

U.S. Department of Education
2015 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. Raymond Metcalf

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

Official School Name Salem Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 7806 Salem Road

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

City Salem State MI Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 48175-5219

County Washtenaw County State School Code Number* 03380

Telephone 248-573-8450 Fax _____

Web site/URL _____

http://www.slcs.us/schools/salem_elementary/index.php E-mail metcalfr@slcs.us

Twitter Handle @SLCSSalem Facebook Page https://www.facebook.com/SalemElementary Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

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

Date _____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. William Pearson

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

E-mail: pearsonb@slcs.us

Other)

District Name South Lyon Community Schools Tel. 248-573-8127

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. Steven Brummer

(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 and National Blue Ribbon Schools requirements, are 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 2014-2015 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 2009 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: 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014.
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):
- 7 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 2 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools

11 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	29	34	63
1	29	37	66
2	38	36	74
3	38	27	65
4	29	26	55
5	33	32	65
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	196	192	388

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 2 % Asian
 - 4 % Black or African American
 - 4 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 88 % White
 - 2 % 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 2013 - 2014 year: 15%

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, 2013 until the end of the school year	24
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2013 until the end of the school year	26
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	50
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	334
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.150
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	15

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 4 %
14 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 9
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish, Romanian, Telugu, Chinese, Kannada, German, Korean, Gujarati, Polish
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 26 %
 Total number students who qualify: 101

Information for Public Schools Only - Data Provided by the State

The state has reported that 44 % of the students enrolled in this school are from low income or disadvantaged families based on the following subgroup(s): Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals

9. Students receiving special education services: 14 %
56 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>5</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>3</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>25</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>4</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>23</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>1</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed |

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

	Number of Staff
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	16
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	7
Paraprofessionals	0
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	1

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 25:1

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

Required Information	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Daily student attendance	97%	96%	96%	96%	96%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2014

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

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

15. Please summarize your school mission in 25 words or less: It is our mission to provide a learning environment where the individual child is supported and celebrated so that he or she can reach their full potential and become a contributing member to society.

PART III – SUMMARY

Less than eight miles from downtown South Lyon, MI, tucked away in the heart of Salem Township, you will find our warm and welcoming building on Salem Road. We are surrounded by a landscape of natural greenery, wetlands, and nature trails, which lead to Johnson Creek, a tributary of the Rouge River that is used for water testing by Salem students. Salem Elementary is also home to a beautiful butterfly garden with a walking trail that is maintained by the local Brownie troop.

The moment you step into our school you are met with a true sense of community, care, and positivity. There is clear evidence that this is a child-centered place; there are student created products in the hallway, and the sound of kids learning and interacting is evident in every corner. The staff has a deep love and enthusiasm for what they do. Regardless of the challenges they may face when teaching a wide variety of students, they embrace every child and truly care about his or her well-being in our school for years to come. It is this sense of community that sets Salem apart from other schools. Staff use the relationships they build with students and families to make kids want to come to school; make parents, who may not have had pleasurable school experiences in their past, realize that the school is a support of kids and families alike. As students and families realize this, we work alongside them to meet their individual needs.

In an effort to not only provide an environment in which students feel comfortable and cared for, but also one that promotes the thinking and academic success required of our changing educational landscape, Salem Elementary has been part of Harvard University's Graduate School of Education's Project Zero Culture of Thinking/Making Thinking Visible. Our school was approached to participate in the transformation 4 years ago and we are continuing to progress. Our school's early success, dedication and enthusiasm prompted the rest of our school district to follow in the culture change. The tenets of this transformation are embedded in all that we do from teaching, professional learning, sharing information with families, student products and even our language.

Salem staff sees the importance of helping students continue their productivity and success beyond the walls of our school. As a result we model and teach the Habits of Mind. These 16 habits, which are learning and thinking habits that successful individuals consistently demonstrate, have been emphasized and taught in our district for nearly 15 years. The principles from these teachings are in alignment with those of our cultures of thinking initiatives.

Most recently, we have implemented a Caring Coyote initiative. In an effort to increase positive relationships between students and help new students understand the culture and expectations of our school, teachers took on the responsibility for implementing this initiative school wide.

Additionally students have opportunities to become safety squad members, student council representatives and officers, and part of our Coyote Choir. We also have our Adopt a Reader program that provides reading tutor for qualifying students, a Kids HOPE mentoring program that pairs students of need with a caring individual from our community as well as several social and academic support systems as provided through grant funds in order to help students meet their potential.

Our school's mission focuses on celebrating the individual child. As our school is growing individuality has become more apparent and welcomed. We historically have served an economically diverse student population, but we are now working with a student body that includes an increased variety of races, ethnicities and abilities. This diverse student population of just over 400 helps students develop understanding and empathy for their peers to enhance the positive school culture we are continually working to build.

Salem has had its share of challenging situations to overcome. In a span of 5 years, the building experienced three principals (one of whom passed away upon retirement), the possibility of closing due to district budget difficulties, the passing of a beloved teacher and community member, and declining enrollment resulting in a reduction of staff. The resiliency of the staff and surrounding community has made Salem the positive place for kids it is today. Families who were once reluctant to attend Salem are now singing its praises and

positively promoting its efforts for kids in the community. Our enrollment is increasing and the sense of pride about our small school is contagious.

Salem exemplifies the charge of doing what is best for kids that is commonly heard in educational circles. The staff and families have a positive relationship that is unmatched which is the key to our success with kids.

PART IV – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Core Curriculum:

The district utilizes a Subject Area Curriculum (SAC) committee process for aligning, reviewing, monitoring and revising curriculum and common assessments. This work includes evaluating potential instructional materials and units for their inclusion of diverse populations and types of learners. The committee members, including representatives from the special education department, are selected to provide all school buildings with a voice in the work and committees are structured to provide multiple opportunities for articulation between grade levels and across building levels for a systemic approach to curriculum, instruction, and assessments.

For ELA and Math, our district utilizes the workshop approach to instruction, which includes providing a mini-lesson on a targeted objective for the day, an opportunity for students to attempt this skill in a guided format, then independently, with a follow up and share at the end of the session. As students are working independently on the day's learning target, the classroom teacher is meeting with students both individually and in small groups, based on need. That is, teachers differentiate instruction during these conferences in order to meet students where they are with specific learning targets. Teachers utilize the formative data gathered from these conferences to drive their instruction. This approach is commonly used throughout our ISD as it allows for multiple re-teaching and differentiation opportunities.

In reading, students read just-right leveled texts so that they are learning reading skills within a text range that is appropriate for individual growth. Students share their thinking in written and verbal form through the lessons but also get practice on utilizing these skills in the other content areas as the expectation that CCSS are embedding in all subject areas.

Students get daily practice in writing through the workshop model outlined above, and then use the portions created in each session to revise and compile an end of the unit writing piece. Additionally, teachers embed writing in all of the subject areas for increased practice in an applicable manner.

Math workshop allows for a skill/concept to be taught and for student to attempt the skill independently. Teachers also provide various practice opportunities through different modes (games, journaling, conversations, assignments, etc.) in a format that also allows for conferences and re-teaching on a regular basis.

Our curriculum in all subject areas is not driven by a specific resource, but rather through several resources to get a well-rounded understanding of each of the standards.

Students demonstrate their understanding through a variety of formative and summative assessments. Teachers utilize checklists, conference notes, student products, interviews, exit slips, teacher-made assessments and various assignments to determine a student's understanding of concepts taught in a formative manner. This guides teacher's day-to-day instruction. Additionally, all students participate in district-wide common assessments in all subject areas. Comprehensive common reading, writing and math assessments are administered twice per year whereas science and social studies unit assessments are administered upon the completion of the unit.

Teachers regularly analyze this information/data to determine next teaching points. This information may tell a teacher that specific groups for re-teaching is necessary and/or which students may need Additional extensions with specific concepts. Teachers then utilize the extensions or re-teaching opportunities listed in the curriculum documents as well as any additional resources the teacher may use (with approval from administration to ensure alignment with curriculum and philosophies- this is a district practice and expectation). Teachers collaborate with grade level colleagues, support staff (reading recovery, special education, etc.) and building administration in efforts to further meet the diverse needs of students.

2. Other Curriculum Areas:

All students, Kindergarten through 5th grade, school participate in art, music and physical education each week. Students attend one 45 minute session of art class, and two 35 minute sessions of both music and physical education.

The instructional approach in each of these classes is similar to the core curricular subjects. While the set of skills in each of the classes are indicative of the specific discipline, it is important to note that each of the classes implement the following as a way to increase systemic growth and skills essential to development of the whole child:

1. Teaching and assessing Habits of Mind; teachers develop specific plans and track the progress of a targeted group of students in addition to teaching and assessing this for the entire student body.

Additionally, each of the classes have a progress monitoring system entitled “Salem Stars” where members of each class rate themselves on a three point scale at the end of the session. The rating is on the Habits of Mind demonstrated by the class as a whole.

2. Implementation of Visible Thinking routines; this deepens our culture of thinking and promote the notion that these “other” curriculum areas are “academic” and students should be thinking about their learning. This also promotes ELA CCSS in that students are writing and reflecting in the other curricular areas.

In art, students are taught specific art concepts through creating various projects which the teacher plans to model after a specific artist who is associated with this particular skill. Students are introduced to the artist through text, visual presentations, videos and pictures and then get a chance to try the skill independently. The art teacher ends projects with an artist reflection related to personal growth and attainment of the learning target.

Music class is driven by the students creating music. On a regular basis students use instruments to demonstrate various music concepts that are modeled by the music teacher and or by various composers. Students are immersed in specific vocabulary terms associated with composing and analyzing various forms of music.

In physical education, students are learning essential gross and fine motor skills for healthy development and appropriate competitive experiences. Teachers break the skills down into essential steps and have students try these skills in isolation and then incorporate them into games for increased engagement and application.

In regard to technology, the Salem media center houses a mini computer lab for student use in addition to three student computers in each classroom. In addition, and most impactful, is the circulation of 140 Google Chromebooks on four different carts. Classroom teachers utilize this technology to teach students how to use the Google Apps for Education. Students in grades 3-5 are provided with a school email address that allows them to communicate with classroom teachers only and utilize the sharing functions of the Google Apps for Education. Students in all grades utilize technology in the classroom as grade level teachers find appropriate and in support of the curriculum. Research, blogging, word processing, and presentations are all ways in which students in the various grades experience the technology, all guided by the classroom teacher. Additionally, our PTO has purchased classroom subscriptions to RAZ-Kids.com as a supplementary reading resource for reading that can be used in the classroom and at home.

3. Instructional Methods and Interventions:

Interventions for students start in the classroom. Teachers recognize students with a need that is varied from the rest of the class and implement strategies based on these needs as demonstrated through formative assessment. This differentiated instruction is implemented through the use of the workshop model of instruction. This structure allows for increased teaching points and re-teaching opportunities. If students are not progressing as anticipated, teachers then try different strategies. As part of our MTSS, teachers in our district develop specific plans for individual students who have not met specific assessment targets in

grades 2-5. These credentialing plans are generally created at the end of the year to serve as an articulation piece from year-to-year so that teachers can start meeting the individual needs of struggling students immediately.

Depending on student progress, an accommodations survey may be started in order to document what specific and different strategies are attempted and their degree of success. Parents are notified by the classroom teacher in that their child is at risk of not meeting the standards and the MTSS process is shared at that time. Teachers monitor progress and make adjustments as necessary. A child study meeting can be requested throughout this process in order to further problem solve and determine next steps for the student, which can include additional interventions with a specified timeline or special education testing if deemed appropriate.

As a Title I Targeted Assistance building, Salem has several intervention teachers to provide additional instruction for students who qualify. The intervention staff and building principal look at school-wide assessment data to determine which grades/classes demonstrate the greatest need. Once that has been determined, students are selected through the criteria as determined by various grant-funded interventions. These students are then selected for the intervention with parent permission. The intervention teachers and classroom teachers work together to determine the best model of delivery and which concepts need to be reinforced. These teacher teams work together to analyze student products and observational data to determine the next teaching points and to determine what growth has been achieved. Families are informed of our intervention programs through a beginning-of-the-year meeting, conferences observations and written communication.

As far as extensions for high ability learners, the workshop model provides the best opportunity for that. Teachers determine a students need through formative assessments and work with students based on their individual needs. Teachers exercise the notion that depth of understanding is essential, as opposed to breadth of knowledge. Teachers pose questions and problems to extend and deepen the thinking of all learners at their zone of proximal development. Additionally, our school's work in developing a culture of thinking has provided students who excel an avenue for divergent thinking by implementing visible thinking routines.

PART V – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results Narrative Summary:

As our staff has analyzed trend data for our state assessment and the following has been identified (although it may not be evident in the charts provided):

We were above state and county averages in ELA and Math, and our economically disadvantaged students' performance levels remain higher than district, county and state averages. Even though our students with IEPs may not qualify in all grades as an official subgroup, we still identify it as such for our building purposes. That being said, we recognize that the achievement gap between this group of student and our larger group of tested students is quite variable depending on the particular grade and ability of the students tested. We recognize that this is a subgroup (official or not) for which a large achievement gap exists.

In efforts to narrow said gap (on state, district and classroom assessments), the following actions are being implemented: Specific SMART goals for individuals and groups of students. Teachers develop these plans of intervention instruction for students with IEPs and those who are demonstrating non-proficiency on multiple assessments. This is separate from the child's IEP. Teachers then implement the intervention strategies within the classroom, reflect on its success and then adjust as necessary. Additionally, we have been adjusting the master schedule to allow for increased co-teaching and push-in model for intervention. This is in effort to get away from a "tutoring" model of intervention and services, but rather making the grade level content more accessible. This way, the student hears the delivery of the lesson and the support staff is clarifying and accommodating as necessary.

An additional noticing is that whole for the past few years we've had an increase in enrollment, our total number of students tested in each grade level has been relatively low; therefore, our gains and drops can be superficial in that each student represents roughly 2 percent. In order to empower staff for change, it has been our charge that if we think about moving 5 students into the proficient range, we are making 10% growth each year, which is greater than what is indicated in our school improvement plan.

An additional noticing is that whole for the past few years we've had an increase in enrollment, our total number of students tested in each grade level has been relatively low; therefore, our gains and drops can be superficial in that each student represents roughly 2 percent. In order to empower staff for change, it has been our charge that if we think about moving 5 students into the proficient range, we are making 10% growth each year, which is greater than what is indicated in our school improvement plan.

When looking at the data we do notice a great decline in the level of proficiency between the 2010-11 and 2011-12 school years. It needs to be noted that the state of Michigan adjusted cut scores for the state assessment. Scores state-wide were affected by the change. After the cut score adjustment, we have recognized that there is no true trend. We have cohorts of students (tracking their progress as they matriculate from 3rd to 5th grade) whose data fluctuates from year to year. Additionally, we notice that certain grade levels have similarly fickle scores. That being said we do recognize that generally students perform better on the reading assessments than math and writing. This can be attributed to the intensive early intervention provided in reading as a result of our Title I funding. Math and writing do get supports, but the greatest number of supports are provided in reading as we have three Reading Recovery teachers. Math and writing have been a focus of differentiation and professional learning so that staff can build their capacity in providing interventions to meet the needs of the diverse learners in each of the classrooms.

2. Assessment for Instruction and Learning and Sharing Assessment Results:

Teachers utilize formative assessments to make instructional decisions. Conference notes, running records, student products, exit slips and interviews all provide teachers with a great deal of information in order to meet the needs of individual students. Staff meetings and release time are dedicated to analyzing this data. Teachers do so individually, with support staff and with grade level colleagues. Common district summative assessment data (in all core content areas) is reviewed by individual classroom teachers and building

administrators. Our data clearinghouse provides multiple reports so that data can be disaggregated depending on need. These reports are shared and analyzed during professional development opportunities. Staff reflect independently and as a whole for the largest assessments (twice-per-year reading, writing and math assessment). These reflections help shape our school improvement plan. The analysis is incorporated into the plan and all professional development opportunities are in alignment with the plan. The strategies in our school improvement plan are designed to narrow achievement gaps, and also increase student achievement for all students.

Students are provided feedback through the formative assessments. Teachers meet with students regularly to teach concepts individually and in small groups. Teaching in this manner allows for feedback opportunities. Assessments are debriefed with students for an additional re-teaching opportunity for skills that may not have been mastered. Families are provided information about their child's achievement through parent-teacher communication, scored assignments, report cards, parent teacher conferences, IEPs and section 504 plans (for qualified students), assessment reporting forms, emails, scheduled and impromptu parent meetings.

The greater community is provided information regarding student achievement through our SIP (shared involvement process). The Salem SIP is comprised of staff members, families and a community member. Data is shared at scheduled meetings then noted in our meeting minutes. Community members are invited to review school and district assessment scores through the state website.

Part VI School Support

1. School Climate/Culture

Salem staff works tirelessly to provide a safe and supportive learning environment that supports student growth in academic, emotional and social capacities. This starts through the district wide teaching of Habits of Mind. This systemic practice ensures that students in our school are taught, reminded, and even assessed in these 16 habits essential to an individual success. Modeling and teaching these habits sets the foundation for an environment that is conducive to student growth in all areas. Additionally, we have recently implemented our Caring Coyotes initiative that promotes kindness in all areas of our school. This initiative promotes a common language and teaching of how we can care for ourselves, others and our community.

Select students, as recommend by classroom teachers or requested by parents, are paired with a Kids HOPE mentor. These mentors are members of our greater community who meet with students on a weekly basis to form relationships, provide some academic and social support in and outside of the school as allowed by the child's family. The students working with these mentors have another person in the community who cares deeply about their well-being.

Students are provided with opportunities to work with our school social worker in order to promote desired behaviors. Our social worker is also a resource for staff members in that she helps problem solve and provide interventions for students of need. Teachers use classroom meetings as a way to incorporate social dialogue and learning in a natural setting. Teachers use these moments to teach the Habits of Mind, reinforce the school expectations of being safe, kind and responsible, all so that we work towards everyone being comfortable in our building so that they can all learn.

Students have leadership opportunities to highlight strengths outside of the academics. Safety squad, student council, and Coyote Choir are all ways for students to demonstrate their strengths in a way that supports our school community.

The Salem staff has been heralded for maintaining a family-like atmosphere in welcoming new staff members, student and families. Regardless of how our staff has grown, we still remain close-knit. The families in our community continue to provide positive feedback about their experiences at Salem which helps staff feel supported in what they do. Staff feels comfortable in coming to building administration and other staff members for support when working with students. Staff also receives feedback regarding strategies with students through daily unplanned interactions and through post evaluation conferences. This helps reinforce the great things that staff members are doing with students and provides guidance in areas of difficulty.

2. Engaging Families and Community

The most effective strategy that the Salem staff uses to work with members of the community is building relationships. The staff demonstrates a level of care and understanding of our unique student needs that is unmatched. Because of this, kids love coming to school, are receptive to the lessons taught and share that with families. Parents know that our school is not like the school they went to as kids; it's a place where all members of the community have a voice and an extra level of care is used when working with kids. These relationships allow us to have courageous conversations with families with the best interest of students in mind. As we continue to foster these positive relationships between the school and the community, communication is more substantive and productive for kids.

For the past few years we have been working toward improving communication more feverishly, as we recognize the importance of involving the community in the school improvement process. Our district has utilized the Shared Involvement Process as a way to increase community involvement in the school improvement process. The SIP serves as a steering committee for school-wide decisions and approves the school improvement plan.

Social media has been a quick and frequent avenue for communicating what is going on in classrooms. The building principal posts on the school Facebook page and the school's Twitter account the various learning that is occurring in classrooms and updates regarding school events. Salem classroom teachers utilize blogs, twitter, websites, and newsletters as a way to communicate what is happening in the classroom. These posts often include happenings in the classroom and ways for families to support the learning in the classroom. As families are made aware of classroom and school-wide happenings they are more likely to ask questions, seek assistance and promote the learning that is essential to student success.

We hold meetings for families who are receiving intervention services and discuss the intervention programs available to their children. IEP team meetings are a positive, thoughtful and personalized avenue to share with families the success of their students and strategies to continue said success (as are parent teacher conferences).

School-wide progress is shared through the state website and at PTO and SIP meetings.

3. Professional Development

Salem Elementary professional development supports our district and school improvement plans. Most professional development opportunities are provided within the building and/or the district. Professional development in our building has increased the capacity for teacher leaders to provide the meaningful learning for other staff members. These teacher leaders work with building and central office administration to provide structured learning experiences with input from colleagues to make the learning more authentic, focused and need-based. The major focus of PD has been narrowing the achievement gap and strengthening our culture of thinking. Our professional development dedicated to narrowing the achievement gap consists of data analysis, new curriculum training and analysis, classroom assessment development, intervention strategy understanding and implementations, staff reflections and dialogue. Our cultures of thinking learning supports the dispositions as deemed necessary by CCSS. Additionally, promoting thinking in the way this philosophy shift suggests, develops a growth mindset and helps students think beyond the walls of the classroom, which all support our mission statement.

Intervention staff work with classroom teachers to observe particular students (with a specific focus) and analyze various forms of data to determine next teaching points for these students. Some classroom teachers have recently taken a deeper leadership role in learning facilitation techniques by working with a quality school consultant from our ISD in order to implement the strategies in a building-based cohort that is focusing on developing a culture of thinking. Most recently, this cohort observed a classroom with the strict focus on student learning behaviors. The group observed what students were doing during specific learning times in order to determine next teaching points in this specific classroom.

In addition to the experiences mentioned above, Salem staff participates in 30 hours of before/after school staff meetings per year. The agendas for these meetings are determined by needs demonstrated at different parts of the year. Early on, we focus on articulating the needs of our students as part of our MTSS (credentialing plans) and then developing SMART goals for these specific students. We spend some staff meetings reviewing the school improvement plan and discuss possible changes for the following year as we determine what is working/not working for our students. Some staff meetings are grade-level oriented so that colleagues can discuss the pressing issues within the grades (assessments, pacing, struggling students, extensions), and others may focus on school-wide, grade level or classroom formative and summative assessment data dialogues.

4. School Leadership

Salem Elementary demonstrates a shared leadership philosophy as much as possible. The building principal often elicits ideas from the staff in order to help make decisions that impact everyone. Staff approaches the principal with ideas about our processes, practices, students, etc. and together they work to come to a consensus on what may need to happen next. A prime example of this is how, when the current principal was in his first year, staff members came to him about the cultures of thinking initiative that was starting in

our county. The school district had not yet invested in this professional learning; however, several staff members were passionate about the project. Through dialogue, we decided to move forward with this learning and haven't looked back. As testament to the effectiveness of this shared decision, the rest of the district saw the learning that was happening at Salem and central office decided to move forward in making this a district-wide focus, so much so it is now part of the district improvement plan.

Other decisions, such as the development for of the school improvement plan, professional development or class placement for students is shared between teaching staff and the building principal. Some of the decisions are made staff-wide, and at times, within smaller groups depending on the circumstances. As illustrated in the way we determine interventions, decisions about how to be support kids is a collaborative and well-thought out process. It is through appropriate information gathering, dialogue and research that we make the decisions that benefit all students in alignment with our school's mission and district's guiding principles.

Additionally, The Shared Involvement Process (SIP) established by our district has systems in place where stakeholders help make decisions regarding our budget, school improvement plan and school-wide protocols/procedures. The SIP team reviews the guiding principles of SIP and our district each year to make sure that decisions made always have the best interest of children and their growth (academic, emotional, and social) at the forefront. For example, the SIP team was approached about our Caring Coyotes initiative and ways to inform parents and promote this initiative's principles, but also they were approached about using operating funds for the purchase of a new spelling resource for teachers, which they supported.

Finally, the Salem PTO plays a role in a supportive decision-making capacity. We are quite thankful for the volunteers and PTO contributions to the effectiveness of our school. Not only do they provide wonderful extracurricular opportunities, they work with the staff to support curriculum and instruction. The PTO asks the building principal and staff about the needs in the building. They then utilize allocated funds to support the teaching and learning in the classrooms by organizing assemblies, purchasing technology and other materials that may not be covered by the school's general budget. All of these choices are made with school staff and with the best needs of children at the forefront.

PART VIII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>MEAP</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>3</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	70	71	57	90	98
Advanced (Level 1)	22	7	0	72	70
Number of students tested	46	45	44	54	53
Percent of total students tested	100	99	99	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above		56	64	100	
Advanced (Level 1)		0	0	60	
Number of students tested		16	11	20	
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient (Level 2) and above				100	
Advanced (Level 1)				10	
Number of students tested				10	
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	67	75	61	100	98
Advanced (Level 1)	23	8	0	73	72
Number of students tested	43	39	36	49	50
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Proficiency cut-scores starting 11-12.

Less than 10 students in a sub group so data is not available for the following:

Special Ed 09-10, 11-12, 12-13, 13-14; Econ Disadv 09-10, 13-14

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>MEAP</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	63	62	60	100	96
Advanced (Level 1)	7	13	8	59	55
Number of students tested	59	47	50	54	66
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	100	99
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	1	1	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	58	33	33		88
Advanced (Level 1)	0	8	0		48
Number of students tested	19	12	21		25
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	10				45
Advanced (Level 1)	10				36
Number of students tested	10				11
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	67	63	63	100	95
Advanced (Level 1)	8	15	9	60	54
Number of students tested	51	40	46	50	63
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Proficiency cut-scores starting 11-12.

Less than 10 students in a sub group so data is not available for the following:

Special Ed 10-11, 11-12, 12-13; Econ Disadv 10-11

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Math</u>	Test: <u>MEAP</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	55	48	47	26	29
Advanced (Level 1)	13	14	15	63	60
Number of students tested	56	56	53	65	45
Percent of total students tested	99	99	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	1	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	50	30		33	42
Advanced (Level 1)	6	10		46	25
Number of students tested	16	20		24	12
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient (Level 2) and above				25	
Advanced (Level 1)				25	
Number of students tested				12	
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	56	48	47	25	24
Advanced (Level 1)	15	15	15	67	63
Number of students tested	48	52	47	57	41
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Proficiency cut-scores starting 11-12.

Less than 10 students in a sub group so data is not available for the following:

Special Ed 09-10, 11-12, 12-13, 13-14; Econ Disadv 11-12

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

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

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	79	80	73	88	95
Advanced (Level 1)	11	23	14	57	53
Number of students tested	46	44	44	54	53
Percent of total students tested	100	99	99	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	1	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above		76	55	85	
Advanced (Level 1)		13	0	45	
Number of students tested		16	11	20	
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient (Level 2) and above				30	
Advanced (Level 1)				10	
Number of students tested				10	
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	77	82	70	90	94
Advanced (Level 1)	12	24	14	59	54
Number of students tested	43	38	36	49	50
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Only reading is reported- only grade 4 was assessed in writing at the elementary level (prior to 2014-15)

New Proficiency cut-scores starting 11-12.

Less than 10 students in a sub group so data is not available for the following:

Special Ed 09-10, 11-12, 12-13, 13-14; Econ Disadv 09-10, 13-14

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test: <u>MEAP</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>4</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	76	85	78	95	89
Advanced (Level 1)	11	9	16	52	39
Number of students tested	57	46	50	54	66
Percent of total students tested	99	99	99	100	99
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	1	1	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	56	64	67		88
Advanced (Level 1)	0	9	10		32
Number of students tested	18	11	21		25
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					36
Advanced (Level 1)					36
Number of students tested					11
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	77	82	76	94	90
Advanced (Level 1)	12	10	15	52	38
Number of students tested	49	39	46	50	63
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Only reading is reported- only grade 4 was assessed in writing at the elementary level (prior to 2014-15)

New Proficiency cut-scores starting 11-12.

Less than 10 students in a sub group so data is not available for the following:

Special Ed 10-11, 11-12, 12-13, 13-14; Econ Disadv 10-11

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: <u>Reading/ELA</u>	Test: <u>MEAP</u>
All Students Tested/Grade: <u>5</u>	Edition/Publication Year: <u>N/A</u>
Publisher:	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	83	82	81	90	93
Advanced (Level 1)	25	18	26	55	61
Number of students tested	55	55	53	66	44
Percent of total students tested	99	99	100	100	99
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	1	0	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	47	75		76	72
Advanced (Level 1)	7	10		36	45
Number of students tested	15	20		25	11
2. Students receiving Special Education					
Proficient (Level 2) and above				58	
Advanced (Level 1)				8	
Number of students tested				12	
3. English Language Learner Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above	85	83	81	93	95
Advanced (Level 1)	30	20	26	56	65
Number of students tested	47	51	47	57	40
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
Proficient (Level 2) and above					
Advanced (Level 1)					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Only reading is reported- only grade 4 was assessed in writing at the elementary level (prior to 2014-15)

New Proficiency cut-scores starting 11-12.

Less than 10 students in a sub group so data is not available for the following:

Special Ed 09-10, 11-12, 12-13, 13-14; Econ Disadv 11-12