

Revised March 14, 2006

2005-2006 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Cover Sheet Type of School: (Check all that apply) Elementary Middle High K-12 Charter

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

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

School Mailing Address 2450 West 3800 South
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

West Valley City Utah 84109-4632
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Salt Lake State School Code Number* 128
Telephone (801) 964-7575 Fax (801) 964- 9264

Website/URL <http://www.graniteschools.org/el/granger/> E-mail nancy.sorensen@granite.k12.ut.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Stephen F. Ronnenkamp
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Granite School District Tel. (801) 646-4523

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mrs. Patricia G. Sandstrom
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

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

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 with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or 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 2005-2006 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has 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 2000 and has not received the 2003, 2004, or 2005 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the 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.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: 61 Elementary schools
 0 Middle schools
 16 Junior high schools
 9 High schools
 5 Other

 91 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$4,612.00

 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$4,762.00

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 area
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural area
 Rural

4. 3 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1, 2005 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
PreK				7			
K	65	57	122	8			
1	48	45	93	9			
2	51	54	105	10			
3	44	37	81	11			
4	39	36	75	12			
5	40	33	73	Other	9	4	13
6	43	30	73				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →							635

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>38</u> | % White |
| <u>1</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>44</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>15</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>2</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 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: 52 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	144
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	187
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	331
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2004	635
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	.5237
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	52

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 54 %
342 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Proficient

Number of languages represented: 22

Specify languages: Arabic, Bosnian, Cambodian, Cantonese, Chinese, Dinka, Filipino, Laotian, Mandarin, Marshallese, Navajo, Portugese, Punjabi, Pushtu, Samoan, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, Tagalog, Telugo, Tibetan, Tongan, Vietnamese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 71 %

Total number students who qualify: 451

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: 17 %
106 Total Number of Students Served

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

<u>1</u> Autism	<u> </u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u>2</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>71</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>8</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>20</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>4</u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u> </u> Multiple Disabilities	

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>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>23</u>	<u>3</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>28</u>	<u> </u>
Support staff	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Total number	<u>59</u>	<u>6</u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers: 26:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. 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 between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Daily student attendance	96 %	94 %	94 %
Daily teacher attendance	96 %	97 %	96 %
Teacher turnover rate	2 %	4 %	5 %

PART III - SUMMARY

Granger Elementary School embraces its highly diverse student body and serves it very effectively. The school is located in West Valley City, of the Salt Lake Valley where diversity abounds, apartment buildings are numerous and our school is a 50 year old facility. Our school of 635 students is diverse with 71% eligible for free and reduced lunch, a 54% mobility rate, 62% ethnic diversity (students come from over 20 countries) and 54% are English Language Learners. These "at risk" factors have increased over the past three years, but our student achievement has also increased. The percent of students that have reached proficiency in the recent three years in language arts has gone up from 69% to 81% and in math has risen from 72% to 86%. We have progressed from program improvement in 1999 steadily raising scores for six years.

Our mission is to welcome all students and move each and every student from where they are academically to a higher level. We focus on the individual student, not the school average. Additionally, we provide a safe, nurturing climate that fosters good citizenship, exposure to the arts and promotes physical fitness.

Granger Elementary consists of a fabulous, well trained faculty that is blinded to race, color, gender and class. They love the students, regardless, and can see that all students can and do have a desire to learn. Our faculty feels that the greatest contributing factor to our school's success is the track (we are a 4 track year round school) and grade level meetings that are held with the principal and the support team. At these meetings each child that is not achieving on level is reviewed. We examine current assessment data together, we discuss interventions together, we laugh and cry together and the outcome of these meetings is group supported dedication to help each child learn and succeed. No child is allowed to fall between the cracks...or be left behind.

Our curriculum is research based, follows our state core guidelines, and very efficient because we scaffold learning by using integration strategies to teach concepts in reading, science and social studies. Three hours each day are devoted to literacy. Additionally, students that are assessed below benchmark receive added interventions and tutoring. Data drives our instruction. All children have the opportunity to learn from our highly qualified staff that has had rigorous professional development in reading instruction, math, technology, data disaggregating and collaboration. Many of the teachers have training in English as a Second Language (ESL) and gifted education. We have an academically oriented after-school program focusing on science, reading, technology and homework help. When students go "off-track" for three weeks, we offer an Intersession class to help our ELL students with language acquisition. As spring testing dates near, we provide intensive tutoring after school for our "bubble students"*pizza makes this very popular.

Contributing to our positive environment are partnerships with many community organizations. Businesses, churches, service clubs, health care professionals, police departments and our local high school contribute time to teach, tutor, and support our students. Parents are welcome in our school and we hold monthly "munch & mingle" days to share information with a Spanish translator to help many of our parents who have limited English proficiency.

Student recognition highlights good citizenship and academic improvement. Weekly B.U.G. (Being Unusually Good) lunches with the principal, Friday Cougar Kudos drawings, Green Rewards Activities held every three week and our annual Cougar Awards give us opportunities to celebrate our successes and publicly support our values.

* "Bubble" students are those whose measured performance is just below Sufficient Mastery according to the Utah (Core) Criterion Referenced Test.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

In Utah all students grades 1 – 6 take a standardized Utah Criterion Reference Test (CRT) in math and language arts each year in the spring. These assessments are multiple choice questions and the answers are reported on bubble sheets for grades 3 – 6 and answered in the test booklet for grades 1 and 2. They are electronically scored. This is an un-timed test. Some accommodations are made as prescribed by the state, for some English Language Learners and students with Individual Learning Plans.

The CRT scores are reported in several ways. At the school, we get the percent correct for each student, each class, and each grade level. The percent correct is also reported for each sub concept area. This is most useful in guiding our instructional practice. Later we also get the scores reported as scaled scores (165 and higher is “proficient”). This makes data comparable across grade levels. These scores are then simplified to four categories of proficiency: 1 – Minimal, 2 - Partial , 3 - Sufficient and 4 - Substantial. Sufficient and Substantial (the 3’s and 4’s) are both at or above the scaled score of 165 and are considered proficient for the NCLB criteria to make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). In our tables we have reported students that are at or above sufficient, thus are proficient by NCLP standards, and we have reported the “above proficient” group which our state labels Substantial.

Prior to 2002-2003, there is no comparable test scores because Utah revised its Core Curriculum and changed its testing format. There was also a change in 2003-04 in the nationally normed test which is noted on the data sheets that follow.

The state defines a Full Enrollment Year (FEY) for year round schools at 151 or more days. All of the CRT data reported in this application is based on students meeting the FEY criteria.

Information about the state assessment system can be found at <http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/>.

As you examine our results in this application, you will see wonderful improvement and progress in most of the sub categories over the past three years. This is particularly true for grades 3-6; the grades that are considered for making Annual Yearly Progress. We note that one year grade one went down in a number of areas and another year grade two went down in a number of areas. We attribute this to a number of teacher changes during those school years in those particular grade levels.

Most outstanding is the progress of our sixth grade classes. On the data sheets you will notice that school scores for this grade in reading increase from 69% of the students proficient to 94% of the students proficient in language arts. In math the increase was from 73% students proficient to 96% of the students proficient. The sixth grade team of teachers has been in place with no teacher turnover for nine years. These are teachers that are dedicated to their students, set high standards and continue to grow professionally themselves.

Another area of noteworthy increase in scores is with our English Language Learners. At every

grade level progress is being made each year. Most of our teachers are trained in sheltered English strategies and many are ESL endorsed. We have a strong ESL lead teacher that helps coordinate our efforts with the ELL students.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Granger Elementary School is a data driven school. The Utah CRT tests provide us with concept based scores as well as the overall proficiency level. The concept based information is the most important as we examine the data to see which concepts the students as individuals are proficient in and where they need more intense instruction. Teachers can also see patterns in concept scores that will reflect where the gaps in the instruction may be so these areas can be a focus of more instruction the following year.

In addition to the state required testing, we do benchmark assessment at the school level. For reading, we assess everyone with DIBELS (Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills) three times each year and we do more frequent progress monitoring with the students that are below benchmark. This gives us data that directly affects instruction and intervention for the students needing extra help. We also use YPP (Yearly Progress Pro) for monitoring math, reading comprehension and language arts. This is a weekly assessment on the computer with “instant” feedback to the student and teacher. Quarterly benchmark math tests have been developed by Granite District to correspond with our curriculum map. We use these as pretests to guide instruction and post tests to assess the learning.

To really pull this all together, we have a spreadsheet developed for each class that has each student on it. We track the scores for each student and update these forms as each new benchmark type test is given. Meetings are held with teachers several times a year to review each student’s progress. The principal and the support team (resource teachers, social worker, ESL teacher, and Title 1 Specialist) attend these meetings which include groups of teachers by track level or by grade level and together we plan how to help each student that is falling behind. These are positive, supportive meetings, recognizing that we all play a role in each student’s success and it does not just fall on the shoulders of the classroom teacher.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Assessment results are communicated to others in various ways. The state publishes AYP reports in the local newspapers. On the state web page the test scores of each school are available to the public. Our district has an annual report on evaluation and assessment that goes to each household.

At the school level, we include the assessment results in our School Student Improvement Plan (SSAP). This plan is reviewed by the District School Board, the School Community Council and is available on line for the public to review. We also have Student Education Planning (SEP’s) meetings three times a year. At these meetings the student, teacher and parents meet for about 20 minutes to review the student’s performance and to make goals for the future. Students and parents are a very integral part of this process. A standardized form is used though out the district so if students transfer schools their SEP will follow them and will be continued. At these meetings, we also share the results of our state standardized tests with parents.

Students also track their own data as they are aware “instantly” of weekly YPP scores for math, reading and language arts while they are still in the computer lab. Those assessed by DIBELS for progress monitoring plot their own scores weekly on a graph.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Granger Elementary School is recognized by the school district as having some model teachers and model programs. Teachers from other schools have come to observe our teaching strategies. This year, in addition to individual teachers or small groups visiting we have hosted a group of principals at a presentation and classroom observations to show how our reading interventions are working. We also hosted an Interconnections Model School visit for a day with over 30 administrators and teachers attending. Interconnections Integrated Curriculum is our science, social studies, thinking skills curriculum.

As the principal, this year I have published an article in a state publication that shares some of our successful teaching and learning strategies in reading. We will continue to share our successes by welcoming visitors into our school and presenting at district planned workshops.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum**

Our core reading program at Granger Elementary is Open Court, published by SRA. We use this grades K – 6. It is a tool for teaching balanced literacy. It has a very strong phonemic awareness and phonics focus, as well as a wonderful anthology using good literature and information texts for building skills in reading fluency, comprehension and vocabulary. This program has whole group instruction and small group instruction called workshop. We use both of these strategies.

Our core math program is Harcourt Brace materials. We use this as a key tool, however, our district has created a curriculum map that is not necessarily in the sequence of these texts. We follow the district map because it correlates with the quarterly benchmark assessments provided by the district and is aligned with the State Core Curriculum. Our teachers have been trained with many hands on methods for teaching mathematical concepts and these are used frequently.

We use an integrated curriculum for science and social studies. This program, called Interconnections, was developed over the past several years by teachers and administrators in Granite School District. It is now on the state approved curriculum list and includes every objective in the state core at the appropriate grade level. It is now published by Granite District and used by some schools in other districts in our state. Interconnections has strands and themes and guiding questions that provide a consistent flow of instruction for the entire school grades K – 6. It is not based on a particular text, but uses materials such as informational books, magazines, videos and pictures collected from various publishers. As some materials become out of date (such as countries changing names or new countries being created), materials can be updated quite easily without having to buy a new textbook.

Art, music and dance are included in our curriculum as extensions of our other curriculum areas. The Interconnections curriculum includes art projects, music and dance as it relates to the cultures and events in the social studies' curriculum. We also use state Land Trust money to further education in the fine arts by providing fine arts field trips and assemblies. This year we will be bringing in a dance specialist to teach us Latin dances for a spring program for our community.

Physical education is taught by the classroom teacher. We are a state Gold Medal School which means we have met physical education requirements and focus on healthy life styles. This year our 3rd and 4th grade students have set extensive walking goals.

2. Reading:

Key to our reading success is the combination of whole group instruction and small group instruction and one-on-one interventions with the struggling readers. Open Court, published by SRA as our main reading tool throughout the school, with additional leveled texts available from many publishers for guided reading. Everyday students have literacy instruction for three hours. One hour of this time is spent in small groups of six to eight students. During this time, which we call workshop, the curriculum is differentiated to meet the needs of different skill levels. Students work about 20 minutes with the teacher on Open Court strategies, 20 minutes with a para-educator doing guided reading at the instructional level of the small group and 20 minutes in word study or writing. We use a tiered model of intervention and those students at tier 1 have individual tutoring with the Reading Recovery teacher or the Early Steps or Next Steps para educator. We do benchmark assessments three times a year with all students and progress monitor our students with the most intensive needs at least every two weeks.

3. Mathematics, Science, Art, Etc.:

Several years ago, Granger was in program improvement for math as a Title I school. During that process we were able to have help in learning about strategies that support the NCTM Standards. Daily mathematics instruction includes 20 minutes of math maintenance and one hour of concept learning. This instructional time can be split up during the day (20 minutes and 1 hour). During the maintenance instruction, teachers use a grade specific program called ADD (Arithmetic Developed Daily) as a spiral review. The hour block of time is spent focusing on introducing, developing, remediating and/or extending state core concepts specific to each grade level. It is during this hour of instruction that we use the Harcourt Brace materials. We do formal benchmark assessment four times a year. Additionally, we use our YPP (Yearly Progress Pro) program to assess our students weekly.

Our science/social studies program called Interconnections was discussed above in the curriculum section. Woven into this curriculum is art, and music. We have found that integrating curriculum areas is good learning practice and makes best use of our time.

4. Instructional Methods

Teachers use a variety of instructional methods. Due to the needs of our diverse student population, but especially our ELL students, teachers use many different types of grouping strategies. This includes whole group, small group, and one-on-one. Cooperative learning is prevalent in most of our classrooms. Additionally, teachers use a lot of different realia to build background knowledge and develop schema with our students. Across the board, in all content areas, all teachers use many types of graphic organizers to assist students learning. Also, technology is a big part of every classroom teacher's instruction at Granger Elementary. The teachers and para-educators at Granger use research-based strategies in their instruction that include scaffolding and differentiating their curriculum. Shelter Instruction using SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) strategies is prevalent in our classrooms.

5. Professional Development

Professional Development at Granger Elementary is driven by the needs at the school. It is based on data, teacher need and our school plan. We have three days in July (our year round school year begins the last week of July) that teachers are paid to meet at the school for school organized and school level professional development. Currently, our focus is on differentiating instruction to meet each student's need. Part of this is becoming proficient at interpreting assessment results, learning intervention strategies and learning how to manage small group and individual instruction, as well as whole group instruction. Past emphasis has been on Sheltered English Instruction and ESL endorsements to meet the needs of our growing ELL population.

In addition to the three days in the summer we have on going professional development during the year. As a school we have studied Robert Marzano's books *What Works in Schools* and *Classroom Instruction That Works*. Collaborative groups of teachers discussed these books and changes have been implemented in the school based on this process. This year our professional reading focus has been on Guided Reading and Reading Interventions. We also have teachers involved at their own initiative in many district and state professional development opportunities.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject **MATH** Grade **6** Test: **Criterion Reference Test**
 Edition/Publication Year: **New every year** Publisher: **Utah State Office of Education**

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	96	91	73		
% Substantial	92	79	54		
Number of students tested	77	66	81		
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	89	88	68		
% Substantial	93	79	47		
Number of students tested	45	48	81		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	92	87	92		
% Substantial	93	79	68		
Number of students tested	26	31	38		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	100	94	41		
% Substantial	100	88	24		
Number of students tested	25	17	29		
4. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient			27		
% Substantial			0		
Number of students tested	*	*	15		
5. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	100	94	56		
% Substantial	98	84	35		
Number of students tested	44	31	34		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject **MATH** Grade **5** Test: **Criterion Reference Test**
 Edition/Publication Year: **New every year** Publisher: **Utah State Office of Education**

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	92	78	74		
% Substantial	79	62	57		
Number of students tested	61	94	72		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	91	89	68		
% Substantial	77	56	52		
Number of students tested	47	88	50		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	94	76	75		
% Substantial	78	57	54		
Number of students tested	18	37	28		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	90	69	71		
% Substantial	72	52	57		
Number of students tested	29	29	21		
5. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient		100	92		
% Substantial		94	75		
Number of students tested	*	17	12		
6. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient		31	38		
% Substantial		23	25		
Number of students tested	*	13	16		
7. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	91	80	67		
% Substantial	79	71	55		
Number of students tested	34	49	33		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject **MATH** Grade **4** Test: **Criterion Reference Test**
 Edition/Publication Year: **New every year** Publisher: **Utah State Office of Education**

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	73	61	78		
% Substantial	61	47	62		
Number of students tested	66	74	93		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	69	57	74		
% Substantial	53	44	57		
Number of students tested	51	61	61		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	77	60	75		
% Substantial	65	48	56		
Number of students tested	26	25	36		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	68	45	72		
% Substantial	52	34	56		
Number of students tested	31	29	32		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient		92	94		
% Substantial		85	89		
Number of students tested	*	13	18		
5. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient	33	33	27		
% Substantial	33	33	14		
Number of students tested	12	12	22		
6. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	73	57	83		
% Substantial	59	49	72		
Number of students tested	37	35	47		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject **MATH** Grade **3** Test: **Criterion Reference Test**
 Edition/Publication Year: **New every year** Publisher: **Utah State Office of Education**

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	83	66	61		
% Substantial	58	41	31		
Number of students tested	64	80	72		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	76	61	57		
% Substantial	50	38	30		
Number of students tested	46	30	53		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	83	73	65		
% Substantial	71	57	26		
Number of students tested	24	30	34		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	76	59	43		
% Substantial	36	26	24		
Number of students tested	25	39	21		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient	100		92		
% Substantial	90		58		
Number of students tested	10	*	12		
5. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient		77	25		
% Substantial		38	8		
Number of students tested	*	13	12		
6. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	84	62	53		
% Substantial	46	34	37		
Number of students tested	37	47	30		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject **MATH** Grade **2** Test: **Criterion Reference Test**
 Edition/Publication Year: **New every year** Publisher: **Utah State Office of Education**

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	85	69	78		
% Substantial	74	53	64		
Number of students tested	62	97	88		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	85	62	74		
% Substantial	71	49	58		
Number of students tested	48	68	57		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	78	62	82		
% Substantial	78	49	68		
Number of students tested	18	68	34		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	87	65	70		
% Substantial	65	47	57		
Number of students tested	31	34	44		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient		92			
% Substantial		77			
Number of students tested	*	13	*		
5. Pacific Islander					
% At or above Sufficient		92			
% Substantial		77			
Number of students tested	*	13	*		
6. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient		55	14		
% Substantial		45	7		
Number of students tested	*	11	14		
7. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	89	68	77		
% Substantial	71	52	49		
Number of students tested	38	50	47		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject **MATH** Grade **1** Test: **Criterion Reference Test**
 Edition/Publication Year: **New every year** Publisher: **Utah State Office of Education**

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	79	83	80		
% Substantial	56	65	63		
Number of students tested	77	99	94		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	77	78	78		
% Substantial	52	57	55		
Number of students tested	52	68	64		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	84	78	89		
% Substantial	68	57	70		
Number of students tested	31	68	47		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	65	71	62		
% Substantial	38	49	45		
Number of students tested	26	41	29		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient	91				
% Substantial	73				
Number of students tested	11	*	*		
5. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient		63	53		
% Substantial		38	47		
Number of students tested	*	46	15		
6. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	77	74	59		
% Substantial	46	54	41		
Number of students tested	39	46	37		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject LANGUAGE ARTS Grade 6 Test: Criterion Reference Test
 Edition/Publication Year: New every year Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	94	91	69		
% Substantial	77	61	36		
Number of students tested	77	66	81		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	89	90	66		
% Substantial	80	56	29		
Number of students tested	46	48	59		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	100	90	79		
% Substantial	70	61	42		
Number of students tested	27	31	38		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	100	94	48		
% Substantial	76	59	14		
Number of students tested	25	17	29		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient	100	100			
% Substantial	94	70			
Number of students tested	16	10	*		
5. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient	70	70	20		
% Substantial	40	20	7		
Number of students tested	10	10	15		
6. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	100	90	50		
% Substantial	82	58	26		
Number of students tested	44	31	34		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject LANGUAGE ARTS Grade 5 Test: Criterion Reference Test
 Edition/Publication Year: New every year Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	80	71	69		
% Substantial	49	40	39		
Number of students tested	61	94	72		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	57	64	68		
% Substantial	47	36	32		
Number of students tested	47	66	50		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	83	76	68		
% Substantial	33	41	39		
Number of students tested	18	37	28		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	72	39	67		
% Substantial	41	34	38		
Number of students tested	29	29	21		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient		88	83		
% Substantial		59	42		
Number of students tested	*	17	12		
5. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient		31	44		
% Substantial		15	6		
Number of students tested	*	13	16		
6. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	76	69	64		
% Substantial	50	41	33		
Number of students tested	34	49	33		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject LANGUAGE ARTS Grade 4 Test: Criterion Reference Test
 Edition/Publication Year: New every year Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	74	68	71		
% Substantial	50	34	40		
Number of students tested	66	74	93		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	71	36	66		
% Substantial	41	31	34		
Number of students tested	51	61	61		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	69	72	69		
% Substantial	34	40	42		
Number of students tested	26	25	36		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	74	55	63		
% Substantial	42	24	28		
Number of students tested	31	29	32		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient		85	89		
% Substantial		54	56		
Number of students tested	*	13	18		
5. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient	33	42	23		
% Substantial	25	17	18		
Number of students tested	12	12	22		
6. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	78	60	74		
% Substantial	49	31	40		
Number of students tested	37	35	47		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject LANGUAGE ARTS Grade 3 Test: Criterion Reference Test
 Edition/Publication Year: New every year Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001		
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)							
SCHOOL SCORES							
% At or above Sufficient	77	66	55	Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.			
% Substantial	38	33	25				
Number of students tested	64	80	72				
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100				
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0				
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0				
SUBGROUP SCORES							
1. Free and Reduced Lunch							
% At or above Sufficient	61	59	62				
% Substantial	35	30	21				
Number of students tested	46	63	53				
2. Caucasian							
% At or above Sufficient	75	73	56				
% Substantial	46	37	24				
Number of students tested	24	30	34				
3. Hispanic							
% At or above Sufficient	68	62	52				
% Substantial	28	23	19				
Number of students tested	25	39	21				
4. Asian							
% At or above Sufficient	90		100				
% Substantial	50		50				
Number of students tested	10	*	12				
5. Students with Disabilities							
% At or above Sufficient		46	25				
% Substantial		15	8				
Number of students tested	*	13	12				
6. English Language Learners							
% At or above Sufficient	70	64	63				
% Substantial	27	28	30				
Number of students tested	37	47	30				

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject LANGUAGE ARTS Grade 2 Test: Criterion Reference Test
 Edition/Publication Year: New every year Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	80	63	76		
% Substantial	52	31	61		
Number of students tested	61	97	88		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	79	60	68		
% Substantial	46	25	53		
Number of students tested	48	68	57		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	89	64	79		
% Substantial	56	36	71		
Number of students tested	18	42	34		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	71	85	68		
% Substantial	45	24	52		
Number of students tested	31	34	44		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient		77			
% Substantial		46			
Number of students tested	*	13	*		
5. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient		27	14		
% Substantial		9	14		
Number of students tested	*	11	14		
6. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	76	54	72		
% Substantial	50	24	55		
Number of students tested	38	50	47		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

UTAH STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject LANGUAGE ARTS Grade 1 Test: Criterion Reference Test
 Edition/Publication Year: New every year Publisher: Utah State Office of Education

Utah designated their proficiency levels as Minimal, Partial, Sufficient and Substantial. Sufficient and higher are considered proficient for NCLB to make AYP.

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month : May and June (4 track year round school)					
SCHOOL SCORES					
% At or above Sufficient	73	78	74		
% Substantial	27	46	41		
Number of students tested	77	99	94		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0		
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch					
% At or above Sufficient	71	71	69		
% Substantial	17	37	34		
Number of students tested	52	68	64		
2. Caucasian					
% At or above Sufficient	77	92	87		
% Substantial	35	58	47		
Number of students tested	31	38	47		
3. Hispanic					
% At or above Sufficient	65	61	48		
% Substantial	12	32	24		
Number of students tested	26	41	29		
4. Asian					
% At or above Sufficient	73				
% Substantial	45				
Number of students tested	11	*	*		
5. Students with Disabilities					
% At or above Sufficient			69		
% Substantial			20		
Number of students tested	*	*	15		
6. English Language Learners					
% At or above Sufficient	67	65	49		
% Substantial	26	33	24		
Number of students tested	39	46	37		

Prior to 2002-2003 there is no comparable data because Utah had a change in core curriculum and a change in testing format.

*less than 10

Utah State Office of Education National Normed Testing

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills was started in fall of 2004 (2003 edition, 2000 Norms Form B, Riverside Publishing, Division of Houghton Mifflin)

Stanford Achievement Test was used prior to 2004 (9th edition - 1996, Harcourt Brace, Educational Measurement Company)

Disaggregation of this data is only by grade level in Utah

Please be aware that since the Stanford Achievement Test and the Iowa test are two different instruments normed in different years and they are not comparable. The fall 2004 results represent a new baseline for this normed reference test. Note that with the Stanford test the important statistic was the percentile.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5

Tests: ITBS and SAT

Edition/Publication Year: See box above

Publisher: See box above

Scores are reported as NPR for the ITBS and Percentile for the SAT

Testing Months – August through October – We are multi-track year round school.

School Scores	ITBS		SAT		
	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Total Score - ITBS	39	33			
Total Score - SAT			NA*	37	26
Number of Students Tested	75	76		73	109
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0

NA Students were inadvertently given the test for the wrong grade.

Utah State Office of Education National Normed Testing

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills was started in fall of 2004 (2003 edition, 2000 Norms Form B, Riverside Publishing, Division of Houghton Mifflin)

Stanford Achievement Test was used prior to 2004 (9th edition - 1996, Harcourt Brace, Educational Measurement Company)

Disaggregation of this data is only by grade level in Utah

Please be aware that since the Stanford Achievement Test and the Iowa test are two different instruments normed in different years and they are not comparable. The fall 2004 results represent a new baseline for this normed reference test. Note that with the Stanford test the important statistic was the percentile.

Subject: Math

Grade: 5

Tests: ITBS and SAT

Edition/Publication Year: See box above

Publisher: See box above

Scores are reported as NPR for the ITBS and Percentile for the SAT

Testing Months – August through October – We are multi-track year round school.

School Scores	ITBS		SAT		
	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Total Score - ITBS	45	42			
Total Score - SAT			NA*	59	35
Number of Students Tested	75	76		73	109
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0

NA Students were inadvertently given the test for the wrong grade.

Utah State Office of Education National Normed Testing

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills was started in fall of 2004 (2003 edition, 2000 Norms Form B, Riverside Publishing, Division of Houghton Mifflin)

Stanford Achievement Test was used prior to 2004 (9th edition - 1996, Harcourt Brace, Educational Measurement Company)

Disaggregation of this data is only by grade level in Utah

Please be aware that since the Stanford Achievement Test and the Iowa test are two different instruments normed in different years and they are not comparable. The fall 2004 results represent a new baseline for this normed reference test. Note that with the Stanford test the important statistic was the percentile.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3

Tests: ITBS and SAT

Edition/Publication Year: See box above

Publisher: See box above

Scores are reported as NPR for the ITBS and Percentile for the SAT

Testing Months – August through October – We are multi-track year round school.

School Scores	ITBS		SAT		
	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Total Score - ITBS	53	43			
Total Score - SAT			53	57	39
Number of Students Tested	64	74	85	88	90
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0

Utah State Office of Education National Normed Testing

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills was started in fall of 2004 (2003 edition, 2000 Norms Form B, Riverside Publishing, Division of Houghton Mifflin)

Stanford Achievement Test was used prior to 2004 (9th edition - 1996, Harcourt Brace, Educational Measurement Company)

Disaggregation of this data is only by grade level in Utah

Please be aware that since the Stanford Achievement Test and the Iowa test are two different instruments normed in different years and they are not comparable. The fall 2004 results represent a new baseline for this normed reference test. Note that with the Stanford test the important statistic was the percentile.

Subject: Math

Grade: 3

Tests: ITBS and SAT

Edition/Publication Year: See box above

Publisher: See box above

Scores are reported as NPR for the ITBS and Percentile for the SAT

Testing Months – August through October – We are multi-track year round school.

School Scores	ITBS		SAT		
	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Total Score - ITBS	61	50			
Total Score - SAT			59	52	48
Number of Students Tested	64	74	85	88	90
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0