

2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Public Private

Cover Sheet

Type of School (Check all that apply) Elementary Middle High K-12
 Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. Beverly Rosenboom
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Whitewood Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 603 Garfield Street
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

Whitewood South Dakota 57793-2122
City State Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Lawrence State School Code Number* 46001

Telephone (605) 269-2264 Fax (605) 269-2099

Web site/URL http://www.meade.k12.sd.us E-mail bev.rosenboom@meade.k12.sd.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Principal's Signature Date _____

Name of Superintendent Mr. James Heinert
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Meade School District 46-1 Tel. (605) 347-2523

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mrs. Katherine Behrens
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

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

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

Mail by commercial carrier (FedEx, UPS) or courier original signed cover sheet to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 5E103, Washington DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

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 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.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district wide compliance review.
6. 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.
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.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

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: _____ 10 Elementary schools
 _____ 1 Middle schools
 _____ Junior High Schools
 _____ 1 High schools
 _____ Other
 _____ 12 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 5389
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 6089

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
 Rural
4. _____ 5 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 _____ 5 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 Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
Pre K			0	7			0
K	12	7	19	8			0
1	6	14	20	9			0
2	8	8	16	10			0
3	14	9	23	11			0
4	8	7	15	12			0
5	8	6	14	Other			0
6	10	10	20				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							127

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 4 | % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| | % Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 2 | % Black or African American |
| | % Hispanic or Latino |
| 94 | % White |

100 % 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 year 4 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year	4
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	1
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	5
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	127
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.04
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	4

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 0 %
- | | |
|---|---|
| 0 | Total Number Limited English Proficient |
|---|---|

Number of languages represented 0

Specify languages:

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals 45 %

Total number students who qualify: 55

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.

10. Students receiving special education services: 21 %
28 Total Number of Students Serve

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>2</u>	Autism	<u>10</u>	Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u>	Deafness	<u>13</u>	Other Health Impairment
<u> </u>	Deaf-Blindnes	<u> </u>	Specific Learning Disabilit
<u> </u>	Emotional Disturbanc	<u> </u>	Speech or Language Impairment
<u> </u>	Hearing Impairment	<u> </u>	Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>1</u>	Mental Retardation	<u> </u>	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>2</u>	Multiple Disabilities	<u> </u>	

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

Number of Staff

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u> </u>	<u>1</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>8</u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialist	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>2</u>	<u> </u>
Support Staff	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Total number	<u>16</u>	<u>4</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of 16 : 1 students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1

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 drop-off 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	96 %	95 %	96 %	96 %	%
Daily teacher attendance	92 %	96 %	87 %	96 %	96 %
Teacher turnover rate	14 %	28 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
Student drop out rate (middle/high	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
Student drop-off rate (high school	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

Please provide all explanations below

In 2004-2005 one of the teachers was undergoing treatment for cancer and utilized several sick days. In 2006-2007 that same teacher utilized several sick days due to reoccurrence of the cancer. That teacher died at the start of the 2006-2007 school year

causing a turnover of one FTE.

In 2005-2006, two teachers resigned to seek employment elsewhere and were replaced by two teachers.

We were unable to access student attendance data for Whitewood specifically back to 2002-2003.

PART III - SUMMARY

Whitewood Elementary is a kindergarten through sixth grade school with a current enrollment of 127 students. It is located in the small rural community of Whitewood in the beautiful Black Hills of South Dakota and is a part of the 3,100 square mile Meade School District 46-1.

While the official mission statement of the Meade School District is 'To Build Knowledge and Skills for Success Today and Tomorrow,' the motto of the Whitewood Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) is 'Kids Are Our Business' and that is also the focus of the work of the school. The parents, teachers, and staff value the children of this community and hold their social, emotional, and educational success as a high priority.

The PTO is very involved with providing out-of-school activities for the children. Since the city of Whitewood cannot offer many fun, safe opportunities for its young residents, the parents do a great deal to create and supervise these activities. School staff plays an integral role in these activities.

The successes of the Whitewood students - academically, artistically, and athletically - reflect the dedication of a staff whose instructional practices and expectations keep the bar high. All instructional teachers meet the NCLB highly-qualified standards. The staff is a good blend of veteran and lesser experienced teachers and paraprofessionals. The district offers a mentor program for beginning teachers which provides a good deal of guidance although the staff at Whitewood Elementary is always ready to help anyone in anyway needed.

The Whitewood School was recognized as a Distinguished School for two consecutive years by the South Dakota Department of Education according to its No Child Left Behind criteria.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

Whitewood Elementary School tests students in grades 3-6 yearly using the Dakota State Test of Educational Progress (Dakota STEP). This assessment is comprised of questions in math and reading based on the South Dakota State Content Standards in those areas. Students in grade 5 also are assessed on the South Dakota State Content Standards for science. Dakota STEP is the measure used by Whitewood Elementary School, Meade School District 46-1, and the state of South Dakota to determine the growth of students in math and reading which fulfills the requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law.

Since the initial testing in 2003, Dakota STEP has been revised to keep the assessment updated whenever the content standards change as well as to amend disparities in the level of questions. Each test is a combination of questions that have been carefully worded and analyzed to determine if the question is advanced, proficient, or basic. After the students take the test, cut scores are developed to determine whether the student reached specific performance levels: advanced, proficient, basic, or below basic.

Information on NCLB can be found at <http://doe.sd.gov/nclb/index.asp>
Information on South Dakotas Content Standards can be found at <http://doe.sd.gov/contentstandards/>
A blueprint of the types and number of questions used for Dakota STEP as well as information on the cut scores can be found at <http://doe.sd.gov/octa/assessment/dakSTEP/index.asp>
An overview of testing in South Dakota can be found at <http://doe.sd.gov/octa/assessment/index.asp>

When the testing data is returned, individual information on students is shared with parents. Parents are apprised on the performance level of the students (advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic) in math and reading. Teachers can also access a state website and share with the parents just how well the students did on the content standards by standard and indicator. Teachers use this information to better meet the needs of the individual students in their classroom.

Information on how well the school district and individual schools meet the requirements of NCLB can be found at <https://sis.ddncampus.net:8081/nclb/index.html>. The information is also shared with the public through the quarterly newsletter 'In Touch' which goes out to all patrons in the school district.

The results of Dakota STEP are disseminated into subgroups: students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, and by ethnicity. Whitewood Elementary has too few students for results to come up on the report card with the exception of economically disadvantaged.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Whitewood Elementary School uses the Dakota STEP assessment and the standards reports to determine the educational plans for the upcoming year. Information is shared at in-services under the train-the-trainer model. Various scientifically-researched educational strategies are modeled to the teachers who in turn use these strategies to help meet the needs of the students in the classroom.

Interventions under the Response to Intervention (RtI) model are planned and implemented with staff. Frequent progress monitoring is used to gauge the growth of the students and then further interventions are discussed and implemented. The instructional staff and the principal discuss this assessment information at staff meetings and principal-teacher conferences throughout the year to continually monitor student progress.

Instructional staff at Whitewood Elementary also use the results of the North Central Accreditation (NCA) testing in math and reading. These tests are based on the content standards for math and reading and can be used in correlation with the results of Dakota STEP. These are conducted three times a year and are a district-designed assessment. The Meade School District holds K-12 NCA Accreditation and this assessment data is also used as part of its reporting mechanism to NCA.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Communicating accurate, complete and timely information about the school--its programs and operations,

the staff, and the students--including successes in performance data, is daunting. But it is a task that we at Whitewood Elementary welcome and take very seriously.

Ongoing efforts to meet the information needs of parents and the community at large include the dissemination of:

- A district wide quarterly publication 'In Touch' to all households and businesses in the community
- News releases, feature stories, story ideas and photographs to four area newspapers
- News releases and story ideas to four local television stations and 11 area radio stations.
- A monthly school newsletter to all parents of students currently enrolled in school
- Up-to-date information via school and district websites

Individual student performance reports are shared with parents and guardians at parent/teacher conferences in the fall and spring of each school year. If a parent is unable to attend conferences, reports are sent home with the indication that they are welcome to come in and discuss the results at any time.

We know that communication enhances the school's image and promotes support for education in the community while also strengthening the school's relationship and partnership with parents and community members. In a small community like Whitewood, we know that the parents place a high level of trust in our efforts to educate their children and we want to maintain that trust.

4. Sharing Success:

The success that students and staff at Whitewood Elementary have experienced in the past is shared through publications such as the district's 'In Touch' quarterly newsletter as well as through news releases and feature stories in area newspapers. We communicate our successes to parents more directly through monthly school newsletters and at monthly Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings. Each fall we start the year with a Back-to-School Picnic hosted by the PTO. Here we share as much as we can with parents and community members as to our previous year's achievements and hopes for the upcoming year.

School-wide assemblies are held after the end of each grading quarter. At those, students, teachers, and staff share the good things that have occurred. This can be good attendance recognition, honor roll recognition, good character recognition, and other good stuff.

Monthly staff meetings are used to convey information about successes, also.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The school's curriculum is focused on the standards established by the state of South Dakota Department of Education and Meade School District 46-1. The curriculum includes the content areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, technology, physical education, and fine arts. The standards utilized have been aligned by the teachers in the district. Using course planners, the teachers are able to identify the district curriculum resources and pedagogical strategies to maximize learning. Standards-based grade cards have been created for students in grades kindergarten through third grade. The standards-based grade cards identify the core curricular areas and specific standards for each grade level. The standards are scored using a four-point scale for proficiency. The levels are below basic (1), basic (2), proficient (3), and advanced (4). These are the same levels identified by the state department of education for reporting state assessment scores. Parents and students are then familiar with the leveled scoring.

Our technology curriculum maintains that students are to be given opportunities to use, manage, and understand technology at developmentally appropriate levels. Students are given opportunities to produce creative works which include text, images, graphics, and media. Our school has an up-to-date computer lab as well as computer workstations in each classroom. Teachers utilize notebook computers and a variety of presentation devices to provide engaging learning opportunities. Students use web-based resources to enhance their academic curriculum areas.

In the health/physical education curriculum at Whitewood Elementary students are taught to monitor how his/her personal behavior affects the well-being of others and recognize behaviors which are disrespectful or have a negative impact. Students are also taught about personal health practices and how to achieve acceptable levels of wellness. Learning activities include focused skills development as well as the development of skills which allow students to participate in lifelong recreational activities.

The vision statement of the Meade District, and Whitewood Elementary, is that all students will be provided with a balanced, comprehensive and sequential fine arts curriculum. At our school, musical and dramatic expression are carried out by our music teacher whose passion for those areas is evident in and out of the classroom. In addition to engaging music classes, the teacher provides opportunities for students to audition for and participate in a school choir and a school band which participate in large and small group performances. Because many of our students do not have the opportunity to participate in theatrical performances that are available in the region, the music teacher at Whitewood Elementary builds performance into the annual holiday concert. Students audition for parts in a three to four act play which accompanies the musical selections done by each grade level, the school choir, and the school band. This annual program is one of the most highly attended performances in the district.

In a desire to promote good citizenry we include character education into our practices. Teachers and staff incorporate core character traits in daily interactions, writing activities, and behavioral incentives. We also incorporate the Boys and Girls Town curriculum into what we do in an attempt to enhance the social skills of our students. I am very pleased with how much the students respect the school and staff here at Whitewood Elementary when many of them come from environments where respect, courtesy, and all those skills are not necessarily taught. We work very hard to build the whole child.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

Whitewood Elementary uses guided reading principles for the reading curriculum with textbooks being used for skills lessons and supplementary materials to meet the content standards in reading. Guided reading involves using leveled reading text in small groups with mini-lessons in whole group as well as small group to meet the various needs of the students. From kindergarten to third grade, there is an emphasis on explicit, systematic teaching of phonics as well. Students use a hands-on approach to the phonics which can also be taught whole group and small group depending on the needs of the students. As the students get older, quality literature (leveled or unleveled) is used to teach the skills for being successful readers as well as develop an appreciation of literature in various genres.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Whitewood Elementary School uses a textbook series that is scientifically research-based with resources to supports hands-on learning experiences, cooperative learning experiences, and problem-solving experiences. The resources allow for differentiation and scaffolding to meet the individual needs of all students. The series is aligned with the South Dakota Content Standards for Math.

The teachers at Whitewood are trained in instructional strategies based on Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) research. A trained teacher-leader instructs the other teachers in the building on the use of cognitively guided instruction and is available to help teachers. Other resources that are used with the South Dakota Math Counts Initiative are as follows: Children's Mathematics, Adding It Up, NCTM Process and Content Standards, Making Sense--The 5 Dimensionsof the Classroom, and Relearning to Teach Arithmetic.

The CGI approach allows students to explore problem-solving strategies and applications in math which reinforce the district's mission statement of building knowledge and skills that students need now and in the future.

4. Instructional Methods:

One of the beliefs of the district is that every student has the potential to be a productive member of society. At Whitewood Elementary we emphasize cooperative learning and groupings that allow students to learn from one another and to respect the differences in each other. Teachers use dynamic reading groups and guided reading groups to fulfill that purpose as well as cross-age interactions such as study buddies, Wednesday walk buddies, and paired readers.

The research framework for many of the methods used daily in the classroom comes from Robert Marzano's, 'Classroom Instruction That Works.' Teachers use a wide variety of graphic organizers knowing that students need the opportunity to express prior knowledge and to find ways to organize their thinking. Teachers are also challenged to ask higher order questions and to ensure that students know the essential questions of the content of which they are learning.

In the area of mathematics, teachers are trained in cognitively guided instructional research practices which cause them to utilize more hands-on learning and a more problem-solving approach to mathematical learning. It also stimulates mathematical communication and vocabulary.

Much emphasis is placed on student writing to respond to literature and mathematical thinking as well as in other subject areas. The Six Plus One Writing Process is used as a guideline from which teachers design the writing opportunity as well as rubrics for student feedback. Aside from structured writing though, students do a good deal of journaling to express themselves and enhance their understanding of print.

We find value in the opportunities we can create, within budgetary constraints, which allow our teachers to team together to meet the needs of our children. There is one full-time inclusion classroom and two partial inclusion classrooms where a wide range of differentiated instructional practices are utilized to provide all students with the opportunity to learn with and from one another. There is also a general educator who teams with teachers in a couple of grades to allow more focus on the children.

5. Professional Development:

Administrators, teachers and classroom paraprofessionals are engaged in a professional development model based on Robert Marzano's book, 'Classroom Instruction That Works.' The model is essentially a train-the-trainer approach. Each school site has a team comprised of teachers and the building administrator who attend trainings on the desired instructional strategies. Those teams then train the colleagues in their buildings. The administrator ensures the expectations are carried out. The teacher leaders are available in the buildings to provide support to their colleagues.

In addition to the time spent on the Marzano strategies, teachers are given professional development time to spend in grade level and department level meetings to discuss and evaluate vertical and horizontal curriculum alignment. Teachers are currently working on course planners to ensure consistency of standards instruction among the various school sites. Teacher leaders from each curriculum department are selected from among their peers to serve on an Instructional Council which works closely with the district's curriculum department and administration.

Another aspect of professional development that we feel correlates to increased student achievement is that of classroom management. The district has chosen the Boys and Girls Town Model of Classroom

Management. All new teachers in the district are trained in the model. The district has invested in the training of its own consultants and trainers to meet that need.

The implementation of a train-the-trainer professional development model coincides with the increased achievement data for our school. This model and the increased achievement scores that are identified in Part 7 of this application have resulted in a higher level of commitment on the part of the teachers as to their abilities and efforts to impact student learning. As a building principal I am inspired by the growth in teacher leadership that I see in my staff.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 3 Test Dakota STEP (State Test of Educational Progress)
 Edition/Publication Year 2003-2007 Publisher SD Department of Education and Harcourt Publishing

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	87	80	83	78	71
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	20	13	18	7	38
Number of students tested	17	17	17	14	13
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	93
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced					63
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced					36
Number of students tested					13
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	87	80	83	78	71
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	20	13	18	7	38
Number of students tested	17	17	17	14	13
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	93
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced					63
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced					36
Number of students tested					13
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced and Proficient	80	87	65	78	61
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	33	1	12	7	15
Number of students tested	17	17	17	14	13
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	93
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced				71	64
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced				7	9
Number of students tested				14	13
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced and Proficient	80	87	65	78	61
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	33	1	12	7	15
Number of students tested	17	17	17	14	13
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	93
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced					64
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced					9
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	100	67	84	54	50
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	15	1	15	8	0
Number of students tested	13	19	14	14	13
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. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced				71	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced				0	
Number of students tested				14	
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	100	67	84	54	50
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	15	1	15	8	0
Number of students tested	13	19	14	14	13
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. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced		77			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		0			
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	78	74	76	73	58
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	1	7	13	0	8
Number of students tested	19	16	17	14	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. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	67			58	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	0			8	
Number of students tested	12			12	
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	100	81	46	39	12
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	90	6	0	8	0
Number of students tested	10	18	13	13	8
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	100	89	92	84	64
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	23	24	23	46	8
Number of students tested	13	19	14	14	13
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. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced		83			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced		25			
Number of students tested		19			
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	89	80	88	85	33
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	22	7	38	14	0
Number of students tested	19	16	17	14	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. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	88				
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	33				
Number of students tested	19				
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	100	88	62	70	88
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	90	22	8	8	12
Number of students tested	10	18	13	13	8
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	100	88	62	70	88
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	90	22	8	8	12
Number of students tested	10	18	13	13	8
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	87	80	83	78	71
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	20	13	18	7	38
Number of students tested	17	17	17	14	13
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	93
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced				71	63
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced				29	36
Number of students tested				14	11
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	100	89	92	84	64
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	23	24	23	46	8
Number of students tested	13	19	14	14	13
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced				93	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced				36	
Number of students tested				14	
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	89	80	88	85	33
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	22	7	38	14	0
Number of students tested	19	16	17	14	12
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Economically Disadvantaged					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Proficient and Advanced	88			67	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	33			0	
Number of students tested	12			12	
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					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr	Mar-Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Proficient and Advanced	100	88	62	70	88
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Advanced	90	22	8	8	12
Number of students tested	10	18	13	13	8
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					