and show, which gives our students a fertile forum for artistic expression. In music, the students sing, play, create, and listen to music, which is the basis of the Utah core. The music specialist also teaches the theater core, where students engage in playmaking, acting, learning about theater, and analyzing theatric performances/forms. At the end of the school year, the older students create and perform plays for the rest of the studentbody. In addition, we sponsor a student talent show which also gives students a grand forum for performance art. Our monthly grade-level Covey assemblies provide that opportunity as well, for most of Covey's concepts are taught by the children through skits and singing.

Our computer/keyboarding specialist has one driving goal: technology proficiency. We want our students to be able to:

- type extended paragraphs by third grade, and be quite fluent with keyboarding when they leave in fifth grade.
- understand the "usage" rules/responsibilities of the Internet as fifth graders and be able to proficiently and responsibly access information and conduct research.
- make a PowerPoint presentation and be proficient with iPad usage.
- All teachers reinforce this continuum of technology expertise in their classrooms as they work with student writing and research tasks.

Our physical education specialist is responsible for most of the PE core, although health curriculum topics are shared with others. Children actively engage in physical movement in PE. They learn rules, self-control, and a responsibility for self and actions--they learn good citizenship. Though our PE specialist teaches general movement-related lessons, she is not a dance teacher. Most of the dance instruction our children receive comes from visiting outside sources, such as the Ririe-Woodbrey Dance Company and Ballet West.

Substance abuse prevention, bullying/violence prevention and healthy self-management skills are also taught by the NOVA officers, employees of the local Cache County Sheriff's department. Good Touch/Bad Touch courses are taught to our little ones by the Child and Family Support Center. Maturation lessons are taught to our fifth graders by district nurses. Our part-time counselor enters classrooms and teaches children about social awareness and responsible friendships. She also teaches our children individually who are experiencing difficulty. We utilize Stephen Covey's 7 Habits of Happy Kids and The Leader in Me to teach kids how to be proactive, goal-oriented, and responsible for personal actions.

Foreign Languages: Our school district has designated certain schools in the district to teach foreign language immersion math classes in Chinese, French, and Spanish. Our school was not chosen for obvious reasons--many of our students are struggling to learn math in English. We are, however, teaching a before-school class of Spanish to 3-5th grade students which we fund through a REACH grant. It is a big hit.

Unique curricula: We are so busy teaching the basics, we can not get too exotic. Our place-specific social studies lessons in third and fourth grades are quite unique because of Utah's singular landscape and history, however. Our utilization of Covey's 7-Habit vision in elementary school may not be a widespread practice, as well.

2. Reading/English:

Reading Curriculum and Instruction – Daily Tiered Reading: In kindergarten, Saxon Phonics and word work is taught whole-group (Tier I) by the teacher. During Tier II time, 4-5 highly trained reading

paraprofessionals join each kindergarten class for an hour to teach all students thirty minutes of Early Reading Inventory (ERI - a Tier II Intervention) and thirty minutes of Reading Mastery (a Tier II Intervention). Students are divided into fluid small groups according to reading levels (as ascertained by ongoing reading assessments). In addition, daily, 1-2 reading paraprofessionals will remain in each class for an additional 30 minutes to individually assess students while the teacher continues to instruct the whole group. In Utah the legislators will not pay for full-day kindergarten. Because it is critical that Tier III reading/language—Special Education and ESL—does not pull children out of the precious half-day, we have those kids come early or stay after their kindergarten sessions. Without added money, we protect their kindergarten Tier I/II time and extend their day with an additional Tier III intervention.

In first grade, Saxon Phonics continues to be the foundation of Tier I reading instruction—children are still learning to decode. During first grade’s hour of Tier II time, five highly trained paraprofessionals enter each classroom to deliver small group instruction. All students receive at least thirty minutes of Reading Mastery instruction at their assessed levels. In addition, and according to their reading proficiency levels, they receive another thirty minutes of Tier II work utilizing Reading for All Learners and Read Well instructional programs. Additional Tier III reading interventions are delivered throughout the day for children with IEPs and ESL needs.

In second grade, children begin with Tier I Saxon Phonics, as well; however, as they gain decoding/fluency proficiency, we begin to introduce them more to our Reading Street basal text in Tier I. During their hour-long, small group, Tier II instruction, Reading Mastery is still used with many of our at-risk students. Reading for All Learners and Read Well programs are also utilized for second grade Tier II instruction. Bona fide chapter books (at second grade reading levels) become more of a Tier II staple for higher-level ability groups. Though Close Reading is modeled by K-1 teachers all along, student comprehension independence develops enough by second grade to make this methodology more realistic. Again, additional Tier III reading interventions are delivered throughout the day for children with IEPs and ESL needs.

In third, fourth, and fifth grades, the Reading Street basal becomes the main text for reading instruction in Tier I. Other non-fiction social studies/science/research texts are increasingly introduced. Close Reading/Reading Like a Writer methodology is employed. Tier II small group instruction is reduced to 45 minutes in these upper grades. Depending on assessed student need, Corrective Reading, Phonics for Reading, REWARDS, Read Naturally, and Reading Mastery are programs of choice for our at-risk readers. More proficient readers undertake level-appropriate novels—in particular, Reading for Success Novel Studies-- and comprehension remains a center focus.

Instructional Methods: Tier I Instruction is delivered whole group with an ongoing emphasis on using student engagement skills and strategies to improve teaching such as the use of proximity, signals, time limits, precision partnering, choral and cloze reading, etc. Tier II instruction is delivered in small groups with the use of paraprofessionals who are trained to use the explicit direct instruction methods needed to teach the programs with fidelity.

Foundational reading skills: Our research-based reading programs are mentioned above. Assessments administered regularly to track goals and progress include in-program testing, the Core Phonics Survey (administered 2-3 times yearly in grades K, 1, and 2), and DIBELS (administered 3 times yearly in grades K-5).

Efforts to Improve Reading Skills for students above and below benchmark: For students reading above benchmark levels, we offer differentiated instruction during Tier I instruction. Students are further challenged in smaller groups during Tier II instruction with the use of novel studies, as well as content area reading in leveled books included in the Reading Street basal program. Our Gifted and Talented program also supports and extends reading opportunities for many children. Students reading below benchmark levels receive differentiated instruction used during Tier I instruction to ensure understanding and learning. All at-risk students receive Tier II small group instruction daily in research-based programs selected and approved by district personnel. In-program tests and progress monitoring assessments are administered,

recorded, and analyzed regularly. Student reading placements are modified as needed based on the collected data. Our Tier III interventions (Special Education, Speech, and ESL) also support our at-risk readers.

3. Mathematics:

Our K-5 math text, Go Math! was scrutinized and piloted by district level personnel and school-level math teams. We were searching for research-based program/text reflecting a Singapore base, the use of model-drawing, content alignment with the core and methodological alignment with core's math practice standards. Go Math! was the clear choice. As our kindergarten teacher/math committee member comments: "Go math was chosen because it is clearly core based and moves students from concrete, to pictorial, to abstract thinking in math. It spirals learning, and there is continuity from grade to grade. It uses real-life situations and a language base to present problems that often require students to plan and perform more than one step. It encourages students to figure out problems in various ways and explain and discuss their thinking. Many questions are open-ended and may have more than one answer. Go Math! is rigorous and requires students to think deeply." (See section 1 – math.)

As mentioned earlier, Lincoln teachers love the Math Practice Standards. They help us focus on process--the process of problem-solving and persevering with deeper math tasks. This focus on process and multiple approaches lends itself to tactile and very visual applications. We wear out our manipulatives, and every child can model-draw. Our kids can speak like mathematicians--and they can walk the talk.

One of our math interventions for at-risk students utilizes a team teaching/push-in model. For example, in 5th grade, we differentiate all the students according to assessed needs. The three fifth grade teachers will each teach a "level." Teacher C will have the highest group, Teacher B will have the middle group, and Teacher A will have the at-risk group. (Approximately half of the A-group students will have math-related IEPs.) Our special education resource teacher will pair and team teach with Teacher A. All classes are taught on grade level and the pacing is similar. The difference is in the amount of enrichment and reteaching that takes place and the instructional methods used. Group C will be taught utilizing more direct instruction methods than groups A and B. The gains have been remarkable, particularly with group A; most group A students tip into the 3 range (3s and 4s are passing) on their end-of level tests. The horizontal sharing and differentiation of students also provides more opportunity for our higher performing math students. Their pace can be faster, allowing more time for deeper study and enrichment.

In various other settings, paraprofessionals, Americor and America Reads volunteers, and parents are also paired with students who are struggling in math: students are helped with their math before school, during lunch study hall, and during Homework Help after school. We also utilize IXL math, an interactive online math program that serves all students at their own particular levels.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

At first glance the key phrases of our mission and motto statements fall into two general categories: academic skills/competencies and life-long dispositions. At second glance, it's apparent that most phrases fit into both.

Our students share a broad range of family success stories. Up-and-coming young professional parents are buying a first house in our area. Descendants of Hyrum pioneers continue to raise "rooted" families and maintain long-held properties here. Most of these children come to us with a firm foundation in literacy and numeracy. They are taught responsibility and understand firm boundaries—they are their family's primary focus. But many of our Lincoln Leopards know hardship and struggle. Unemployment rates are high, as are instances of incarceration, divorce, drug and alcohol abuse, and poverty and homelessness. Survival is the focus of many of our families.

Abraham Maslow's "hierarchy of needs" theory plays out at Lincoln Elementary School. Too many come to us hungry and without sleep. Too many have insecure, unstable lives. Too many feel powerless to control their environments. Too many feel unloved and neglected. Too many have little self-esteem. We

know, from experience, that children need those things to be successful in school. Hence, there is our REAL mission. We work very hard to meet many of our students' life needs in order to fulfill their academic needs. And every child benefits from that, not just those at risk.

The Language Arts core focuses on reading, writing, listening, and speaking. In order, to provide an authentic performance venue for these skills, each grade-level is assigned an assembly each month to plan/create, practice, and perform. We have also wanted a broader venue—not just classroom discussion—for our character education efforts. In past years, we have used the Character Counts topics. Each grade level would take a “pillar” of character and build an assembly around it: Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship. For the last couple of years, however, we have switched to the Coveys' works, particularly *The Leader in Me* and *The 7 Habits of Happy Kids*. Still our classroom instruction and assemblies focus on the same basic traits, but the Coveys package and relate them in much better ways, namely:

Habit #1 – Be proactive

Habit #2 - Begin with the End in Mind

Habit #3 - Put First Things First

Habit #4 - Think Win-Win (and Covey's “Emotional Bank Account”)

Habit #5 – Seek First to Understand, Then to be Understood

Habit #6 – Synergize

Habit #7 – Sharpen the Saw

Each month teachers nominate students who are good examples of the Habits. These students are specifically awarded and acknowledged in the next assembly.

Though we are technology-poor at Lincoln, we teach through and give students access to computers, iPads, and projection systems. Problem-solving instruction/opportunity is supported by the rigor of our new core and our end-of-level assessments. “Depth of Knowledge” tasks are now part of our practice.

It is our regular school/classroom practice to give regular homework assignments to help students develop a sense of personal learning responsibility. We absolutely hold children accountable for their work and seek to distill in them the understanding that the academics we do both at home and at school are important. Many of our students are signed up for an hour of homework help every day after school. If homework is not done, they finish during lunch recess in our supervised study hall.

In other words, we DO work to prepare students to function effectively in a global, technological society as competent, productive, caring, and responsible individuals. To function effectively, our students . . .

-Master fundamental academic, technological, and social skills

-Demonstrate problem-solving skills

-Develop a strong sense of self-efficacy

-Become self-directed, creative, lifelong learners.

Our students are RESPONSIBLE, RESPECTFUL, RESILIENT, and REMARKABLE!

5. Instructional Methods:

We are all about assessment, data analysis, and resultant differentiation. We use academic and behavioral data to initially “people” and balance each classroom. Grade-level teachers have the same instructional schedule so when it is time for different contents—like math—we can swap kids and create differentiated academic groups in different classrooms (even between different grade levels). We differentiate Tier II and III reading. We differentiate math instruction. In addition, a large portion of our studentbody is involved with ESL, Special Education resources, and Speech instruction. When we receive children with significant needs who can't access even tiered small-group instruction, we create individual skill-leveled curricula and give the students one-on-one instruction. There are NO “sink or swim” attitudes here.

Examples of such are plentiful. One year we received a 4th grade student from Haiti who had lived in an orphanage. She hadn't been humanly socialized; she had never held a pencil or crayon. None of us spoke her language :o). Last year we received a 2nd grade child who had been locked in her house/yard and had

never attended school. This year three siblings came to us from Mexico, and, they too, had not been in school for the past two years. What do we do when this happens? We conduct appropriate assessments, study the data, and circle the wagons. Many people become the teachers of these particular children. A classroom teacher will be assigned, but the child will also be taught, potentially, by special educators, the Speech and Language Pathologist, the ESL teacher, other classroom teachers, reading paraprofessionals, and perhaps a behavior specialist and/or therapist.

We don't differentiate instruction for only the at-risk students. When we "level" instruction, this applies to all children. Certainly, we have a Gifted and Talented program and a Tier III program for at-risk students, but we also differentiate Tier I and Tier II for all. These children are part of that shifting and sharing on grade level—a "high" math classroom rotation, for example—and in Tier II, they are instructed according to their assessed higher reading levels in small groups.

I wish I could say that technology is a mainstay of our instruction, but I can't. There are no "bells and whistles" here--there is little money to pay for it. We teach keyboarding and computer applications to all students. Interactive at-risk and ESL computer program support is also a tool for us (Read Naturally, Imagine Learning, IXL Math). The students use computers to write like crazy, and the older students do research online and create PowerPoint presentations. We have a handful of iPads for student use, and the teachers use computers, Elmos, iPads, and projection systems as teaching tools in their classroom. The teachers are embracing their iPads, and some WONDERFUL applications are emerging. (Inadequate wireless access has been a stumbling block, however.)

6. Professional Development:

The School, the District, and, at times, the State team up to direct and provide on-going professional development. Often state PD is a response to legislated directives/changes (politics) and/or adaptations made to the core, end-of level assessments, and employee evaluation systems. District PD generally supports national/state foci, assists with district-adopted curriculum issues, and responds to whole-school performance data/needs. School-level PD takes place almost solely through our Professional Learning Community (PLC) work. Here we support what the state and district ask us to change and do. But mostly, we are a family of professionals who meet together every Friday afternoon to solve teaching-learning problems. It is here we study our school and student data. It is here we focus on student achievement and work on ways to become better teachers. As a PLC, we seek out and follow the research of particular educators such as Richard DuFour, Robert Marzano, Douglas Reeves, Vicki Spandel, Chris Biffle, Annette Brinkman, Anita Archer, E.D. Hirsh, and Tim Shanahan and apply that research to our own practice. (We LOVE Anita Archer.)

Lately, in our district and school PLCs, we have spent much time learning about, reading research, and working on enhanced student engagement strategies. Other recent school level work and study has centered on a total familiarity with and application of the new state core standards, core alignment w/teaching and student assessments, better student writing, close reading, and "Depth of Knowledge" performance tasks.

Utah, Cache, and Lincoln's PD efforts align fairly explicitly because of larger current political/economic forces. Laws, numbers, and competition rule. There are certainly downsides, but that control is good when numbers and competition = enhanced student learning. We are all working together to measure up, and professional development and PLC efforts get us there.

7. School Leadership

As federal educational presence has increased over the last few years, there has been a big change in focus and administrative philosophy at the state, district, and school levels. Yes, we have learned to be more particular and "hands on." Nothing is left to chance; no educational "leaf" is unturned. Lincoln has become OCD about educating kids. At the forefront of change, this direction felt a little top-down and the district and principal had to lead out and rally school personnel and stakeholders. This was done. Now, however,

we are WE. We truly have a culture where we all problem-solve and go after results together--the nation, the state, the district, and Lincoln Elementary School.

Lincoln examples of "we": Our Student Assistance Team (SAT) is an amazing leadership team. There are twelve adults who meet weekly to problem-solve and collaborate concerning the needs of at-risk students. The principal, resource teacher, SLP, 2 ESL teachers, a counselor, a reading facilitator, the after-school coordinating teacher, the SAT facilitator, and three other teachers focus on one child at a time. Everyone comes prepared with related data and anecdotes. We do triage; we work to positively impact the child's greatest needs and to find better ways and resources.

During Individual Learning Plan (ILP) meetings, our leadership team consists of the principal, literacy facilitator, and the teacher. Three times a year, after DIBELS testing, we meet together, and classroom/student literacy data is examined at length. A plan for action is developed for each at-risk child. Tier II curriculum, delivery, and assessments are examined for past success and promising potential.

We have a Gifted and Talented leadership team in place. The G&T teacher, a committee chair, the principal, and a teacher from 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades meet regularly to collaborate and problem-solve in order to maintain an effective G&T program.

At present, the district and school are focusing on increased student engagement. We have a leadership team composed of nine people—the literacy facilitator, an ESL teacher, the principal, and six K-5 teachers—who assist with PLC inservice and technological support as we move to examine and improve our current practices. Right now, for example, we are utilizing iPads to film students as they respond to teacher-applied engagement strategies during the school day. This effort is meant as a form of self-assessment, but we will share and learn from these individual experiences as a group during our PLC discussions. Our weekly PLCs, themselves, are also examples of shared leadership. The principal is the main facilitator; however, the entire group, horizontally, is dedicated to collaborative efforts/learning that bring about enhanced school/teacher/student success.

We have a fifth grade student leadership team, the Lincoln Leaders. They are primarily a student service organization, but the principal and their adviser work hard to hone their leadership skills and provide them with ample opportunity to constructively impact the studentbody. Covey's guidebook, *The Leader in Me*, gives us direction.

Schools have principals for a reason. There must be someone at the helm to make sure the school is following the appropriate course—that policies, programs, relationships and resources focus on student achievement. Sometimes that is an "I" job. The principal is also primarily responsible for the shared school culture and operational/teaching/learning efficacy. That is a "we" job. The principal at Lincoln Elementary School is single-minded in this regard: Both the "I" and "we" aspects of school leadership are focused on student learning.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Test: 3rd grade Math - CRT/CDAS
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* | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 95 | 91 | 95 | 72 | 84 |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 79 | 73 | 73 | 46 | 45 |
| Number of students tested | 76 | 81 | 63 | 67 | 64 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 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 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 92 | 85 | 97 | 59 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 66 | 64 | 76 | 34 | |
| Number of students tested | 38 | 47 | 34 | 41 | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 83 | 92 | 100 | 73 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 67 | 67 | 71 | 45 | |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 12 | 7 | 11 | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 75 | 62 | 100 | 25 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 25 | 15 | 50 | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 8 | 13 | 2 | 12 | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 86 | 78 | 88 | 42 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 50 | 43 | 50 | 8 | |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 23 | 8 | 12 | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|--|
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 97 | 96 | 96 | 85 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 85 | 84 | 77 | 60 | |
| Number of students tested | 62 | 56 | 53 | 48 | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: 1. The disaggregated 2008-2009 data has been excluded from the state data site (PSD Gateway). It can no longer be pulled up through that official portal.
2. Alternative assessments are rare. (We teach SpEd resource and don't have a self-contained unit.)
3. Test changes in the last five years: A shift to online testing occurred in In 2011. (There is a MAJOR change in online test composition/procedures this year as the state moves to SAGE--the evaluation response to the new Utah Core.)

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Utah Board of Education

Test: 4th grade math CRT/CDAS
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* | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 91 | 77 | 93 | 83 | 76 |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 77 | 56 | 67 | 64 | 42 |
| Number of students tested | 82 | 62 | 67 | 66 | 71 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 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 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 85 | 75 | 92 | 77 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 68 | 53 | 58 | 57 | |
| Number of students tested | 47 | 36 | 36 | 30 | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 87 | 100 | 100 | 88 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 67 | 80 | 91 | 50 | |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 5 | 11 | 8 | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 64 | 0 | 60 | 50 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 36 | 0 | 20 | 17 | |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 2 | 5 | 6 | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 78 | 60 | 83 | 75 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 48 | 50 | 25 | 42 | |
| Number of students tested | 23 | 10 | 12 | 12 | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|--|
| plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 96 | 82 | 98 | 85 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 88 | 58 | 78 | 70 | |
| Number of students tested | 57 | 50 | 50 | 53 | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: 1. The disaggregated 2008-2009 data has been excluded from the state data site (PSD Gateway). It can no longer be pulled up through that official portal.
2. Alternative assessments are rare. (We teach SpEd resource and don't have a self-contained unit.)
3. Test changes in the last five years: A shift to online testing occurred in In 2011. (There is a MAJOR change in online test composition/procedures this year as the state moves to SAGE--the evaluation response to the new Utah Core.)

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Utah Board of Education

Test: 5th grade math CRT/CDAS test
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* | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 94 | 85 | 97 | 91 | 87 |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 84 | 67 | 84 | 69 | 61 |
| Number of students tested | 67 | 66 | 64 | 70 | 54 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 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 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 95 | 78 | 97 | 88 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 84 | 52 | 83 | 62 | |
| Number of students tested | 37 | 40 | 29 | 42 | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 83 | 91 | 100 | 92 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 83 | 36 | 86 | 58 | |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 11 | 7 | 12 | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 57 | 80 | 88 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 33 | 29 | 60 | 50 | |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 7 | 5 | 8 | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 71 | 91 | 87 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 75 | 29 | 73 | 53 | |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 14 | 11 | 15 | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|--|
| plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 92 | 92 | 98 | 93 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 85 | 79 | 86 | 73 | |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 48 | 50 | 55 | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: 1. The disaggregated 2008-2009 data has been excluded from the state data site (PSD Gateway). It can no longer be pulled up through that official portal.
2. Alternative assessments are rare. (We teach SpEd resource and don't have a self-contained unit.)
3. Test changes in the last five years: A shift to online testing occurred in In 2011. (There is a MAJOR change in online test composition/procedures this year as the state moves to SAGE--the evaluation response to the new Utah Core.)

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Utah Board of Education

Test: 3rd grade LA/Reading CRT/CDAS
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* | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 95 | 89 | 94 | 82 | 87 |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 58 | 62 | 70 | 43 | 56 |
| Number of students tested | 76 | 81 | 63 | 67 | 64 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 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 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 92 | 85 | 94 | 73 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 45 | 49 | 79 | 24 | |
| Number of students tested | 38 | 47 | 34 | 41 | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 83 | 100 | 91 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 50 | 25 | 29 | 18 | |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 12 | 7 | 11 | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 75 | 69 | 100 | 58 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 25 | 23 | 50 | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 8 | 13 | 2 | 12 | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 86 | 78 | 88 | 75 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 43 | 26 | 75 | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 23 | 8 | 12 | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|--|
| plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 97 | 93 | 94 | 90 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 61 | 75 | 70 | 58 | |
| Number of students tested | 62 | 56 | 53 | 48 | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: 1. The disaggregated 2008-2009 data has been excluded from the state data site (PSD Gateway). It can no longer be pulled up through that official portal.
2. Alternative assessments are rare. (We teach SpEd resource and don't have a self-contained unit.)
3. Test changes in the last five years: A shift to online testing occurred in In 2011. (There is a MAJOR change in online test composition/procedures this year as the state moves to SAGE--the evaluation response to the new Utah Core.)

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: 4th grade LA/Reading CCRT/CDAS test

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Utah Board of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 94 | 82 | 85 | 85 | 84 |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 54 | 53 | 48 | 52 | 42 |
| Number of students tested | 82 | 62 | 67 | 66 | 71 |
| 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 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 94 | 82 | 85 | 85 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 54 | 53 | 48 | 52 | |
| Number of students tested | 82 | 62 | 67 | 66 | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 96 | 78 | 81 | 83 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 36 | 53 | 31 | 47 | |
| Number of students tested | 47 | 36 | 36 | 30 | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 100 | 60 | 67 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 20 | 0 | 20 | 17 | |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 2 | 5 | 6 | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 80 | 67 | 75 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 23 | 60 | 8 | 25 | |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 10 | 12 | 12 | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|--|
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 91 | 84 | 90 | 87 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 64 | 54 | 58 | 57 | |
| Number of students tested | 58 | 50 | 50 | 53 | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

- NOTES:** 1. The disaggregated 2008-2009 data has been excluded from the state data site (PSD Gateway). It can no longer be pulled up through that official portal.
2. Alternative assessments are rare. (We teach SpEd resource and don't have a self-contained unit.)
3. Test changes in the last five years: A shift to online testing occurred in In 2011. (There is a MAJOR change in online test composition/procedures this year as the state moves to SAGE--the evaluation response to the new Utah Core.)

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: 5th grade LA/Reading CRT/CDAS test

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Utah Board of Education

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | May | May | May | May | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 93 | 92 | 94 | 87 | 93 |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 61 | 61 | 64 | 59 | 50 |
| Number of students tested | 67 | 66 | 64 | 70 | 54 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 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 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 97 | 88 | 90 | 83 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 65 | 45 | 62 | 52 | |
| Number of students tested | 37 | 40 | 29 | 42 | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 100 | 71 | 58 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 50 | 27 | 29 | 17 | |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 11 | 7 | 12 | |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 86 | 80 | 75 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 0 | 14 | 0 | 50 | |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 7 | 5 | 8 | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 92 | 93 | 82 | 87 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 33 | 36 | 45 | 47 | |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 14 | 11 | 15 | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|--|
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | 94 | 94 | 96 | 87 | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | 68 | 71 | 68 | 62 | |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 48 | 50 | 55 | |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % of 3s plus 4s = % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % of 4s = % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: 1. The disaggregated 2008-2009 data has been excluded from the state data site (PSD Gateway). It can no longer be pulled up through that official portal.
2. Alternative assessments are rare. (We teach SpEd resource and don't have a self-contained unit.)
3. Test changes in the last five years: A shift to online testing occurred in In 2011. (There is a MAJOR change in online test composition/procedures this year as the state moves to SAGE--the evaluation response to the new Utah Core.)