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The signatures on the first page of this application 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 has some configuration that includes grades $\mathrm{K}-12$. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2007-2008 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2002 and has not received the No Child Left Behind-Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
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7. 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.
8. 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.

All data are the most recent year available. Throughout the document, round numbers to the nearest whole number to avoid decimals, except for numbers below 1, which should be rounded to the nearest tenth.

DISTRICT (Question 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:
$\qquad$ Elementary schools Middle schools Junior High Schools High schools

1 Other
1 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: $\qquad$

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)
3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located
[ ] Urban or large central city
[ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban are
[ ] Suburban
[ ] Small city or town in a rural are
[X] Rural
4. $\qquad$ Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
$\qquad$ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

| Grade | \# of <br> Males | \# of <br> Females | Grade <br> Total | Grade | \# of <br> Males | \# of <br> Females | Grade <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre K |  |  | 0 | $\mathbf{7}$ | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 8 | 5 | 13 | $\mathbf{8}$ | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 6 | 7 | 13 | $\mathbf{9}$ | 6 | 7 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 5 | 7 | 12 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 3 | 4 | 7 | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 3 | 6 | 9 | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 6 | 3 | 9 | Other |  |  | 0 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 6 | 4 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

| $\frac{1}{1}$ | \% American Indian or Alaska Native |
| :---: | :---: |
| \% Asian or Pacific Islander |  |
| 1 | \% Black or African American |
| 97 | \% Hispanic or Latino |
| \% White |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | \% TOTAL |

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.
7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past yea $\qquad$ \%

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

| (1) | Number of students who <br> transferred to the school after <br> October 1 until the end of the year | 13 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| ( 2 ) | Number of students who <br> transferred from the school after <br> October 1 until the end of the year | 12 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students <br> [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 25 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the <br> school as of October 1 | 135 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row <br> (3) divided by total students in row | 0.19 |
| ( 6 ) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 19 |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: $\qquad$ \%

1 Total Number Limited English Proficient
Number of languages represented 1

Specify languages: Spanish
9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals $\qquad$ 44 \%

Total number students who qualify: 27

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low income families, or the school does not participate in the federally supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

The numbers shown above are for our students in grades 7-12. the total number of students were 62.
10. Students receiving special education services: $\qquad$ \%

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

|  | Autism <br> Deafness |  | Orthopedic Impairment <br> Other Health Impairment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Deaf-Blindnes | 7 | Specific Learning Disabilit |
|  | Emotional Disturbanc |  | Speech or Language Impairment |
|  | Hearing Impairment |  | Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 1 | Mental Retardation |  | Visual Impairment Including |
|  | Multiple Disabilities |  | Blindness |

11. Indicate number of full time and part time staff members in each of the categories below:

## Number of Staff

|  | Full-time | Part-time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrator(s) | 2 | 0 |
| Classroom teachers | 18 | 5 |
| Special resource teachers/specialist | 1 | 1 |
| Paraprofessionals | 1 |  |
| Support Staff | 5 | 4 |
| Total number | 27 | 10 |

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

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Please explain a high teacher turnover rate. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student dropoff rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy in attendance, dropout or the drop-off rates. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates, and only high schools need to supply drop-off

|  | $2006-2007$ | $2005-2006$ | $2004-2005$ | $2003-2004$ | $2002-2003$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Daily student attendance | 97 | $\%$ | 97 | $\%$ | 96 | $\%$ | 95 | $\%$ | $\%$ |
| Daily teacher attendance | 96 | $\%$ | 96 | $\%$ | 95 | $\%$ | 96 | $\%$ | 96 |
| Teacher turnover rate | 19 | $\%$ | 14 | $\%$ | 29 | $\%$ | 11 | $\%$ | 20 |
| Student drop out rate (middle/hig | 0 | $\%$ | 3 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ | 1 | $\%$ | $\%$ |
| Student drop-off rate (high school | 5 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ | 14 | $\%$ | 0 | $\%$ |  |

Please provide all explanations below
We did not have data available for the 2002-2003 school years in some aspects.
In regards to the teacher turn-over rate: some of our percentages seem high, this is due
to the fact that we are a small school with fewer teachers therefore losing 2 or 3 teachers a year will cause the percentage to be higher. In the 2006-2007 school year we lost 4 teachers. All four moved on for financial reasons. We pay the state minimum here at Ballard. All four teacher left to go to schools that paid more. In 2005-2006 we lost three teachers, 1 of these retired and the other 2 moved for financial reasons. In the school year of 2004-2005 we lost 6 staff members, of those 6 , two of them were part time. 2 of them contracts were not renewed, the other 2 left for financial reasons and 1 retired. In 2002-2003 4 left our district, 2 retired, 1 moved to California for family reasons and the other was a part-time employee.
In 2003-2004 we lost only two. One of those was the principal, whose contract was not renewed. The other one was our Title One teacher who left to retire.

## 14. (High Schools Only. Delete if not used.)

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2007 are doing as of the Fall 2007.

| Graduating class size | 9 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 45 | $\%$ |
| Enrolled in a community college | 11 | $\%$ |
| Enrolled in vocational training | 22 | $\%$ |
| Found employment | 22 | $\%$ |
| Military service | 0 | $\%$ |
| Other (travel, staying home, etc.) | 0 | $\%$ |
| Unknown | 0 | $\%$ |
| Total | 100 | $\%$ |

## PART III - SUMMARY

The Ballard RII School District is a small, rural, one campus, K-12 school district located in West Central Missouri. The district is accredited and has been recognized for Accredited with Distinction in Performance through the Missouri School Improvement Program in 2004/2005, 2005/2006, and 2006/2007. Our average student enrolment is 135 students. With this enrollment our student to administrators' ratio is $68: 1$ and the student to classroom teacher (total certified staff) ratio is $10: 1$. We currently have 25 certified staff members and 10 support staff members. Being a small school district we still offer a variety of extra-curricular activities. We offer the sports of basketball, volleyball, baseball and softball while also offering academic activities such as Academic Bowl, National Honor Society, Science Olympiad, and Math Relays to name a few.

We have recently completed an addition to our school in which we added 4 classrooms, 2 locker rooms, and an office area. By completing this addition it allowed us to separate all elementary grades, giving each grade their own classroom as well as their own teacher. With the support of the community this became possible. Our community is very supportive of the school. This is probably due to the fact that this is the only business other than a feed store that is currently operating at this time.

The mission statement for the Ballard RII School District is that in partnership with parents and community, we will establish high attainable standards of learning, high attainable expectations for achievement, and guidance for success. We believe that all students can learn and that all students need a safe environment to learn in. We also believe that all students can be prepared to live as responsible, respectable, productive citizens in society and that education is the responsibility of parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, the students, and the community. The Ballard RII School District envisions that students will become self-sufficient and have the skills necessary to be successful. We also envision that our students will be life long learners and value education as well as achievement. Lastly, we envision that students will experience parent and community involvement and strive to reach their potential towards their own goals.

## 1 Assessment Results:

Assessment in our school district takes two general forms. The first is instructional assessment. Instructional assessment involves the assessment of student mastery of the desired learner outcomes. For students to be successful, they must have mastered the various expectations introduced during their coursework.
The second general form of assessment is total program assessment. One issue or area of focus in the program assessment is compliance with national or state standards. Another focus area is student success after school (college/vocational).

We are a small rural school which only has one Math teacher and one English teacher for the district in grades 9-12. Because we are small, we do not have 'departments'; therefore, we do not have school-wide assessments at the high school level. The assessments that are used are teacher written or modified from the text-provided materials. On a day-to-day basis, the teachers use those assessments to modify teaching, as well as align with the state Grade Level Expectations. This helps improve our state MAP scores continually.

The District's purpose for assessing students is to gain better understanding of the individual student's abilities, aptitudes, skills, and personal characteristics. Testing is also an indicator of the success and quality of the total education program in the school district. Assessment can also be used in guidance and counseling. With this, parents, students, and professional staff will be able to use assessment data of individual students and make decisions about future goals of the students.

The Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) assesses students' progress relative to the Show-MeStandards and, as mentioned before, the Grade Level Expectations. The MAP is the required assessment program for all Missouri public-school children in the subject areas of Math (grades 3-8, and 10 ), and Communication Arts (grades $3-8$, and 11). The MAP is given in the spring with results available to schools in the fall. The data gathered from this test is utilized for student improvement. Data will be shared on a need to know basis with administrators, certified staff, aides, parents, and students. The District curriculum Director will be responsible for using the data to revise the curriculum as needed to help teachers upgrade instruction on a day to day basis.

Within our district, being that it is small and rural, we only have basically two sub-groups. Those subgroups are gender and free-and-reduced. With these two sub-groups we must meet the state performance levels. Each year we must increase the percentage of students in the grades that take the MAP test that score proficient or advanced on this test. Information regarding our district's test scores may be found at www.dese.mo.gov. This information includes the disaggregate data, which shows how well the subgroups are progressing.

## 2. Using Assessment Results:

The central purpose for assessment in the Ballard RII School District is the improvement of educational opportunities for the students it serves through data based decision-making. As most other school districts we use our assessment results as a tool to increase or sustain future test scores. The data is used for both the test group and the individual student. The test results indicate areas that need to be addressed. If there are group concerns, the course of study is adjusted to correct the problem area. In the case of individual concerns, the student is provided alternate strategies of instruction. Overall, assessment results are important feedback on effectiveness of classroom techniques and instruction.

Data gathered from tests administered by the Ballard School District will be utilized for student improvement. Data will be shared on a need to know basis with administrators, certified staff, classroom teachers, parents, and students. The district curriculum director, as well as the classroom teacher, will be responsible for using the data to revise the curriculum as needed to help teachers upgrade instruction on a day to day basis. District-wide data will be provided to the Board of Education as it becomes available. The use of standardized exams, state tests, and in-class assessments are all important in continually improving instructional programs and enhancing student achievement.

## 3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Our school district does a good job in communicating with our stakeholders when it involves student performance. Our school district has district wide parent/teacher conferences at mid quarter of the first quarter. For this scheduled parent/teacher conference we almost always have at least a $90 \%$ attendance rate from the parents of our students. During this mid-quarter parent/teacher conference not only do we talk to the parents about their student's academic performance for the beginning of the school year but we also go over the student's MAP scores from the previous year. This is done at this time because the MAP scores usually do not arrive to our district until two weeks prior to the parent/teacher conferences. The district also has parent/teacher conferences scheduled three other times throughout the school year.

The students are invited to attend the conferences with the parents when they come in and talk with the teacher. Students are also informed by the regular classroom teacher of their performance on the MAP tests.

Students who achieved Proficient or Advanced on the MAP test are listed in the school newspaper as well as posted on the bulletin board so that anyone coming into our school may view them.

Administrators send letters, as well as make phones calls to parents when students are successful and when they are faulting in an area. The school newspaper and local newspaper is also used to keep the parents and community informed of student achievement in our school district. Parent communication and involvement are high priorities here at Ballard R-II School District.

## 4. Sharing Success:

The Ballard R-II School District is always willing to share ideas and values with other school districts. We believe that if we as a school are successful, then we should share our knowledge and skills in order to make other districts successful.

Some of the ways in which we share ideas are by attending conference meetings with our local schools. It is at this time that we meet with other grade level teachers to discuss strategies that work.

Often our teachers will talk with teachers from area schools at athletic functions. This is also a good time to share information.

Our district's MAP scores are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's website. These scores are available for other schools to view. It is after other school districts view our MAP scores that they will contact us by phone or e-mail to find out how we are helping our students achieve academically.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

## 1. Curriculum:

The state of Missouri has established that certain skills in technology, equity, research, and workplace readiness are critical to the future of Missouri's students. Ballard High School agrees with this concept and is committed to integrating those skills into the daily instructional decision-making. Ballard has an established K-12 curriculum for research within the Communication Arts curriculum, and a K-12 workplace readiness curriculum in the Vocational Arts/Practical Arts Curriculum and Guidance and Counseling Curriculums. Equity issues are addressed K-12 by the Guidance and Counseling Curriculum. The district offers several opportunities for technology at the K-12 level.

We set standards high here at the Ballard School District. The state of Missouri requires that a student graduates from high school with 25 units of credit. At Ballard we require 26 units.

Students are required to have 4 units of Language Arts. Three of those units must include Language Arts I, II, and III; the remaining unit is an elective in the Language Arts area.
Students are also required to have 2 units of Math in which Algebra I and Geometry are required.
In Social Science 3.5 units are required. American History, World History, Government, Economics, and Geography are the required courses. The high school student must also pass the United States Constitution Test and the Missouri Constitution Test.

In the area of Science, students must gain 3 units, with Biology I and Physical Science II being required. The remaining unit is an elective.

In other academic areas students must gain a unit of credit in Fine Arts, Practical Arts, and Physical Education. Students must also obtain a half unit of credit in Computer Education, Health Education, and Personal Finance.

We also offer Spanish as a Foreign Language. With this academic area we offer Spanish I, II, and III.
Students in our district may also attain a College Preparatory Studies Certificate. With this certificate standards are set even higher than with a regular diploma.

## 2b. (Secondary Schools) English:

Throughout our English curriculum the district offers a variety of courses. The core of the English curriculum is the English I, II, and III classes. Throughout these classes students build strengths in reading understanding literacy works, writing in specific genres, and applying grammar skills. Students use language to express individual perspectives, articulate arguments and solutions, evaluate test and multimedia, and communicate information in real-life settings. Students have the opportunity to stretch themselves creatively in the composition courses as they learn about the writing process, and they learn to understand, analyze, and appreciate literature in a whole new way.

All 9-12 students are required to take and complete the classes of Language Arts I, II, and III. Other course offerings through the English department are College Prep English, Novels, Short Stories, and Shakespeare.

Being that we are a small school we can get a lot accomplished each day in the classroom. During the school day the students have opportunities to have some quiet reading time. All students who may be reading below grade level, which are very few, can receive extra support through the Special Services Department if they are part of the program. It is only those students, who are reading below grade level by the time that they get to high school.

## 3. Additional Curriculum Area:

The 7th-12th grade math classes at Ballard strive to teach the student to 'teach himself' ' to learn how to be an independent learner. Study methods are taught to compliment that goal. Goals are set high for the
students in terms of mathematics. While the teacher sees to it that she discusses the 'what every citizen should know' topics in Algebra I and Geometry, she also teaches specialized topics in those classes so that no door is closed to a student who wishes to proceed beyond the core material. The teacher encourages students to strive for their very best, to not be satisfied with mediocrity.

Our elective courses, Algebra II, Math Analysis/Trigonometry, and Calculus, are college preparatory classes that encourage/reinforce independent thought and disciplined study habits. These classes provide guidance in what it will take to be successful in a college Math setting as well as introduce Mathematics that go beyond the 'what every citizen should know' level. The elective course, Applied Math, gives students an opportunity to clarify math concepts perhaps not previously mastered as well as learn to develop problem solving through another field of mathematics or computer programming. This course emphasizes the life lesson of 'you get out what you put in' and the opportunity to develop self-discipline as it is a self-paced course.

## 4. Instructional Methods:

Being that we are a small, rural school district we are able to use a variety of instructional methods. The different instructional methods we use are set upon the needs of our students. With our smaller class sizes, students who are falling behind or that may be lacking some of the key components tend to get more instruction. Teachers at Ballard are very dedicated to their students and know that they are truly the reason for their being at this school. There is a connection between learning, teacher, and student that you will not find anywhere else.

Many other instructional methods are used within our district. Some of these include the traditional methods such as lecturing, guided learning/practice, and questioning techniques. Other instructional methods include cooperative learning, graphic organizers and peer tutoring (think, pair, share).

Again, being that we have small class sizes it makes sense that we try different instructional methods. We are here to help the student succeed in learning. With our staff they will do what they need to do to accomplish this effort. Variety of instruction, as you can see, is a vital component of our success.

## 5. Professional Development:

The Ballard R-II Professional Development Committee provides professional opportunities that address assessing student performance standards and developing assessment techniques. Professional development is a key factor if a teacher is to be successful in the classroom. Within our district, teachers have many opportunities to go to conferences throughout the school year as well as during the summer time. Professional development workshops also take place within the district.

Professional development meetings impact student achievement by providing fresh, new ideas, stimulating teacher reflection and analysis, and renewing teacher enthusiasm.

Within our school district professional growth in expanding one's own academic knowledge and experiences to help students reach their full academic potential is a must for our teachers. Teachers will also be setting their own personal/professional goals and establishing means to achieve these goals. Professional development will provide the growth for individuals within each group, resulting in interdependence among the team. We at the Ballard R-II School District believe that professional growth is the continuous process of learning throughout one's career.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Subject Reading (LA) | Grade 7 |  | Test Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Edition/Publication Year yearly |  | Publisher Riverside Publishing |  |
|  |  |  |  |


|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | March | March | April |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards proficient or advanced | 33 | 39 | 20 | 15 | 17 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards advanced | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 12 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 . \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Math Grade 7

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | no test | no test | no test |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Proficient or Advanced | 57 | 31 |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Advanced | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 9 | 13 |  |  |  |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 . \quad \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 8 Test Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | no test | no test | no test |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Proficient or Advanced | 50 | 58 |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards <br> Advanced | 8 | 17 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 . \quad \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Math Grade 8 Test Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)

## Edition/Publication Year Yearly

Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | March | March | March |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proficient or Advanced | 67 | 42 | 8 | 0 | 9 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advanced | 25 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 11 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 . \quad \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | March | March | March |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proficient or Advanced | 60 | 22 | 0 | 7 | 28 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advanced | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 9 | 15 | 14 | 22 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Math Grade 10 Test Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | March | March | March |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proficient or Advanced | 67 | 67 | 11 | 12 | 14 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advanced | 8 | 33 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 12 | 9 | 15 | 14 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 . \quad \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $3 .$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Math Grade 10 Test Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | March | March | March |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proficient or Advanced | 67 | 67 | 11 |  | 14 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advanced | 8 | 33 | 11 |  | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 12 | 9 |  | 14 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 |  | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1 . \quad$ N/A |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2 . \quad \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $3 .$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Math Grade 5 Test (MAP) Missouri Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | $2006-2007$ | $2005-2006$ | $2004-2005$ | $2003-2004$ | $2002-2003$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | No Test | No Test | No Test |
| SCHOOL SCORES* "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% | 50 | 55 |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards | 0 | 18 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Percent of total students tested | 91 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| \%. "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 4 Test MAP

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | No Test | No Test | No Test |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 46 | 40 |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 18 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Math Grade 4 Test MAP

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | March | March | March |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \%"Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 55 | 40 | 27 | 22 | 7 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 15 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 3 Test MAP

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | March | March | March |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 64 | 44 | 30 | 31 | 9 |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 11 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Math Grade 3 Test (MAP) Missouri Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | No test | No Test | No Test |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 73 | 56 |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standarc |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 5 Test (MAP) Missouri Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | No Test | No Test | No Test |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 60 | 55 |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

Subject Math Grade 6 Test (MAP) Missouri Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year Yearly
Publisher Riverside Publishing

|  | $2006-2007$ | $2005-2006$ | $2004-2005$ | $2003-2004$ | $2002-2003$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing Month | April | April | No Test | No Test | No Test |
| SCHOOL SCORES* "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% | 58 | 43 |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 12 | 7 |  |  |  |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| \%. "Meeting" plus \% "Exceeding" State Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% "Exceeding" State Standards |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

