

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

[X] Public or [] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Mr. Scott Cleland

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

Official School Name Highland Park Elementary

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 2 Mydland Road

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

City Sheridan State WY Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 82801-2719

County Sheridan County State School Code Number* _____

Telephone 307-672-2113 Fax _____

Web site/URL http://www.scsd2.com E-mail scott.cleland@scsd2.com

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

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

Date _____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Mr. Craig Dougherty E-mail: craig.dougherty@scsd2.com
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Sheridan County School District #2 Tel. 307-672-2113

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

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

Date _____

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school’s application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school’s eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as “persistently dangerous” within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school’s application and/or rescind a school’s award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution’s equal protection clause.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
- 6 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 2 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 10 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city
 - Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - Suburban
 - Small city or town in a rural area
 - Rural
3. 4 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0
K	34	27	61
1	27	41	68
2	33	30	63
3	29	28	57
4	36	28	64
5	27	35	62
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	186	189	375

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 2 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 1 % Asian
 - 1 % Black or African American
 - 1 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 95 % White
 - 0 % Two or more races
 - 100 % Total**

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

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 8%

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

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	Answer
(1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	16
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	14
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	30
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	355
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.085
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	8

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %
4 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 0
 Specify non-English languages:
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 33 %
 Total number students who qualify: 124

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: 13 %
50 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.

3 Autism	1 Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	4 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	25 Specific Learning Disability
0 Emotional Disturbance	14 Speech or Language Impairment
0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
0 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
1 Multiple Disabilities	2 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	20
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	7
Paraprofessionals	8
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	3

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 20:1

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	94%	95%	94%	93%	94%
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

Highland Park Elementary School is a K-5 middleclass neighborhood school with a yearly average attendance of 375 students. The mission of our school starts and ends with a focus on student learning. Every decision, every discussion, every move is made with that one goal in mind. We minimize all outside distractions, focus on the strengths and weakness of each and every child, and develop instructional strategies and assessments through our PLC process to provide the best possible education. Acceptance and tolerance are key components to our mission each day. We embrace the differences in each staff member, each student, and within our parent community. We understand the importance of "a community of learners," and welcome all stakeholders to our HP school.

Five years ago we ushered in a "change process," based on the PLC model. Through positive leadership, a vision of what a school community should look and feel like, and a common expectation that excellence will be the only option accepted within the walls of HP. Teams began to set common goals and work together to achieve them. All children and adults were learning, and their growth was being celebrated. High expectations were established for everyone involved, in an effort to work together, in collaborative culture, with student learning as our only focus.

Five years later, we are one of the top performing schools in the state. The data is only a piece of the puzzle. Our students know we love them, and will do everything we can to insure that each one of them has the best day possible here at HP. We do believe in educating the whole child, every day, with every possible "tool" we have available. We continue to set weekly, monthly, and yearly goals within each grade level team, and as a school as whole. Grade level teams analyze student data each day, and organize their educational strategies around that data, driven internally by those very same teams. It is ownership that has been created, and that ownership is what motivates each teacher to be at her/his best each day. This school has been built from the bottom up, and there is tremendous sense of pride that engulfs this building.

Our school culture and climate, as commented on by every person that walks through our doors, is one of most precious "traits." We understand that the message we send out from HP each day is one centered on taking care of others, treating each person with respect, and doing everything we can to make the lives of our children and parents the best they can be. We don't just preach it, we live it! We have a number of events and organizations that allow our parents to get involved in their school. HP understands the role parents play in the success of our school. We have over 50 parent volunteers that donate their times and talents to our school on a regular basis. It is truly a "community" school that embraces the value of each person.

Special events at HP include Author visits that engage our students in both the reading and writing process. We schedule at least one or two of those each year. PTO sponsored Book Fairs and assemblies that focus on our mission statement are routine events. Field trips, both having students attending away from HP, and bringing community groups into HP provide our students with an up-close look at our community and role models. We have quarterly celebrations that include staff, students and our parents. Recognition for perfect attendance, academic performance, behavior outcomes, and reading incentives are celebrated!

We have been recognized by state agencies and websites as the top performing elementary school in the state of WY for the last 2 years. That has not always been the case here at HP. Five years ago we were in the bottom tier of that group, and because of our commitment to excellence, our PLC model, and hiring a super staff, we have made the jump to the top one percent of performing schools in this state.

Our population has increased by over 50 students since four years ago. Our at-risk population grows each year, and boundary changes within the district has created some wide-spread demographic concerns and challenges. Our SPED population is growing at a similar rate.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Highland Park Elementary is about academic excellence! Our goal is to be the best, and we make no excuses in our mission as every student can and will learn. Every decision we make is based on that simple foundation. As a result, our state-wide assessment, Proficiency Assessments for Wyoming Students (PAWS), scores demonstrated tremendous growth in the percent of proficient and advanced students since 2008. I will cite only several examples of many, so please refer to the data section where you will view similar results in all grades and content areas. In third grade writing the percentage of advanced and proficient students improved by 49 percent; whereas, our fourth grade students saw an increase of 20 percent in the area of reading. Even more remarkable is a 53 percent growth for fifth graders in writing. Not that these scores by themselves aren't impressive enough, but placed in comparison to the state average they are even more compelling as the state average growth (just in the above areas) was 25 percent, no gain, and 23 percent respectively; thus, Highland Park Elementary out-performed the state average by 24 percent, 20 percent, and 30 percent!

These improvements were not a result of random arbitrary interventions, rather a systematic data driven approach focused on proven research based best practices. Upon analyzing the data it became very obvious that we were not focused on the right things. First, more time needed to be spent on students using text to support their answers along with more opportunities to read a variety of functional and expository text. Second, teachers needed to do a better job of modeling these expectations and holding all students accountable. Therefore, the next two summers and the entire next year was dedicated to setting the essential outcomes and creating common formative assessments within each grade level and curriculum area. This work was not just for Highland Park, but also for the District as we were breaking new ground by developing the essential outcomes for reading and writing. These outcomes, along with a goal of 90 percent or higher proficiency on each assessment were shared with all students, parents, and staff to foster school-wide ownership of excellence. Yes, there were "bumps" during the first year due to a lack of 100 percent commitment by all stakeholders resulting in a range of school changes from support distribution to even the replacement of personnel. After the first year we did see gains, but in "drilling deeper" into the data we found that our subgroup of males to females were not demonstrating commensurate growth. Therefore, increasing interventions through: intensive small group instruction, web based computer software remediation (done at school and home), and more inclusion support practices which propelled our results even more.

This was a team effort, as we know it takes a whole village to raise a child. Parents were provided specific expectations as to the need to have their children read a minimum of 20 minutes at night along with checking for understanding and having students write about what they read. This information was also shared with parents at Parent/Teacher conferences as well as providing Literacy and Math Nights where teachers modeled research based best practices for parents and students with the intent of replicating these simple activities at home. This buy-in by parents was also evident in a change from our major fund raiser of selling cookie dough to a read-a-thon, where to our surprise raised even more money and more importantly reinforced our priority of reading.

The last notable shift was the changing of our expectations as no longer was mediocrity acceptable academically or socially. We fully implemented the Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) where we taught behaviorally expectations in all areas of the school. We celebrate monthly by honoring students for making the right choices in our Husky Student of the Month assembly. This resulted in a reduction of office referrals by over 50 percent after the first year, and now referrals are almost non-existent. And even more important is our students treat one another and our staff with respect and a genuine concern for all.

Our students deserve only the best and it is our responsibility to ensure this is happening every day of the school year. These changes and many others have truly moved our school from good to great.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Data drives instruction. This is not just a saying at Highland Park, rather something we do each and every day. It was obvious based solely on our PAWS assessments that something was broke. Therefore, we (the entire K – 5 staff) “rolled up our sleeves” and proceeded to disaggregate all aspects of the reading, writing, and math assessments along with all subgroups. What we found was tremendous inconsistencies of what each teacher felt was “essential” which correlated to why pockets of students were being successful while others were not. This then led us to having the difficult (yet imperative) conversations about what is it we want all students to know (essential outcomes), how will we know they know it (common and formative assessments), and then what will we do when they don’t get it (intervention) as well as when they do (enrichment). Hence, the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) model was born at Highland Park and these four essential questions drove (and continue to drive) what we do every day. After intensive and passionate discussions the Essential Outcomes documents were established as they were aligned with our state standards and then organized to ensure that everything on the PAWS assessments was taught prior to March 1st. Staff then developed common formative and summative assessments that were directly aligned with the Essential Outcomes and would be consistently administered by every teacher. A schedule was then created where a daily thirty minute block for intervention and enrichment (I & E) was provided for every student in grades kindergarten – fifth. Teachers also met at least once per week for an hour discussing: success and concerns with lessons taught, sharing results of common formative assessments, placing students into I & E groups based on reading and writing assessments, book studies, and research best practices.

In addition to the PAWS and common formative assessments we also analyzed the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark and Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments. These were administered in the fall and again at the end of the year. Upon receiving the results teachers disaggregated individual student results looking for strengths and areas of growth. This data was also looked at comparatively for trends within a cohort as well as with a specific teacher. One specific insight was that over 90% of our students were proficient or advanced in comprehension; however, this was actually a false positive (found only by deeper analysis). This was determined by looking more closely at the three strands that comprise comprehension. What we found was that students did well on two of the three, but actually were at the basic level in the third strand “thinking beyond the text”. This then resulted in more focused instruction on higher level thinking and inferring through multiple genres and forms of text. This was also communicated with parents with the intent that they provide similar opportunities at home. This assessment analysis continues every year and throughout the year in an effort to address the active learning of all students as opposed to after they have left for the summer. Again, if you look at the data from 2008 to 2012, it becomes quite obvious that a change process has occurred, and has made a significant difference in the learning lives of our staff and students.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

We understand the importance of this profession at HP, and over the last 2-3 years we have been the leader both within our district and state-wide. Numerous schools from both MT and WY have traveled here to spend days with our staff and students. Each time they leave here with the realization that “it” can be done, that through true collaboration, and a hedgehog-like focus on student learning, that the top of the mountain can be reached. That “it” is our focus on student learning, and how everything we do is centered on that issue. From teacher lounge discussions to PTO meetings, the discussion never wavers from student learning. Our staff has put on PLC, Balanced Literacy, PBIS, and Everyday Math workshops for other schools in our district, traveled to state conventions to speak about the “HP Way,” and are constantly being contacted by school districts to share the story of our success. We do so willingly, and proudly with all in this profession.

I have personally traveled to the National Reading Recovery Council Convention and spoke about the accomplishments of our school. We are proud of the work we have done, but understand that learning is a life goal, and one should never sit or rest on accomplishments. Our students are changing before our eyes, their needs are never static, and our goal is to be one step ahead of the learning curve. The focus of the

presentation at the NRCC was how we integrate Reading Recovery and the PLC process, our utilization of staff within our RR staff, and the leadership role played by our lead RR person. Our Reading Recovery Specialist's insight into how students learn to read is critical in the success of our PLC process.

We have had a number of "outside professionals" from Solutions Tree and other national organizations come to visit our school. Each time they leave, and address our staff, they make comments about how it is possible to be great, how we are "living proof" that the concept of PLC, and the laser-like focus on student learning works, and works very well. One of the presenters, Mr. Anthony Muhammad stated that this was the type of school he would want his own children to attend. That sums up the approach we take here at HP.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Parents and community members are involved in numerous ways at HP. We have a very strong and involved Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). The group meets once a month, and one of the primary tasks is fundraising. The goal of the fundraising has been focused on literacy, primarily our student libraries in each room and our Guided/Leveled Reading school library. This group has contributed over \$15,000 in the last two years alone, and has made a significant impact in the reading and writing lives of our students. They have recently switched their focus to technology, and over the next two years have pledged over \$10,000 in support of both devices and software for our school.

Our students attend numerous field trip experiences that the community provides for them. Sheridan embraces education, and business are often asking our students and staff to come down to their location and learn about their business or experiences. As a result, we have a wonderful working relationship with our community leaders, and they are willing to support everything we do. Our business community puts on leadership training workshops for our students, career day, and brings specific educational opportunities to our school. Just recently for example, we had the banks in Sheridan put on a "finance fair" about the importance of managing money for our fifth grade students.

We have an open door philosophy at HP, and all stakeholders know that their voices will be heard and respected. It is that level of ownership and pride that resonates through the halls of this great school. WE are in this together, as one team, that counts on each other to bring out the best of us, and the kiddos we work with everyday. We refuse to let each other down!

Teachers are in constant contact with our parents. Through emails, phone calls, parent study nights where we bring them in to learn how we teach reading, writing and math, weekly newsletters, P-T conferences, and the sending home of all our data results including PAWS, MAP, and district assessments, our parent community is very well informed of the learning process here at HP.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

At HP Elementary School, we take pride in celebrating learning, respecting diversity and building community; it is our mission. The constant collaboration of teachers and students builds upon the strengths of all and empowers us to be fervent learners. Our core curriculum is aligned with our state standards. It also allows us to provide for the individual needs of our students, while still maintaining a rigorous learning environment.

Our math curriculum is used across all grade levels and supports our school mission of respecting diversity. This spiraling curriculum, align to our district, state and NCTM standards, provides students with numerous opportunities to return to concepts previously learned. This promotes retention of material and success in learning. Students build critical thinking skills, allowing them to construct meaning in various ways. These skills also support the connection of school and community by giving our students the tools they need to be successful outside of the classroom. Our focus within the math curriculum is on deeper problem solving skills, moving away from rote learning. Structuring of numbers, a change in the teaching of numbers, helps students understand how math actually works, and how it is used in everyday life.

Our reading curriculum incorporates a variety of teaching methods that best meet the needs of our students. All grade levels practice a balanced literacy framework. Numerous reading methods; such as read alouds, shared reading, independent reading, guided reading and literature circles; promote student success and allow our students opportunities to improve reading comprehension and skills.

Highland Park School believes every child deserves the opportunity to become successful. Our writing curriculum is centered around essential outcomes that are specifically designed to directly correlate with learning standards. Vertically and horizontally aligned outcomes promote unity across grade levels within our school. Through our Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and intervention and enrichment groups, we, as educators, are able to meet the needs of all students. We believe that every child can see their accomplishments - allowing them to take ownership of their own learning and successes through the growth they undergo.

Our science curriculum correlates with the National Science Education Content Standards. The social studies curriculum is based upon our state standards. Both the science and social studies curriculums encourage our students to engage in the material through the process of inquiry and critical thinking. Both subjects are embedded into our balanced literacy approach. Focus areas in the science area include robotics, life cycles, energy, and other relevant topics that our students can use. The primary focus of our science curriculum is shifting to the STEM program, with concentration in technology, engineering, and mathematics as applied to the science curriculum. In Social Studies we have shifted our focus to cultural awareness and appreciation of the history of other countries and cultures.

The school provides opportunities for our students to explore other areas of interest. There are programs in visual and performing arts, physical education/health/nutrition, and technology. Teachers implement curriculum in these programs that integrates standards in an engaging and rigorous manner. Students connect and relate the arts to other disciplines and to society. Many students choose to pursue their interests in the arts based on the foundation they received at Highland Park Elementary School.

It is obvious to our school community that our teachers and students are dedicated to making learning our top priority. Our unique community of learners celebrates learning and respects diversity within our school.

2. Reading/English:

At Highland Park Elementary, students engage in various elements of a balanced reading curriculum that include read alouds, shared reading, guided reading or literature circles, and independent reading. These elements revolve around a model of gradual release. Teachers work toward a gradual decline of teacher support and a gradual increase in student independence based on demonstrated student capacity.

Lessons are designed with the following guiding principles:

- Reading must be purposeful as it is the foundation for all academic achievement
- Students compare and evaluate information read from a variety of sources: narrative and informational/expository
- Students use and apply information in meaningful ways
- Students engage in discussions that encourage exploration of ideas and expansion of thinking

An extensive library of reading resources is available for teachers and students for each element of the balanced reading curriculum. New resources are always added to update and refresh the choices, especially in the area of leveled text to support guided reading. A greater emphasis has been placed recently on the selection of informational text.

An example to illustrate how students acquire foundational skills is provided in the following – Kindergarten students are immersed in early reading strategies from the first day of school with read alouds and shared reading. As their skills develop, these students are placed in ability assigned guided reading groups that provides them with the level of support necessary for their individual progress. Student grouping remains flexible throughout the school year as students move along the continuum of low to high performance.

At all grade levels, students performing below grade level are provided with extra assistance. Instruction is usually provided in small group formats. For students performing above grade level, various configurations are used to enhance and enrich these students growth as readers. These can include but are not limited to, small pull-out groups, cross-grade groups, and interest based groups.

The elements of a balanced reading curriculum are supported by extensive research in effective reading instruction. Additionally, teachers collect diagnostic information to inform instruction and assessment data to ensure accountability. One example of formative assessments, are running records, which are used to monitor and guide instruction for both individuals and groups of students.

Highland Park staff strongly believes that literacy learning must be designed to meet the needs and strengths of each child in the classroom. Our balanced literacy approach stresses and encourages active participation from each child regardless of their current level of literacy acquisition.

3. Mathematics:

HP recognizes the importance of mathematics in the lives of our students. The district has adopted the Everyday Math curriculum, and it has served our staff and student very well, as reflected by our statewide PAWS scores. Last year for example, in grades 3-5, our students proficiency scores were above the 95%!

Concepts in this program spiral, meaning that essential topics/objectives are revisited repeatedly in a variety of ways for mastery to occur. For example, the telling of time is introduced at the K level, but not expected to be mastered until second grade. Counting by ten, or hundreds works the same way. The difference between introduction and mastering is a spiraled concept. Teachers provide challenging materials both from the curriculum and through best practices to meet the needs of every student. The regular use of differentiated instruction, through our PLC framework, recognizes and responds to each learner's needs. While we have very high intensity focus on our at-risk students, the same can be said about our Gifted and Talented students. The Everyday Math curriculum allows us to move our students up and down the curriculum ladder to meet every need.

Teachers and support staff at HP support active student participation in math lessons by incorporating manipulative and hands-on practices through scaffolding instruction. Concrete, real life examples make the concept meaningful and come to life for our students. We are constantly looking at ways to connect our students to the math lesson for that day. Teachers use both curriculum provided assessments as well as those

derived through the PLC process, to get a constant read on the development of our students. No stone is left unturned, through the common assessment process, as well as MAP data, PAWS data, and continual checks-for-understanding. We understand that math is one of the most important curriculum areas to make sure that no child misses out on a step, or an objective without becoming proficient.

Math Recovery is provided in our district to address the needs of our at-risk kiddos in our lower grades. This is both a pull out and push in program for instruction, and targets the learning needs of the students. We have seen great results from this program, and along with Title, that targets our Free and Reduced group of learners, and SPED. Our at-risk kiddos get a tremendous opportunity to be successful. It is truly a team approach at HP!

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

As part of a school-wide health program, the art, music, physical education, and guidance areas have developed a character education program that centers on the PBIS fundamentals of behavior, respect, and attitude. Across the school, these "essential traits" are emphasized throughout, and the students and staff embrace the concepts that are consistently delivered and modeled. We recognize each week the Husky Stars, one student from each classroom, who has best displayed those traits that we are focused on. We hold a Friday Assembly every week, and recognize both students and staff for their modeling of the behavior we desire and expect here at HP!

Over the last two years we have brought in nationally recognized speakers on bullying, held numerous grade level events, assemblies, councils, and community events to help our students and parents make better life decisions, once again based on the essentials that we focus on here at HP. The message has been delivered and we have seen a reduction in the number of office referrals for behavior. As a matter of fact, HP has the lowest behavior incident to student ratio in the district. We are proud of the behavior our students display here at HP!

PBIS is a district-wide program based on the fundamental belief that behavior, like any other curriculum area, must be taught, modeled, reinforced, and implemented consistently to be effective. We begin each school year with a two-day "safari" that teaches the behavioral expectations for areas within our school. For example, I have instructed the expectations of the playground part of the "safari" and have our older students role play the behaviors that we expect to see, and those that are not acceptable. Our staff is a constant state of reinforcing and modeling the behaviors all over the school. Behaviors have to be taught, not expected. Outside presenters coming to HP often compliment our staff and students about their excellent behavior. They model appropriate behavior, professionalism, and the proper way to approach each school day.

The community, especially our health center, has made monumental contributions in this area for our staff and students. Informational meetings on nutrition, managing stress, and other health related issues have been brought into our school from this group, many which are parents of our students here at HP.

We also have Block Thursday, where we bring in orchestra, keyboarding, computers, and health education for all of our students. At HP, we truly do educate the whole child!

5. Instructional Methods:

Highland Park Elementary School differentiates instruction based on our students' diverse needs. As a Professional Learning Community (PLC), we are able to ensure high levels of student learning and achievement through daily modification and supplementation. We use standards-based learning outcomes to guide our instruction in all areas.

Numerous methods are utilized, in the area of literacy at HP Elementary School, to meet the diverse needs of our student subgroups. Such methods include: guided reading groups based on individual instructional reading levels within the classroom, individual instruction through Reading Recovery, booster group reading

intervention with a Reading Specialist, and Special Education. Special Education is a federal program, IDEA, that identifies learning disabled students, conducts Individual Learning Plans based on the specific needs of each student, and specialized staff members deliver the instruction accordingly. Writing instruction is differentiated through small needs-based groups. The groups meet on a daily basis, and the instruction is developed by the grade level PLC teams based on the needs of that group. Literacy instruction is also differentiated through our Gifted and Talented program, (Seminar). This program identifies our top performing students and places them in an accelerated program one day per week. Students from all five of our elementary schools come into a central location and take on challenging topics, discussions for deeper thinking skills.

Additional methods for meeting the needs of our students are incorporated in the area of math. A common curriculum is used throughout all grade levels. Each lesson provides opportunities to adjust the lesson through modification and enrichment activities. Everyday Math is also designed to repeatedly present and build upon core concepts throughout all grade levels. Math Recovery and math groups, Special Education, and differentiated instruction in the classroom provide venues for all students' success. Special Education students have been identified with specific learning disabilities, and we are fully staffed with teachers and support staff to meet the needs of each student. They are also integrated into our PLC groups for leveled instruction.

Technology is embedded throughout the curriculum in a variety of ways to support instruction. The computer lab is accessible to all students, as well as laptops and iPads which are available for check out. Our school also utilizes Flashmasters for individualized fact practice, iPods, and document cameras to aid in differentiated instruction. Our school purchases site licenses for a variety of educational programs that can be tailored to meet the varying needs of our students.

6. Professional Development:

HP follows more than just a "program" for professional development. Our team has created a culture of collaboration that lives and breathes the true Professional Learning Community philosophy. Our professional development opportunities have included each staff member attending PLC workshops through Solutions Tree and Summit training. Staff that has already attended the basic training, participate in to further their leadership skills within their grade level teams. We are committed to working collaboratively in an ongoing process of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students we serve. In order to meet and maintain the high expectations we set for ourselves and our students, we operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for ourselves as educators.

On a weekly basis, grade level teams consisting of administrators, teachers, specialists, and paraprofessionals come together to accomplish one common goal: to improve and enrich student learning. During these meetings, we analyze data to inform and drive classroom instruction - all of which is aimed towards meeting the unique needs of each of our students. To build upon our current instructional schema, skills, and expertise of each team member, we utilize strategies learned from reading current, research-based professional texts. Through the use of our team book discussions, we have been able to consistently improve our pedagogical knowledge and ability to meet the needs of our students

In addition to meeting with our grade level teams, we also collaborate once a month with another grade level team to discuss our professional readings and current classroom instruction. These discussions have helped to align our curriculum and instruction across the grade levels as well as serve as a way to learn from each other. During district in-service days throughout the year, time is allocated to vertically align various learning outcomes based on academic standards across grade levels. This collaborative effort has allowed us to increase and maintain high student expectations and unite the teaching staff within our school, ultimately resulting in a high level of student performance across the board. HP has learned how to use collaboration which focuses on student achievement as a means for effective professional development. Highland Park Elementary's example has caused a ripple effect, impacting the professional development of other schools in

our district and across the state of Wyoming. The majority of schools in Wyoming have adopted the PLC model, based on what they have taken away from our school and district.

A lot of schools may say they do these things, but if you walk into Highland Park you will be able to see every member of our staff living this collaborative philosophy and growing together as educators.

7. School Leadership

Highland Park Elementary School operates under a shared leadership philosophy. The building structure consists of one principal, two educational facilitators, and roughly forty-five certified and classified staff. The educational facilitators spend half of their time supporting at-risk students in literacy, while the other half of their time is spent modeling literacy and/or math and facilitating team meetings. The school structure consists of grade level based teams; the teams include both certified and classified staff ranging from classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, student teachers, counselors, and the principal. The two educational facilitators expedite team meetings on a weekly basis.

The primary focus of all team meetings is student learning. Minutes from each meeting, along with documents such as formative assessments and rubrics, are turned into the principal for review and kept in a binder for easy reference. This system allows the principal to monitor the implementation of policies and to support staff in their endeavor of meeting the expectations of our school community.

The school principal takes a very active role in the education of all students. He is an instructional leader that team teaches and models lessons for staff. In the first semester of every year the principal is a member of a team and is responsible for attending all of that team's meetings. He will also periodically attend other team meetings to offer support and guidance. The principal takes a small group of students on a daily basis and provides instruction based on the current outcome being taught in the classroom. Instruction will consist of intervention on a skill in which students are struggling or enrichment on a skill they have mastered.

In a shared leadership environment, it is very important that staff view themselves as a team. Each staff member is asked to lead team meetings and share data and successful teaching strategies. Staff constantly talks about becoming a great team. Our definition is simple; a great team is a group of individuals who refuse to let each other down. The staff and community of HP truly believe this. We take responsibility for our students' learning and hold each other accountable by sharing data and creating shared goals. At the opening of every year, the principal organizes staff development in the area of the school goal. Motivational and team building activities are intertwined within the training. While operating under this leadership philosophy, Highland Park Elementary School has made tremendous gains in student learning as evidenced by state and local assessments.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2009</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					98
% Advanced					38
Number of students tested					45
Percent of total students tested					100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					0
% of students tested with alternative assessment					0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					100
% Advanced					18
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					90
% Advanced					20
Number of students tested					10
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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
% Advanced					19
Number of students tested					39
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: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2011</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			61		
Number of students tested			40		
Percent of total students tested			100		
Number of students tested with alternative assessment			2		
% of students tested with alternative assessment			1		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			18		
Number of students tested			13		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			33		
Number of students tested			8		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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		
% Advanced			60		
Number of students tested			35		
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: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2012</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		98			
% Advanced		64			
Number of students tested		58			
Percent of total students tested		100			
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		1			
% of students tested with alternative assessment		1			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		95			
% Advanced		55			
Number of students tested		21			
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91			
% Advanced		55			
Number of students tested		12			
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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			
% Advanced		61			
Number of students tested		57			
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: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2013</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98				
% Advanced	52				
Number of students tested	60				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95				
% Advanced	47				
Number of students tested	19				
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90				
% Advanced	50				
Number of students tested	10				
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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				
% Advanced	51				
Number of students tested	58				
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: <u>Math</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2009</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					96
% Advanced					26
Number of students tested					50
Percent of total students tested					100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					0
% of students tested with alternative assessment					0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					90
% Advanced					15
Number of students tested					20
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					92
% Advanced					7
Number of students tested					13
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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					90
% Advanced					25
Number of students tested					40
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: <u>Math</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2011</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			98		
% Advanced			59		
Number of students tested			54		
Percent of total students tested			100		
Number of students tested with alternative assessment			0		
% of students tested with alternative assessment			0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			95		
% Advanced			53		
Number of students tested			19		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			92		
% Advanced			33		
Number of students tested			12		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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			94		
% Advanced			58		
Number of students tested			50		
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: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2012</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		97			
% Advanced		57			
Number of students tested		37			
Percent of total students tested		100			
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		2			
% of students tested with alternative assessment		1			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	0	91			
% Advanced		36			
Number of students tested		13			
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		86			
% Advanced		0			
Number of students tested		9			
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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		97			
% Advanced		57			
Number of students tested		35			
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: <u>Math</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2013</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97				
% Advanced	55				
Number of students tested	60				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90				
% Advanced	20				
Number of students tested	20				
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85				
% Advanced	23				
Number of students tested	13				
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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	97				
% Advanced	55				
Number of students tested	58				
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: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2009</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					86
% Advanced					30
Number of students tested					43
Percent of total students tested					100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					0
% of students tested with alternative assessment					0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					100
% Advanced					18
Number of students tested					11
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					50
% Advanced					0
Number of students tested					8
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					0
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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					88
% Advanced					56
Number of students tested					34
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: <u>Math</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2011</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			96		
% Advanced			62		
Number of students tested			51		
Percent of total students tested			100		
Number of students tested with alternative assessment			1		
% of students tested with alternative assessment			1		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			87		
% Advanced			40		
Number of students tested			15		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			90		
% Advanced			30		
Number of students tested			11		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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			95		
% Advanced			62		
Number of students tested			47		
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: <u>Math</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2007</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		97			
% Advanced		73			
Number of students tested		62			
Percent of total students tested		100			
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		0			
% of students tested with alternative assessment		0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91			
% Advanced		65			
Number of students tested		23			
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		86			
% Advanced		50			
Number of students tested		14			
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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		97			
% Advanced		72			
Number of students tested		60			
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: <u>Math</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2013</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97				
% Advanced	87				
Number of students tested	38				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93				
% Advanced	73				
Number of students tested	15				
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89				
% Advanced	56				
Number of students tested	9				
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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	97				
% Advanced	87				
Number of students tested	37				
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2009</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					59
% Advanced					8
Number of students tested					45
Percent of total students tested					100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					0
% of students tested with alternative assessment					0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					55
% Advanced					5
Number of students tested					11
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					55
% Advanced					5
Number of students tested					10
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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					59
% Advanced					8
Number of students tested					43
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2011</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			97		
% Advanced			57		
Number of students tested			40		
Percent of total students tested			100		
Number of students tested with alternative assessment			2		
% of students tested with alternative assessment			1		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			91		
% Advanced			41		
Number of students tested			13		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			41		
Number of students tested			8		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			97		
% Advanced			58		
Number of students tested			40		
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2012</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		98			
% Advanced		62			
Number of students tested		54			
Percent of total students tested		100			
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		0			
% of students tested with alternative assessment		0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		85			
% Advanced		10			
Number of students tested		21			
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		72			
% Advanced		18			
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					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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			
% Advanced		62			
Number of students tested		54			
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2013</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92				
% Advanced	25				
Number of students tested	60				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79				
% Advanced	21				
Number of students tested	19				
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70				
% Advanced	10				
Number of students tested	10				
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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	93				
% Advanced	26				
Number of students tested	57				
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2009</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					62
% Advanced					17
Number of students tested					50
Percent of total students tested					100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					0
% of students tested with alternative assessment					0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					48
% Advanced					8
Number of students tested					20
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					31
% Advanced					0
Number of students tested					13
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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					62
% Advanced					17
Number of students tested					50
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2011</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			98		
% Advanced			41		
Number of students tested			54		
Percent of total students tested			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					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			40		
Number of students tested			19		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100		
% Advanced			17		
Number of students tested			12		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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		
% Advanced			49		
Number of students tested			53		
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2012</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		97			
% Advanced		80			
Number of students tested		37			
Percent of total students tested		100			
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		2			
% of students tested with alternative assessment		1			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91			
% Advanced		64			
Number of students tested		13			
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		86			
% Advanced		43			
Number of students tested		9			
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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		97			
% Advanced		58			
Number of students tested		35			
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2013</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95				
% Advanced	58				
Number of students tested	60				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85				
% Advanced	20				
Number of students tested	20				
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77				
% Advanced	15				
Number of students tested	13				
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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				
% Advanced	54				
Number of students tested	57				
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2009</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					81
% Advanced					24
Number of students tested					43
Percent of total students tested					100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					0
% of students tested with alternative assessment					0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					69
% Advanced					6
Number of students tested					8
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					44
% Advanced					0
Number of students tested					8
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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					81
% Advanced					24
Number of students tested					43
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2011</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			94		
% Advanced			30		
Number of students tested			51		
Percent of total students tested			100		
Number of students tested with alternative assessment			0		
% of students tested with alternative assessment			0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			87		
% Advanced			7		
Number of students tested			15		
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			90		
% Advanced			10		
Number of students tested			11		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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			94		
% Advanced			10		
Number of students tested			51		
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test:
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2012</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Jan	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		98			
% Advanced		66			
Number of students tested		62			
Percent of total students tested		100			
Number of students tested with alternative assessment		0			
% of students tested with alternative assessment		0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		52			
Number of students tested		23			
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		93			
% Advanced		21			
Number of students tested		14			
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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		97			
% Advanced		72			
Number of students tested		58			
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: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test: <u>PAWS</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>2013</u>
Publisher: <u>Pearson</u>	

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100				
% Advanced	66				
Number of students tested	38				
Percent of total students tested	100				
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100				
% Advanced	53				
Number of students tested	15				
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100				
% Advanced	33				
Number of students tested	9				
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
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				
% Advanced	66				
Number of students tested					
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: