# REVISED 3-15-06

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

*U.S. Department of Education*

**Cover Sheet** Type of School: (Check all that apply) X Elementary __ Middle __ High __ K-12 __Charter

Name of Principal: Mr. Maurice Veilleux

Official School Name: Clayton Elementary School

School Mailing Address: P. O. Box 130, 221 Prentice Street South

| Clayton | Wisconsin | 54004-0130 |
|---|---|---|
| City | State | Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) |

County: Polk State School Code Number* 1120

Telephone: (715) 948-2163 Fax: (715) 948-2362

Website/URL: www.claytonsd.k12.wi.us E-mail: veilleux@claytonsd.k12.wi.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.

_____ Date_____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Mr. Maurice Veilleux
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name: Clayton School District Tel. (715 ) 948-2163

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.

_____ Date_____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mrs. Mary A. Smith
(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.

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

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

# PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

The signatures on the first page of this application 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:
   - **1** Elementary schools
   - **1** Middle schools
   - **0** Junior high schools
   - **1** High schools
   - **0** Other
   - **3** TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: **$10,117**

   Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: **$10,590**

**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
   [ **X** ] Small city or town in a rural area
   [ ] Rural

4. **15** 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 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PK** | 17 | 13 | **30** | | **7** | | | |
| **K** | 17 | 14 | **31** | | **8** | | | |
| **1** | 22 | 12 | **34** | | **9** | | | |
| **2** | 16 | 13 | **29** | | **10** | | | |
| **3** | 11 | 20 | **31** | | **11** | | | |
| **4** | 11 | 20 | **31** | | **12** | | | |
| **5** | 16 | 14 | **30** | | **Other** | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | **TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →** | | | | | 216 |

***[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]***

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:

**92** % White
**3** % Black or African American
**0** % Hispanic or Latino
**1** % Asian/Pacific Islander
**4** % 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: **7%**

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(1) 4** | Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | |
| **(2) 8** | Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | |
| **(3) 12** | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | |
| **(4) 195** | Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | |
| **(5) .06** | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | |
| **(6) 6** | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: **N/A**

**0** Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: **0**
Specify languages:

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: **46%**

Total number students who qualify: **99**

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: **15%**
**33** 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.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2** | Autism | | Orthopedic Impairment |
| | Deafness | **3** | Other Health Impaired |
| | Deaf-Blindness | **6** | Specific Learning Disability |
| **1** | Emotional Disturbance | **20** | Speech or Language Impairment |
| **1** | Hearing Impairment | | Traumatic Brain Injury |
| **0** | Mental Retardation | | Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| | Multiple Disabilities | | |

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

| | **Number of Staff** | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Full-time** | **Part-Time** |
| Administrator(s) | **2** | _____ |
| Classroom teachers | **13** | _____ |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | **6** | **3** |
| Paraprofessionals | **3** | **5** |
| Support staff | **6** | **9** |
| Total number | **27** | **17** |

12. Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers: **14:1**

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 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily student attendance | 97% | 97% | 96 % | 95% | 95% |
| Daily teacher attendance | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Teacher turnover rate | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

# PART III. SUMMARY

The teachers at Clayton Elementary School want you to know that something special goes on in their school and district. Located between farm fields and uninhabited woods in northwestern Wisconsin, the Clayton School District serves 430 students in a single building with 216 in grades PK-5. In an age and culture where bigger is better and size often garners more attention and funding, Clayton staff have become experts at maximizing finite resources to help students achieve high expectations. Their secret to success: building long-term relationships and a cohesiveness among school stakeholders.

The Clayton School District groups its 216 pk-5 students in an elementary wing with the middle and high school wings in adjoining sections of the building. This configuration of pk-12 in a single building symbolizes a core value the local community passes on to its youth in the district's educational philosophy document: *Students are supported by all members of our rural community who contribute to an educational system that will help students develop " initiative, self-determination and accountability for your own lives, actions and decisions as mature members of a democratic society".*

Teachers collaborate not just across grade levels and content areas, but also across that great divide between administration and faculty. The superintendent and teachers share administrative tasks and responsibilities to keep the school smoothly operating. Many staff members are double stakeholders in a system where they both work and send their children to school. In this dual role they value the support of their neighbors who serve on the school board, sit on committees and whose taxes pay teachers' salaries.

For their part, parents, community and school board members have financially supported facility improvements as well as a long term plan to encourage 100% of the teaching staff to participate in professional development through a professional development plan process. Students willingly come to school ready to work because the learning environment gives them a sense of security and trust.

The Clayton school community has expressed its collective educational philosophy in a statement adopted by the school board in 2003. The community believes the primary purpose of their local educational institution is to "teach children to become functional citizens of a democratic society and to provide an educational program with roots that establish a small, rural school district with a strong commitment shared by faculty and family to educational excellence". The document further articulates the community's strong commitment to develop students as well rounded human beings who not only posses basic knowledge, but also acquire initiative and practice self-determination to the betterment of society.

The local school board underscores the importance of shared decision making regarding school issues by documenting an official stance on community and staff involvement in the local decision making processes which encourages and solicits broad input from both groups of stakeholders.

The Clayton school community is proud of their mutual efforts to create a unique school system that holds high expectations for students. Teachers treat their work as a vocation requiring life-time dedication. They see themselves as progressives who are willing to take risks, innovate and stay on the cutting edge of education if it will benefit their students.

# PART IV. INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

**1. Assessment Results**

Clayton Elementary School participates fully in the assessment framework developed by the State of Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE) evaluates student achievement in reading, language, mathematics, science, and social studies at grades 4, 8 and 10. Beginning in November, 2005 the test was expanded to include evaluation of student achievement in reading and mathematics additionally at grades 3, 5, 6 and 7. WKCE results are reported in four categories of achievement: minimal, basic, proficient and advanced. Wisconsin Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2004-2007 requires 47.5% of a tested population score in the proficient or advanced categories in mathematics and 67.5% of a tested population score in the proficient or advanced categories in reading. More information on the Wisconsin assessment system may be found at http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/sig/index.html .

Clayton student achievement data is reported by grade level; data is also disaggregated for the economically disadvantaged. Within its small population of students, Clayton Elementary School has achieved consistent results on the WKCE tests. Clayton's 4th grade test results are attached.

At the 4th grade level, the Clayton Elementary School tested 100% of its students in each of the past three years in both reading and mathematics. The percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced in reading rose from 84% in November 2002 to 100% in November 2003 and back to 96% in November 2004. Similar growth was achieved in mathematics by 4th graders beginning with 63% at the proficient/advanced range in November 2002 to an increase of 100% in November 2003 and back to 94% in November 2004.

The only subgroup for which data is publicly disaggregated and reported is for the economically disadvantaged who make up approximately 35-40% of the school district's population. The results for this subgroup are strikingly similar to the whole school results. The vast majority of the economically disadvantaged students are proficient or advanced readers over the past three years: 88% in 2002, 100% in 2003 and 94% in 2004. In mathematics, a comparable 75% in 2002, 100% in 2003 and 94% in 2004 were proficient or advanced.

**2. Using Assessment Results**

Clayton Elementary School began examining student achievement data in the late 1990's with the onset of state testing. For the past five years the school has conducted annual data analysis activities attended by 100% of the administration and teaching staff. Participants analyze data in four areas: student performance, professional development, school programs/services, & family/community connections.

The school system has realized three major benefits through these annual data analysis retreats. First, data analysis has focused attention on student learning – both the individual student and the collective results achieved throughout the school. Student needs drive discussions about curriculum, teaching methods and multiple ways to assess student learning. Another benefit derived from data analysis is that the needs determined through data analysis become the foundation for the school improvement plan. Each data retreat begins with a review of the prior year's improvement plan and its accomplishments. Those results begin to shape the improvement plan for the upcoming year in terms of goals, evaluation strategies, activities to accomplish goals and timelines. Finally, examination of school data on a regular basis has led to the creation of faculty study or focus groups that in essence form a school- wide community of learners. It is this professional model of collaboration and inquiry that sparked interest in school-wide improvement through a Comprehensive School Reform grant initiative. Clayton adopted the Onward to Excellence II Model (OTE) and continues to utilize faculty focus groups to study and pilot research-based teaching practices.

**3. Communicating Assessment Results**

The Onward to Excellence model established a School Leadership Team with representatives from administrators and teachers whose job it is to make recommendations and, at times, decisions regarding school improvement plans. The team is a conduit for communication among the school district's stakeholders of teachers, parents, community, school board, and students. Under the direction of the School Leadership Team, an External Study Team comprised of community members and educators from other systems (neighboring school districts, a university, and the regional Cooperative Educational Service Agency #11 office) collected and examined assessment data and prepared a summary report for the Leadership Team and Board of Education. The Leadership Team disseminated information about student achievement during an evening open house and at parent-teacher conferences throughout the year. The school system has also utilized a technology software program as a communication tool between school and home. Additionally, the district provides exceptional access to the use of computer technology with a student-computer ratio of approximately 2 to 1. A large number of families have the capacity to access from their homes the assessment information (both specific to their individual children and collective class/district-wide results). Students reference assessment data to prepare for student-led conferences with their parents and teachers. More teachers are guiding students in how to track their own learning progress in the standards benchmarked for a particular grade level and content area by teaching students to use rubrics to evaluate elements of learning. Students are able to track their progress over time and compare results along a continuum of achievement. Additionally, the school schedules three parent/teacher conferences during the course of the school year which results in an 85% average attendance rate by parents over the course of the school year.

**4. Sharing Success**

Clayton's superintendent recently proposed forming a regional partnership, the Prairie Lake School Consortium, with three small neighboring rural schools. The consortium's first efforts focused on bringing teachers together to share expertise on professional development needs in curriculum design, instructional methodology, and assessment techniques. Clayton's teachers shared their professional development experiences with Onward To Excellence in consortium gatherings and eloquently reported on how the changes they have made in teaching techniques have positively impacted student achievement. The Clayton superintendent and the school board encourage district teachers to participate in regional professional development activities such as those hosted through CESA 11 where Clayton teachers have attended workshops and seminars, not only as participants, but also as trainers and co-facilitators. Some of the networking opportunities include the following:

- STAR Academy offering 2 credit graduate courses and workshops for teachers
- Facilitating the Future Conference offering 2, 4, and 6 graduate credits for summer courses and follow up sessions throughout the school year
- Title 1 consortium activities in reading and math
- Title 4 Safe and Drug Free Schools consortium
- Monthly meetings for reading specialists
- Monthly meetings for curriculum coordinators
- Monthly meetings for assessment coordinators

# PART V. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

### 1. Curriculum

**English (reading & language)** Every PK-5 teacher in the school agrees that using reading, writing and speaking as tools for communicating effectively is the core component of the local English-language arts curriculum. For the past four years, the entire PK-5 staff have focused on enriching the vocabularies of students at all grade levels and on integrating writing into every aspect of the PK-5 curriculum in all content areas. Students regularly use writing as a tool for demonstrating understanding of content in other classes.

**Mathematics** The Clayton mathematics curriculum is based on the six content standards outlined in the WI Model Academic Standards and on the performance standards that measure student abilities to construct personal meaning and to creatively and collaboratively solve realistic problems with mathematics. The K-12 math curriculum committee which consisted of one-third of the districts 38 teachers adopted new math materials approved by the National Science Foundation: a blended approach to Scott Foresman & Investigations in K-5 followed by complementary approaches in middle and high school. One of the big shifts teachers will make with these new materials is that students must be able to explain the "why" of mathematics concepts using math vocabulary both orally and in writing.

**Science** Several years ago the Clayton staff adopted an inquiry approach to science which places emphasis on how scientists use an inquiry model to understand the world. This type of curriculum approach requires Clayton students to pose questions and construct investigations to answer problems. This hands-on, constructivist approach meets our state standards in science.

**Social Studies** The core of the social studies curriculum centers on helping students develop an awareness of the importance the past and the part it has played in shaping the present and the future. Social studies lessons and learning activities prepare students for their roles as family members, productive workers and contributing citizens in an ever changing global society by requiring students to think critically to analyze, reflect, make predictions and solve problems. Again, writing and vocabulary enrichment figure prominently in social studies lessons.

**Fine and Applied Arts** Through the arts Clayton students find opportunities to develop self-expression and grow intellectually and creatively through performance, production or research. Art and music teachers stress the specialized vocabulary used by artists and performers.

**Health and Physical Education** Classes in this field introduce students to life-long activities and teach information based decision making strategies that can be applied in real life situations. Students engage in physical activities and chart the impact – both physically and mentally. Students also become familiar with health research and its impact on their lives.

### 2. Elementary reading

This program is a balanced mix of research-based teaching approaches used with a variety of material resources that provide students with choices in reading materials. Providing such choices allows teachers to individualize the curriculum to meet specific learner needs. Materials are drawn from literature trade books, novel studies, and basal reader selections. This array of reading materials is supported with a variety of instruction in phonics, other word decoding strategies and comprehension

strategies. Vocabulary enrichment is always embedded into content area studies as is writing. Process writing practices incorporate the "6 Traits of Writing" and focus on helping students develop as competent and engaging writers. Teachers have chosen this eclectic approach because they know that no single program or approach exists that is the perfect fit for every reader. Teacher study groups investigated six research based practices and determined that students are best served when an array of choices and strategies are used.

**3. Mathematics**

Following three years of study in faculty focus groups, math teachers elected to adopt new materials that redefined how math is taught in Clayton. In the words of teachers, the new integrated curriculum was chosen because it promoted connections among math concepts, it built on a constructivist approach that requires students to explore strategies and become life-long learners who can use mathematical thinking to solve problems, it provided ample opportunities for teachers to use a variety of instructional methods to meet varied student needs, and it had the best correlation to the academic standards. In its first year of implementation teachers at all levels report students expressing deeper understanding of math concepts and connections through their written reflections and explanations of processes to solve problems. Materials selected at all levels earned the approval of the National Science Foundation. At the K-5 level, teachers find the strategies that promote exploration of concepts in teams or small groups to be highly effective in building conceptual understanding.

**4. Instructional Methods**

One of the benefits of receiving a school improvement grant was that Clayton's faculty had a three year window of opportunity to study, pilot and select research based instructional strategies that aided students in learning. Teachers explored more than twenty different instructional strategies. Most were based on the research supporting brain compatible learning and Howard Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligence. Teachers identified four strategies as highly effective across all grade levels and content areas.

- Teaching to visual, auditory and kinesthetic learning styles in a lesson
- Using choral responses as an aid to memory
- Using attention getting devices to initially capturing the attention of students and hold their attention throughout a lesson and onto the next day and even week
- Motivating students with music & incorporating rhythmical activities as well as sound (pitch, tones, etc.) into learning tasks to help students connect new learning to what they already know

Other strategies teachers found useful included "turn-and-tell-your-neighbor", Ab=Mf , an acronym that reminded teachers to chunk lessons into manageable chunks based on the age (A) of the brain (b) being taught and matching the minutes (M) of instructional focus (f) to the numerical age of the student. Each month at faculty in-service meetings, staff took turns sharing most successful practices with one another and teaching new strategies to peers.

**5. Professional development**

Clayton's professional development plan for teachers grew out of its work with the Comprehensive School Reform grant initiative. The district's goal, supported by the superintendent and Board of Education, was to support 100% of its teachers in their pursuit of professional growth. When asked about the elements of the district professional development program that had the greatest impact on them, teachers named four key practices.

1) Identifying professional goals and reflecting on annual progress with those goals through the district's required PDP or Professional Development Plan which required each teacher to keep an updated file of professional evidence related to selected goals and the Wisconsin Teaching Standards
2) Participating in sustained professional development that spanned a number of monthly in-service sessions (focusing on brain compatible teaching techniques)
3) Collaborating with colleagues to improve practices targeted at making gains in student learning
4) Taking graduate classes in instructional methodologies (the CSR grant provided incentive stipends to take graduate level classes).

In practical terms, these four key practices have impacted student learning in the following ways. First, the emphasis on developing vocabulary across all content areas has resulted in students using richer vocabulary and more appropriate word choices in both writing and speaking. Local criterion referenced reading tests show improvement in vocabulary as measured in subtests on vocabulary acquisition, meaning and use. Local assessments of student writing using the 6 Trait Writing model also show slight improvement in student scores in the trait of "word choice".

Secondly, focused use of brain compatible teaching techniques (see #4, page 11 for examples of strategies) has resulted in greater levels of attentiveness and participation among students as measured by administrative observations of teaching. Local assessment results over time show students retain more information for longer periods of time and, more importantly, apply learned skills to new situations. Teachers design local assessments that deliberately require students to demonstrate their abilities to apply skills to new situations and problems.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

**Wisconsin 2006 Blue Ribbon School Nominee Proficiency Information - REVISED**

School and District Name: **Clayton Elementary, Clayton School District**
Subject: **Mathematics**
Tested Grade(s): 4
Test: Wisconsin Knowledge & Concepts Examination (WKCE)
Publisher: State of Wisconsin and CTB/McGraw-Hill

**Note 1**: No performance data are reported for student subgroups with fewer than 10 full academic year (FAY) students. In addition, performance data for some subgroups larger than 10 are not reported in order to avoid indirect disclosure of confidential information; these are noted with an asterisk (*).
**Note 2**: Performance data for 2004-05 and 2003-04 include students scoring in each of Wisconsin's four proficiency categories on the WKCE + the Wisconsin alternate assessments for students with disabilities (WAA-SwD) and English Language Learners (WAA-ELL). Data for 2002-03 are for the WKCE + the WAA-SwD only, due to a change in the way WAA-ELL results were reported beginning in 2003-04.
**Note 3**: Totals for the four proficiency categories may not add to 100% due to some combination of (a) rounding, (b) the exclusion of WAA-ELL results for 2002-03 (see Note 2), (c) the suppression of certain data to protect student privacy (see Note 1), and/or (d) student non-participation in testing.

| | **2004-2005** | **2003-2004** | **2002-2003** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | November | November | November |
| **SCHOOL SCORES (Full Academic Year Students):** | | | |
| % Proficient + Advanced (meeting state standards) | 94% | 100% | 63% |
| % Advanced | 39% | 52% | 27% |
| Number of students (full academic year) | 31 | 25 | 33 |
| Percent tested | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 3% | 0% | 3% |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES (Full Academic Year Students):** | | | |
| 1. White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| % Proficient + Advanced (meeting state standards) | 94% | * | * |
| % Advanced | 39% | * | * |
| Number of students tested | 31 | 24 | 31 |
| 2. Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| % Proficient + Advanced (meeting state standards) | 94% | | |
| % Advanced | 20% | | |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 8 | 8 |

**Wisconsin 2006 Blue Ribbon School Nominee Proficiency Information - REVISED**

School and District Name: **Clayton Elementary, Clayton School District**
Subject: **Reading**
Tested Grade(s): 4
Test: Wisconsin Knowledge & Concepts Examination (WKCE)
Publisher: State of Wisconsin and CTB/McGraw-Hill

**Note 1**: No performance data are reported for student subgroups with fewer than 10 full academic year (FAY) students. In addition, performance data for some subgroups larger than 10 are not reported in order to avoid indirect disclosure of confidential information; these are noted with an asterisk (*).
**Note 2**: Performance data for 2004-05 and 2003-04 include students scoring in each of Wisconsin's four proficiency categories on the WKCE + the Wisconsin alternate assessments for students with disabilities (WAA-SwD) and English Language Learners (WAA-ELL). Data for 2002-03 are for the WKCE + the WAA-SwD only, due to a change in the way WAA-ELL results were reported beginning in 2003-04.
**Note 3**: Totals for the four proficiency categories may not add to 100% due to some combination of (a) rounding, (b) the exclusion of WAA-ELL results for 2002-03 (see Note 2), (c) the suppression of certain data to protect student privacy (see Note 1), and/or (d) student non-participation in testing.

| | **2004-2005** | **2003-2004** | **2002-2003** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | November | November | November |
| **SCHOOL SCORES (Full Academic Year Students):** | | | |
| % Proficient + Advanced (meeting state standards) | 96% | 100% | 84% |
| % Advanced | 48% | 60% | 33% |
| Number of students (full academic year) | 31 | 25 | 33 |
| Percent tested | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 3% | 0% | 3% |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES (Full Academic Year Students):** | | | |
| 1. White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| % Proficient + Advanced (meeting state standards) | 96% | * | * |
| % Advanced | 48% | * | * |
| Number of students tested | 31 | 24 | 31 |
| 2. Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| % Proficient + Advanced (meeting state standards) | 94% | | |
| % Advanced | 40% | | |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 8 | 8 |