

# Final Evaluation Report

## Minnesota Reading First Program 2006 – 2007



*Prepared by  
Assessment and Evaluation Concepts Inc.*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2. Evaluation Methodology</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 3. Interview Results</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 4. Classroom Observation Results</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Chapter 5. Achievement Results</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Chapter 6. Summary and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix A: Data Reports by Subtest by School for Round Two Schools</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix B: Data Reports for Disaggregated Groups for Round Two Schools</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix C: Data Reports for Racial/Ethnic Groups for Round Two Schools</b> .....	<b>51</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Results of Classroom Observation for Kindergarten . . . . .	10
2. Results of Classroom Observation for First Grade . . . . .	10
3. Results of Classroom Observation for Second Grade . . . . .	11
4. Results of Classroom Observation for Third Grade . . . . .	11
5. Number of Students Tested by Grade . . . . .	14
6. Round Two Schools: Grade 1 – Number and Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets. . . . .	14
7. Round Two Schools: Grade 1 – Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets for Disaggregated Groups. . . . .	15
8. Round Two Schools: Grade 1 – Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets by Racial/Ethnic Categories. . . . .	15
9. Round Two Schools: Grade 1– Two-Year Comparisons Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets. . . . .	16
10. Round Two Schools: Grade 2 – Number and Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets. . . . .	16
11. Round Two Schools: Grade 2 – Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets for Disaggregated Groups. . . . .	17
12. Round Two Schools: Grade 2 – Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets by Racial/Ethnic Categories. . . . .	17
13. Round Two Schools: Grade 2 – Two-Year Comparisons Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets. . . . .	18
14. Round Two Schools: Grade 3 – Number and Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets. . . . .	18
15. Round Two Schools: Grade 3 – Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets for Disaggregated Groups. . . . .	19
16. Round Two Schools: Grade 3 – Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets by Racial/Ethnic Categories. . . . .	19
17. Round Two Schools: Grade 3 – Two-Year Comparisons Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets. . . . .	19



## Chapter 1

# Introduction

During the 2006–2007 school year, the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) funded 24 elementary schools throughout the state, including schools with a substantial number of educationally disadvantaged students, to implement Reading First programs. The overall goal of these Reading First programs is to improve the reading skills of educationally disadvantaged students in grades K–3. The program is a key component of the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (Title I, Part B) and utilizes scientifically-based reading research instructional strategies and assessment procedures.

Each of the 24 Reading First schools was coordinated by a full-time Literacy Coordinator, a part-time (two days per week) External Facilitator from the University of Minnesota (the U of M), and a part-time data collector from the U of M. It should also be noted that each school’s building principal played a prominent role in his/her school’s program. As in previous school years, the Literacy Coordinators organized weekly Study Group meetings within their respective schools where the teachers, principals, and Literacy Coordinators discussed the latest reading research findings provided by the U of M. (The U of M prepared packets of the reading articles from the latest reading journals for the teachers to use within their Study Groups.) During the year, the evaluation consultants observed Study Groups where higher-level questioning skills, vocabulary, and comprehension instructional strategies were discussed. The Literacy Coordinators modeled lessons for the teachers and offered suggestions to the Reading First teachers on how to improve their reading instruction, and arranged for the videotaping of teachers to help them further examine their instruction methods. The External Facilitator frequently participated in each school’s Study Group and was observed interpreting the Reading First test scores with the classroom teachers. They, along with the Literacy Coordinator, helped each teacher identify individual students’ strengths and weaknesses and suggested instructional techniques to remediate students’ deficiencies. The U of M’s data collectors used classroom observation instruments to determine the specific instructional techniques teachers implemented within their classrooms. As noted above, each Reading First principal played a prominent role within his/her school’s Reading First program. Each principal participated in the school’s weekly Study Groups and attended the numerous professional development workshops provided by the U of M. The principals were also given training on how to implement “shared leadership” and other effective administrative strategies.

As previously discussed, the U of M provided the entire Reading First community with numerous professional development workshops during the summer (the Summer Institute) as well as during the school year (the Fall, Winter and Spring Institutes). These large-scale training sessions (approximately 500 Reading First teachers, principals, Literacy Coordinators, and External Facilitators attended these workshops) included presentations by national reading experts and Dr. Barbara Taylor, a professor from the U of M, and her associates. The Institutes also included presentations by many of the Literacy Coordinators, the External Facilitators, and many Reading First classroom teachers.

### The Reading First Program Components

As noted above, the Reading First program is based upon scientifically-based reading research. Therefore, the United States Department of Education recommended that each Reading First program focus on the five major components of reading instruction. They include the following:

- Phonemic Awareness Instruction,
- Phonics Instruction,

- Fluency Instruction,
- Vocabulary Instruction, and
- Text Comprehension Instruction.

*Phonemic Awareness Instruction* is the ability to notice, think about, and work with individual sounds in spoken words. *Phonics Instruction* focuses on the relationships between the letters of written language and the sounds of spoken language. *Fluency Instruction* focuses on helping students read text accurately and quickly. *Vocabulary Instruction* is designed to help students recognize word meanings and to effectively communicate those meanings. The use of the word vocabulary here can imply either oral vocabulary or reading vocabulary, where oral vocabulary refers to words that are used in speaking or recognized in listening, and reading vocabulary refers to words recognized or used in print. *Text Comprehension Instruction* is the ultimate reason for reading. As a federal government pamphlet on Reading First said, “If the readers can read the words but do not understand what they are reading, they are not really reading.”

### **Participating School Districts and Schools: Round Two Schools**

Fourteen school districts throughout Minnesota implemented a Reading First program in the following 24 elementary schools:

#### **Anoka-Hennepin Public Schools**

University Elementary School  
Wilson Elementary School

#### **Austin Public Schools**

Neveln-Woodson Elementary School

#### **Cass Lake-Bena Public Schools**

Cass Lake-Bena Elementary School

#### **Crookston Public Schools**

Washington Elementary School

#### **Minneapolis Public Schools**

Bancroft Elementary School  
Bethune Community School  
Jenny Lind Community School  
Ramsey Fine Arts School  
Risen Christ (Nonpublic)  
Shingle Creek Urban Environmental Center  
Waite Park Elementary School

#### **North St. Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale Public Schools**

Richardson Elementary School

#### **Ogilvie Public Schools**

Ogilvie Elementary School

#### **Owatonna Public Schools**

Wilson Elementary School

#### **Robbinsdale Public Schools**

Neill Elementary School

#### **Rochester Public Schools**

Riverside Central Elementary School

#### **South Koochiching/Rainy River Public Schools**

Indus Elementary School

#### **Spring Lake Park Public Schools**

Woodcrest Elementary School

#### **St. Cloud Public Schools**

Discovery Community School

#### **St. Paul Public Schools**

Crossroads Elementary School  
Farnsworth Aerospace Magnet School  
Hancock-Hamline University Collaboration  
Magnet School  
Paul and Sheila Wellstone Elementary

## Chapter 2

# Evaluation Methodology

As in the previous two school years, Assessment and Evaluation Concepts Inc. (AEC) was hired by the MDE to conduct the summative evaluation of the Reading First program. (The U of M, under the direction of Dr. Barbara Taylor, conducted the formative evaluation of the Minnesota Reading First subgrant program.) This final evaluation report summarizes the various tests and assessments administered in each of the 24 participating Reading First schools. The evaluation report also includes the results of a series of classroom observations conducted by the evaluation consultants, which focused on the five major components of the Reading First program: Phonemic Awareness Instruction, Phonics Instruction, Fluency Instruction, Vocabulary Instruction, and Text Comprehension Instruction. In addition, the evaluation report contains the results of a series of individual interviews from each of the Reading First schools' principals, Literary Coordinators, External Facilitators, and a sample of the classroom teachers. The evaluation consultants examined all relevant program documents and data files from the MDE, the U of M, and a sample of the Reading First schools.

Regarding the Reading First tests and assessments, the Minnesota Reading First proposal to the United States Department of Education delineated several specific reading tests and subtests for the Round Two schools to administer and provided specific target scores for these Reading First schools to achieve. Therefore, the achievement tests were analyzed to determine the number of students meeting the achievement targets and the total number of students participating in the Reading First program. Furthermore, percentages of students meeting or exceeding the targets for the state over time are presented in this final evaluation report.





## Chapter 3

# Interview Results

AEC visited 20 of the participating Reading First elementary schools. During these on-site visits, the evaluation consultants individually interviewed each school principal, the Literacy Coordinator, the External Facilitator, and a sample of the Reading First classroom teachers. Using a series of structured interview guides, the evaluation consultants conducted interviews with a sample of the Reading First staff. The following is a summary of these interviews.

### The Reading First Principals

Each of the building principals interviewed were pleased to have their schools participating in the Reading First program. They all indicated the various tests and assessments help drive the reading instruction within their buildings. One rural principal said, “This is the first time we have used test data to drive instruction in my school.” She said that the reading scores for the Reading First program help identify individual students’ needs, monitor the students’ progress, are used to communicate with the children’s parents, and help her inform her school board on the achievements of her students in the Reading First program. A principal in a non-public urban school had similar feelings toward the use of the various tests and assessments in her school’s Reading First program. She said, “The test scores help my teachers determine the placement of students in reading groups, monitor each child’s progress, and determine what type of intervention is appropriate for each child.” One urban principal was critical of the tests and assessments used in the Reading First program and said, “The tests in the program are not very useful in working with special needs students or English language learners.” However, nearly all other principals felt the tests and assessments were worthwhile components of the Reading First program.

All principals interviewed were positive about the use of the latest reading research in their schools. Several principals discussed how they used the reading research in their schools’ Study Groups. One suburban principal said, “The research we discuss in our Study Groups help us be strategic about achieving our goals. We discuss best practices and how to implement the instructional strategies we read about.” An urban principal indicated she used the reading research in her school’s faculty meetings as well as in her school’s Study Groups. Another urban principal said he worked closely with his Literacy Coordinator and planned the topics discussed in his school’s Study Groups. He indicated that his school focused on comprehension and vocabulary topics in this year’s Study Groups. He also planned to extend the Study Group’s model for his fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade teachers.

Each principal was laudatory about his/her school’s Literacy Coordinators and the External Facilitators. They all felt these “reading experts” were an invaluable resource to their classroom teachers. Whether they were modeling a lesson for a struggling teacher or helping set the agenda for the weekly Study Group meetings, all principals were pleased with their school’s Literacy Coordinator and External Facilitator. One principal said, “Our External Facilitator is unbelievably helpful to my teachers. She is an excellent resource.”

The principals were also complimentary about assistance from the Minnesota Department of Education. One urban principal said, “My Reading First specialist is excellent...she is always positive and very knowledgeable.” Another principal from a rural elementary school made similar positive remarks. She said, “My Reading First specialist from the Minnesota Department of Education has been extremely helpful to me...I can call or e-mail her any time.”

Nearly all principals were positive about the professional development workshops provided by the U of M. They felt that the training sessions provided their teachers with many valuable instructional strategies to use in their reading classes. One urban principal said, “I think the workshops give my teachers many new insights. The workshops also give my staff an opportunity to network with other teachers.” In spite of the many positive comments about the professional

development workshops, one urban principal thought the U of M should have provided a more in-depth presentation on various components of the Reading First program at the beginning of the program. Another urban principal suggested his instructional assistants be invited to the professional development workshops, while another urban principal thought the workshops were too repetitive.

### **Literacy Coordinators**

All of the Literacy Coordinators interviewed were enthusiastic about their participation in their schools' Reading First program. The Literacy Coordinators discussed how they helped teachers interpret and use the various tests and assessments. For example, one Literacy Coordinator said, "We look for trends in the data and use the tests to differentiate the instruction." Another Literacy Coordinator said they have monthly assessment days in her school and use the test information to monitor her students' progress. Another Literacy Coordinator from an urban school said, "We use the test data to drive the instruction in my school...and we look at the test scores to see what interventions the students need." In addition, another Literacy Coordinator discussed how she presented the Reading First test results to her local school board. She thought the positive test results would be beneficial to retaining her position when the Reading First grant expires.

The Literacy Coordinators discussed their roles within their schools' Study Groups. A Literacy Coordinator from an urban school said, "We have weekly Study Group meetings to discuss comprehension skills and Early Intervention Programs...we try to identify strategies that impact our students' achievement." A Literacy Coordinator said, "Through our Study Groups, we try new instructional techniques." She also discussed how teachers used videotaping to critique each others' teaching. She noted, "We try to find out what works with our students."

Literacy Coordinators indicated that they worked closely with their schools' principal. One Literacy Coordinator said, "I meet weekly with my principal and we discuss our school's Leadership Team." These meetings help us set the agenda for our weekly Study Group meetings. Another Literacy Coordinator said she had an excellent relationship with her principal. She said, "My principal is an excellent problem solver."

Nearly all of the Literacy Coordinators were positive about the professional development workshops provided by the U of M. A Literacy Coordinator said, "The workshops have made a huge difference in my school...Catholic schools do not have much professional development...my teachers are able to hear nationally known experts." Another Literacy Coordinator from an urban school indicated that there was a great resistance from some of her teachers about having to attend the U of M workshops. She said, "Some of my teachers have embraced the new ideas and suggestions...and others are not willing to learn new approaches." As a matter of fact, one of the teachers said to the evaluation consultant, "These workshops are a waste of my time...I have taught over 30 years and I already know all this stuff."

### **External Facilitators**

Each External Facilitator indicated that he/she worked closely with the school's Literacy Coordinators, as well as helping the principal and teachers interpret the test scores. They also indicated that they worked closely with the Literacy Coordinators in implementing the Study Groups within their schools. One External Facilitator from a large urban school said, "I am the representative from the U of M...I am there to provide the research to the teachers." She also saw that her role was to provide the teachers with information about the best instructional practices. Another External Facilitator from an urban school said, "I work closely with the Literacy Coordinator...and spend a great deal of time in the classrooms...to give feedback to the teachers."

All of the External Facilitators indicated that they would frequently model lessons for their teachers. One External Facilitator said, "I demonstrate a lesson for the teachers and share the video of my lesson with other teachers." Another External Facilitator indicated that she modeled lessons several times a week and had her teachers critique her lesson. She found the modeling of lessons to be an effective learning experience for her teachers. After modeling the lesson, the External Facilitator would go into the teacher's classroom and observe the teacher trying the newly learned instructional technique.

Besides modeling lessons, the External Facilitators frequently distributed research articles to their teachers. One External Facilitator from a large urban school said, “I am constantly distributing articles to the teachers. . .our school subscribes to *Reading Research* and we discuss these articles in our Study Groups.” Another External Facilitator from another large urban school said, “The reading articles and the professional workshops provide my teachers with useful information on instructional practices.”

Overall, the External Facilitators were seen as valuable resources to each school’s Reading First program. Working closely with their schools’ Literacy Coordinators and building principals, they provided expert assistance to each of their respective Reading First schools’ classroom teachers.

### **Classroom Teachers**

An overwhelming majority of the teachers interviewed said they were pleased to participate in the Reading First program. Although most of the teachers indicated the program required a significant time commitment, they felt that they had learned a great deal about reading and they substantially improved their teaching skills. For example, many teachers discussed how they used test scores to set up their reading groups. They also discussed how they used the test results to identify each student’s strengths and weaknesses. One teacher from a large urban elementary school said, “I use the test data to refer students for special education and to talk to the parents.” Another teacher in a rural elementary school indicated she used the test results “to identify which of my students need an intervention and to monitor the other students’ progress.”

Nearly all of the teachers indicated they used the research they had acquired in their Study Groups to improve their teaching. Working closely with their schools’ Literacy Coordinators and the External Facilitators, they had learned many new instructional techniques. For example, a teacher from a large urban school said, “I try to apply the latest techniques in my class. . .such as Post-it notes for questioning skills.” Another teacher from another urban school said, “The research has changed the way I teach reading. . .I use higher-level questioning in my reading classes.” In spite of the numerous positive comments, one negative teacher from a large urban elementary school said, “I read about things I already know about. . .I know much of the material already.”

Many of the teachers interviewed indicated that they participated in their school’s Leadership Team. One teacher from an urban elementary school said, “We have a wonderful environment in our school. . .we are very supportive to one another. . . even though we combined two different schools.” Another teacher from a suburban school said, “We have a representative from each grade level on our school’s Leadership Team and we discuss new ideas and make decisions together.” Another teacher from a non-public school said, “I have an awesome relationship with my principal and I also love my Literacy Coordinator. She is very helpful to me.”

Most of the teachers interviewed were very positive about professional development workshops they were required to attend. A teacher from a rural elementary school said, “The workshops really meet my needs. . .I learned many new ideas from each session.” Another teacher from a large urban school was particularly laudatory about the Winter Institute and said, “I really like the Winter Institute. . .the teachers got to share what they were doing in their classes.” She also suggested that the teachers be given an opportunity to visit other teachers’ classrooms. Several other teachers were pleased they had an opportunity to view other teachers’ videos. One teacher from an urban school said, “We saw how other teachers are doing things. . .and learn from each other.” One less-than-enthusiastic teacher from a suburban elementary school said, “I think the in-service workshops are so-so. . .some of the workshops are great and some are not so good.”

All of the teachers interviewed were pleased with the abundance of new instructional materials they had received to use with their students. For example, one rural teacher said, “The Literacy Coordinator is always getting us plenty of new instructional materials.” Another teacher from a suburban elementary school said, “We have an amazing amount of materials.” Overall, the teachers were very enthusiastic about the amount of new reading books they had acquired.

In summary, nearly all of the teachers interviewed by the evaluation consultants were pleased to participate in the Reading First program. As noted above, they had learned a great deal about reading instruction through the weekly Study Group meetings and the U of M's professional development institutes. They like participating in their schools' Leadership Teams and they had acquired an infusion of new reading materials. There were only a few teachers who were negative toward their participation in the Reading First program.

## Chapter 4

# Classroom Observation Results

During September and October of 2006, January of 2007, and May of 2007, the evaluation consultants visited 20 of the Reading First schools throughout Minnesota. During these on-site visits, the evaluation consultant observed kindergarten through grade 3 Reading First classes. After the MDE Reading First specialist contacted the Reading First schools, the evaluation consultant called the school and the Literacy Coordinator or the principal faxed a schedule of classroom observations for the evaluation consultant to follow. These classroom observations were usually conducted during the morning's school reading/literacy block and each classroom observation lasted between 20–30 minutes. Using a specially constructed classroom observation instrument, the evaluation consultants visited a sample of the Reading First classrooms. It should be noted that the classroom observation instrument focused on the five major areas of the Minnesota Reading First program: Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, and Text Comprehension. Below is a brief description of each of these five major components:

Under **Phonemic Awareness**, the instruction included such components as identifying and making oral rhymes, identifying and working with syllables in spoken words, identifying and working with syllables in spoken words, identifying and working with onsets and rimes in spoken syllables, and identifying and working with phonemes in words spoken.

Under **Phonics**, the instruction included such components as systematic approach, explicit approach, relating letters and sounds, breaking spoken words into sounds, blending sounds, aiding children in applying letter-sound correspondence as they read and write text, and adapting to needs of individuals.

Under **Fluency**, the instruction included such components as fluency (students reading and re-reading text until fluency is met), guidance in re-reading through student-adult reading, choral reading, tape-assisted reading, partner reading or reader's theater, and monitoring students toward reading effortlessly and with expression.

Under **Vocabulary**, the instruction included such components as engagement in daily oral language, text orally read, time for extensive individual reading, implicit and explicit word instruction, and repeat exposure to vocabulary, word learning strategies such as word parts (affixes), and using context clues.

Under **Text Comprehension**, the instruction included such components as strategies for comprehension monitoring, use of graphic and semantic organizers, teacher's questioning, student generating questions, elements for text structure, direct instruction such as direct explanations, modeling guided practice and application, activating prior knowledge, and use of mental imagery.

Using these five major components of the Reading First program, the evaluation consultants rated their implementation during the classroom observation on a five-point Likert scale:

- 0=No evidence of implementation
- 1=Minimal evidence of implementation
- 2=Some evidence of implementation and usage
- 3=Evidence of implementation, with no practice
- 4=Evidence of implementation, minimal practice
- 5=Extreme evidence of implementation

Frequently, the evaluation consultant observed more than one component of the Reading First program being taught; for example, Vocabulary instructional strategy was included in a lesson focusing on Comprehension. Therefore, the total reading scores are a duplicated count, with some lessons receiving only one rating and some lessons receiving several ratings for an individual lesson. The following are the total ratings and the mean rating scores for each grade level.

Table 1 reports the ratings of the evaluation consultants for the kindergarten classes observed. Phonics was clearly the most prevalent Reading First component observed followed by Fluency instruction. Since many kindergarten teachers spend a substantial amount of time teaching their students letter sounds and blends, it is not surprising that the evaluation consultants observed Phonics being taught in many kindergarten classrooms.

**Table 1**  
*Results of Classroom Observation for Kindergarten*  
(N=22)

Reading First Component	Total Rating	Mean Rating
Phonemic Awareness	3	3.00
Phonics	44	4.88
Fluency	30	4.28
Vocabulary	19	3.80
Text Comprehension	19	3.80

Table 2 shows the ratings of the evaluation consultants for the first-grade classes. Fluency instruction (mean=4.50) was the most prevalent instruction activity observed by the evaluation consultants followed by Comprehension (mean=4.25) and Vocabulary instruction (mean=3.87) in the first-grade classes.

**Table 2**  
*Results of Classroom Observation for First Grade*  
(N=30)

Reading First Component	Total Rating	Mean Rating
Phonemic Awareness	4	4.00
Phonics	27	3.85
Fluency	36	4.50
Vocabulary	31	3.87
Text Comprehension	34	4.25

Table 3 presents the ratings of the evaluation consultants for the second-grade Reading First classes observed. Interestingly, Text Comprehension (mean=4.69), Vocabulary (mean=4.44), Fluency (mean=4.20), and Phonics (mean=4.25) all had very similar ratings. Not surprisingly, Phonemic Awareness was not observed in any of the second-grade classes, since Phonemic Awareness is usually only taught in kindergarten classes.

**Table 3**  
*Results of Classroom Observation for Second Grade*  
(N=32)

Reading First Component	Total Rating	Mean Rating
<b>Phonemic Awareness</b>	0	0
<b>Phonics</b>	17	4.25
<b>Fluency</b>	21	4.20
<b>Vocabulary</b>	40	4.44
<b>Text Comprehension</b>	61	4.69

Table 4 below depicts the results of the classroom observations for the third-grade Reading First classes. During the 2006–2007 school year, the evaluation consultants visited 32 third-grade classes. Text Comprehension was observed in a substantial number of these third-grade classes, followed by Vocabulary instruction. Since Comprehension skills play a prominent role in the reading curriculum as one moves into higher grade levels, it is not surprising that they were frequently observed in the third-grade classes.

**Table 4**  
*Results of Classroom Observation for Third Grade*  
(N=32)

Reading First Component	Total Rating	Mean Rating
<b>Phonemic Awareness</b>	0	0
<b>Phonics</b>	5	5.0
<b>Fluency</b>	18	3.60
<b>Vocabulary</b>	30	4.28
<b>Text Comprehension</b>	63	4.84





## Chapter 5

# Achievement Results

The Minnesota Reading First program has established a comprehensive system to collect relevant achievement information on the participating students. As mentioned earlier, numerous formative assessments are conducted to provide Reading First personnel with ongoing diagnostic and achievement measurements on the participating students. These assessments are utilized from kindergarten through grade 3 and comprise the basis of the formative assessment component conducted by the University of Minnesota.

The summative evaluation, conducted by AEC, uses the overall impact assessment subtests specified in the MDE's agreement with the federal Reading First program. The required summative evaluation achievement instruments are administered to participating students in grades 1–3. These test instruments are:

- ◆ *Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension* (grades 1, 2);
- ◆ *Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding* (grades 1, 2);
- ◆ *Gates-MacGinitie Word Knowledge* (grade 2);
- ◆ *Deno's Oral Fluency* (grades 1, 2, 3); and
- ◆ *Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment – MCA II* (grade 3).

The achievement information in this chapter comes from several sources. The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA II) information was generated directly from MDE data files. The demographic files and coding schemes were provided by the MDE; the non-MCA II student achievement files were provided by the University of Minnesota. AEC converted these files and merged them with the student demographic data by using the state's system of student identification numbers as the common element. During the analysis, when missing or duplicate student identification numbers were encountered, they could not be matched and were therefore dropped from the analysis. AEC maintained strict confidentiality and security procedures at all times throughout the processing and analysis of the data.

This evaluation report presents end-of-year overall and disaggregated achievement performance data for grades 1–3 to indicate the number and percentage of students meeting the target proficiency level and the total number of students in the tested group. Disaggregated information is provided for racial/ethnic categories and for special population groups (students on free and reduced price lunch, limited English proficient students, and special education students). Due to the substantial amount of overall school data and disaggregated school data for the subtests included in the Minnesota Reading First program, this information is included in Appendices A, B, and C. The results are presented for students for whom test scores were reported and who could be matched across files by their student identification number. In order to maintain confidentiality of individual student information and to avoid presenting data from groups that are too small to provide reliable achievement estimates, AEC has used the Minnesota reporting policy of not reporting group data for fewer than 10 students. As a result, any data cell that includes fewer than 10 students is signified by a notation.

The achievement targets, established by the MDE and used in this report, are in terms of normal curve equivalents (NCEs) for all Gates-MacGinitie subtests, words correct per minute for Deno's Oral Fluency measures, and achievement levels for the MCA II.

Also, where possible and technically defensible, AEC has provided achievement information over the two years that the Round Two schools in the Reading First program have been collecting data. The large majority of the analyses include

at least 100 cases. The reader is reminded that the accountability provisions of NCLB require a cross-sectional design in which students are tested at each grade level but not followed longitudinally. Therefore, the comparisons over time should be viewed with some caution since they are derived from different groups of students being compared (e.g., third graders from last year versus this year's third graders).

Table 5 indicates that the Minnesota Reading First program had complete test records on a total of 4,573 students in grades 1–3 in the Round Two schools during 2006–2007 across the school sites that operated the program.

**Table 5**  
*Number of Students Tested by Grade*

Grade	Number of Students Tested
Grade 1	1,519
Grade 2	1,544
Grade 3	1,510
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,573</b>

**Grade 1 Achievement Information**

The 2006–2007 achievement information for grade 1 is presented on Tables 6–8.

**Table 6**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 1*  
*Number and Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets*

Subtest	Percent Meeting the Target	Number of Students Meeting the Target	Total Number of Students
<b>Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension</b>	67.3	1,021	1,517
<b>Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding</b>	71.2	1,080	1,517
<b>Deno's Oral Fluency</b>	71.2	1,081	1,519

Nearly 70 percent of students met or exceeded the target in comprehension and slightly over 70% achieved the target in word decoding and oral fluency. When the data are broken down for disaggregated groups in Table 7, the percentages are somewhat lower. For instance, the results for students identified on the poverty indicator (free and reduced price lunch) show that about 60% of the students met the achievement targets. Special education students scored the lowest of the three groups.

**Table 7**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 1*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets for Disaggregated Groups*

<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Free/Reduced Price Lunch</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient</b>	<b>Special Education</b>
<b>Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension</b>	58.7	56.4	42.3
<b>Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding</b>	62.9	56.3	54.1
<b>Deno's Oral Fluency</b>	63.2	60.3	54.7

NCLB also requires that the achievement data be disaggregated by racial/ethnic categories. Table 8 presents these data and indicates that first-grade Caucasian Reading First students are meeting the achievement targets at higher rates than the African American, Asian, and Native American students, and that Hispanic students are scoring the lowest.

**Table 8**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 1*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets by Racial/Ethnic Categories*

<b>Subtest</b>	<b>Native American</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>African American</b>	<b>Caucasian</b>
<b>Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension</b>	57.3	69.5	52.8	55.8	78.0
<b>Gates- MacGinitie Word Decoding</b>	71.9	66.8	54.2	63.6	81.8
<b>Deno's Oral Fluency</b>	63.8	75.3	54.2	62.5	80.6

It was also possible to compare the percentages of students meeting the Minnesota Reading First achievement standards in 2006–2007 to those of the previous year. Table 9 presents this information and indicates that a higher percentage of students participating in Reading First in 2006–2007 met the target in oral fluency than in the first year of the program. As mentioned earlier, the reader is reminded that the accountability provisions of NCLB require a cross-sectional design in which students are tested at each grade level but not followed longitudinally. Therefore, the comparisons over time should be viewed with some caution.

**Table 9**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 1 – Two-Year Comparisons*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets*

Subtest	Percent Meeting the Target 2005 - 2006	Percent Meeting the Target 2006 - 2007	Percentage Difference
Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension	69.1	67.3	- 1.8
Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding	72.0	71.2	- 0.8
Deno’s Oral Fluency	69.7	71.2	+ 1.5

**Grade 2 Achievement Information**

The 2006–2007 achievement information for grade 2 in Round Two schools is presented on Tables 10–12. On Table 10, the overall data indicate that, on the Gates-MacGinitie subtests, participants are meeting the achievement targets at a low-to-mid 60% level. On Deno’s Oral Fluency measure, only 74% of the students met the words-per-minute criterion set as the target.

**Table 10**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 2*  
*Number and Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets*

Subtest	Percent Meeting the Target	Number of Students Meeting the Target	Total Number of Students
Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension	65.9	1,008	1,529
Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding	64.2	981	1,528
Gates-MacGinitie Word Knowledge	64.5	987	1,531
Deno’s Oral Fluency	74.0	1,143	1,544

When the data are broken down for disaggregated groups in Table 11, as we saw in earlier tables for grade 1 data, the percentages are lower than the information across all Reading First students.

**Table 11**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 2*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets for Disaggregated Groups*

Subtest	Free/Reduced Price Lunch	Limited English Proficient	Special Education
Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension	55.1	48.5	37.2
Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding	54.2	46.7	41.0
Gates-MacGinitie Word Knowledge	52.0	40.5	40.4
Deno's Oral Fluency	66.3	64.8	47.2

Table 12 indicates the results for racial/ethnic categories. As with grade 1, Caucasian students did better than the other groups. Hispanic students performed lower overall than the other groups.

**Table 12**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 2*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets by Racial/Ethnic Categories*

Subtest	Native American	Asian	Hispanic	African American	Caucasian
Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension	73.3	58.9	46.3	50.0	79.3
Gates- MacGinitie Word Decoding	70.7	57.6	42.6	50.7	77.1
Gates- MacGinitie Word Knowledge	70.7	49.1	41.2	48.9	81.3
Deno's Oral Fluency	82.9	74.2	60.3	61.9	82.0

Table 13 presents the two-year information and indicates mixed results with three of the four subtests registering lower percentages over time. Once again, the reader is reminded that the comparisons over time should be viewed with some caution since there were different students in each of the two years (not the same students over time).

**Table 13**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 2 – Two-Year Comparisons*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets*

Subtest	Percent Meeting the Target 2005 – 2006	Percent Meeting the Target 2006 – 2007	Percentage Difference
Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension	69.9	65.9	- 4.0
Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding	67.1	64.2	- 2.9
Gates-MacGinitie Word Knowledge	62.3	64.5	+ 2.2
Deno’s Oral Fluency	75.7	74.0	- 1.7

**Grade 3 Achievement Information**

The 2006–2007 achievement information for grade 3 is presented on Tables 14–17. The overall data indicates that 67.6% of the students were meeting the target on the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA II), while 80% of the students met the words-per-minute criterion set as the target for the oral fluency measure. It should be noted that 2006–2007 marked the first year that students classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) were required to take the state test. About 25% of the Reading First group (380 of 1,510 test takers) were classified as LEP.

**Table 14**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 3*  
*Number and Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets*

Subtest	Percent Meeting the Target	Number of Students Meeting the Target	Total Number of Students
MCA II	67.6	1,020	1,510
Deno’s Oral Fluency	80.0	1,188	1,485

The data broken down for disaggregated groups in Table 15 indicates, as with the earlier grades, the percentages of students meeting the targets in disaggregated groups are lower than the percentages demonstrated for all Reading First students.

**Table 15**  
*Round Two*  
*Grade 3*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets for Disaggregated Groups*

Subtest	Free/Reduced Price Lunch	Limited English Proficient	Special Education
<b>MCA II</b>	56.2	46.1	42.2
<b>Deno's Oral Fluency</b>	73.6	72.9	54.3

Table 16 indicates the results for racial/ethnic categories. As with grades 1 and 2, Caucasian students did better than the other groups. Native Americans students also met targets relatively well.

**Table 16**  
*Round Two*  
*Grade 3*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets by Racial/Ethnic Categories*

Subtest	Native American	Asian	Hispanic	African American	Caucasian
<b>MCA II</b>	70.7	56.8	53.3	52.3	82.5
<b>Deno's Oral Fluency</b>	82.7	81.6	73.2	69.1	86.4

Table 17 below shows the two-year comparisons on the MCA II and the Deno's Oral Fluency measure. While the oral fluency measure showed an increase, the MCA II, the Minnesota state assessment instrument, results appear to show a 3.6% decline in the number of students meeting the achievement targets. In addition to the cautions listed in other sections of this report on comparisons over time, 2006–2007 marked the first year that students classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) were required to take the state test. Approximately 25% of the Reading First group were classified as LEP.

**Table 17**  
*Round Two Schools*  
*Grade 3 – Two-Year Comparisons*  
*Percent of Students Meeting the Achievement Targets*

Subtest	Percent Meeting the Target 2005 – 2006	Percent Meeting the Target 2006 – 2007	Percentage Difference
<b>MCA II</b>	71.2	67.6	- 3.6
<b>Deno's Oral Fluency</b>	78.1	80.0	+ 1.9





## Chapter 6

# Summary and Recommendations

At each of the Reading First classes visited, the teachers focused on one of the five major components of the Reading First program. Furthermore, based upon the interviews of the classroom teachers, building principals, Literacy Coordinators, and External Facilitators, the staff were using the test results to help drive the reading instruction. Whether they were using the test scores to identify individual students' strengths and weaknesses or monitoring their students' progress, the reading tests played a significant role in the Reading First programs. In addition, the weekly Study Group meetings, the videotaping of the participating teachers, and the extensive professional development activities provided by the University of Minnesota have all apparently contributed to the reading gains.

With respect to the summative evaluation data, there are several general statements that can be made about achievement of the Reading First participants.

- ◆ Overall, about 2/3 of the participants met the achievement standards in the 2006–2007 school year.
- ◆ Children in poverty and those with limited English proficiency did not score as well as the overall group of participants.
- ◆ Special education students generally scored lower than any other group.
- ◆ Caucasian students in the program consistently out-performed other groups. Hispanic students tended to score lower than all other racial/ethnic groups.
- ◆ The required inclusion of LEP students in the MCA II may have contributed to the lower scores in the second year as this group tends to score lower on standardized tests as they are building their English skills.

In order to help “fine tune” the Minnesota Reading First program, the evaluation consultants offer the following recommendations:

- Since the Reading First program is only funded through 2007–2008, the MDE should continue to encourage each of the participating Reading First schools to develop plans to continue components of the program when the grant expires (such as a Literacy Coordinator or the Study Groups to assist in the interpretation and use of the assessment results).
- More attention should be given to the issue of sustainability after the Reading First funds are gone. A survey of the Round One schools whose funding ended in 2005–2006 should be considered to determine which elements of the Reading First operations have been sustained, which have not, and the challenges faced by these schools in continuing the program. This information should help Round Two schools in their thinking about the sustainability issues.
- Several of the classroom teachers indicated they would like to observe other teachers in other Reading First schools. Therefore, the MDE may want to encourage the Reading First principals to arrange for some of their teachers to visit other Reading First schools.
- When external facilitators are selected to work in a Reading First school, neither school personnel nor the MDE have input into the hiring process. There should be a method for the University to seek and consider input from these sources as they each have a major stake in the selection of the External Facilitator.



**APPENDIX A**

**DATA REPORTS BY SUBTEST BY SCHOOL**

***FOR ROUND TWO SCHOOLS***



### Notes for Reading the Tables in the Appendices

- ◆ In order to maintain confidentiality of individual student information and to avoid presenting data from groups that are too small to provide reliable achievement estimates, AEC has used the Minnesota reporting policy of not reporting group data for fewer than 10 students. As a result, any data cell that includes fewer than 10 students is signified by a notation (\*).
- ◆ The reader should note that, while there may be many notations in cells particularly on the disaggregated tables, each of those notations represents actual achievement data for fewer than 10 students, and these data are aggregated into the totals for the tables in the body of the report.



**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 1 - Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension by School  
Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	82.56%	71	86
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	78.31%	65	83
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	81.40%	70	86
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	60.76%	48	79
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	70.89%	56	79
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	50.00%	27	54
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	47.06%	16	34
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	49.21%	31	63
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	51.65%	47	91
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	84.00%	21	25
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	78.79%	26	33
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	59.32%	35	59
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	66.10%	39	59
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	87.10%	27	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	55.00%	44	80
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	83.33%	50	60
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	75.28%	67	89
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	88.00%	88	100
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	62.82%	49	78
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	63.46%	33	52
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	69.74%	53	76
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	59.15%	42	71
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	32.65%	16	49
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>67.30%</b>	<b>1021</b>	<b>1517</b>

R2A1



**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension by School  
Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	79.73%	59	74
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	75.51%	74	98
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	82.54%	52	63
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	74.58%	44	59
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	70.93%	61	86
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	47.17%	25	53
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	61.90%	13	21
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	45.59%	31	68
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	60.23%	53	88
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	79.31%	23	29
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	38.24%	13	34
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	65.45%	36	55
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	62.90%	39	62
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	70.97%	22	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	61.84%	47	76
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	65.85%	54	82
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	81.71%	67	82
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	100.00%	13	13
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	79.28%	88	111
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	55.26%	42	76
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	71.43%	35	49
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	66.18%	45	68
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	54.26%	51	94
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	36.84%	21	57
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>65.93%</b>	<b>1008</b>	<b>1529</b>

R2A2

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 1 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding by School  
Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	88.37%	76	86
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	84.34%	70	83
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	94.19%	81	86
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	78.48%	62	79
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	65.82%	52	79
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	46.30%	25	54
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	61.76%	21	34
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	49.21%	31	63
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	61.54%	56	91
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	88.00%	22	25
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	66.67%	22	33
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	62.71%	37	59
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	61.02%	36	59
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	100.00%	31	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	58.75%	47	80
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	85.00%	51	60
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	78.65%	70	89
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	87.00%	87	100
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	70.51%	55	78
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	67.31%	35	52
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	64.47%	49	76
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	64.79%	46	71
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	36.73%	18	49
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>71.19%</b>	<b>1080</b>	<b>1517</b>

R2A3

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding by School  
Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	71.62%	53	74
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	78.57%	77	98
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	87.30%	55	63
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	77.97%	46	59
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	72.09%	62	86
MINNEAPOLIS	BANGCROFT ELEMENTARY	33.33%	18	54
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	61.90%	13	21
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	40.30%	27	67
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	56.82%	50	88
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	72.41%	21	29
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	44.12%	15	34
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	56.36%	31	55
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	59.68%	37	62
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	74.19%	23	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	55.26%	42	76
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	67.07%	55	82
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	81.71%	67	82
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	100.00%	13	13
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	76.58%	85	111
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	59.21%	45	76
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	62.50%	30	48
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	66.18%	45	68
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	51.06%	48	94
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	40.35%	23	57
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>64.20%</b>	<b>981</b>	<b>1528</b>

R2A4

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 1 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School  
Passing >=40 Words Correct Per Minute**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	86.05%	74	86
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	77.11%	64	83
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	83.72%	72	86
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	71.43%	60	84
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	75.64%	59	78
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	50.00%	27	54
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	64.71%	22	34
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	53.13%	34	64
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	54.95%	50	91
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	73.33%	22	30
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	87.88%	29	33
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	65.52%	38	58
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	63.79%	37	58
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	83.87%	26	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	64.56%	51	79
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	86.67%	52	60
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	78.89%	71	90
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	89.90%	89	99
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	73.08%	57	78
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	60.78%	31	51
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	71.62%	53	74
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	63.38%	45	71
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	38.30%	18	47
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>71.17%</b>	<b>1081</b>	<b>1519</b>

R2A5

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 2 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School  
Passing >=75 Words Correct Per Minute**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	86.49%	64	74
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	78.79%	78	99
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	84.62%	55	65
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	89.83%	53	59
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	77.91%	67	86
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	62.96%	34	54
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	90.48%	19	21
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	53.62%	37	69
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	66.30%	61	92
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	81.82%	27	33
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	67.65%	23	34
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	75.00%	42	56
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	70.97%	44	62
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	70.97%	22	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	71.05%	54	76
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	74.39%	61	82
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	86.59%	71	82
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	100.00%	13	13
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	84.96%	96	113
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	64.47%	49	76
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	66.00%	33	50
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	75.00%	51	68
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	67.02%	63	94
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	47.27%	26	55
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>74.03%</b>	<b>1143</b>	<b>1544</b>

R2A6

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 3 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School  
Passing >=95 Words Correct Per Minute**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	84.13%	53	63
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	82.93%	68	82
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	82.19%	60	73
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	85.92%	61	71
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	74.47%	35	47
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	81.48%	22	27
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	57.35%	39	68
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	78.00%	78	100
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	73.53%	25	34
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	76.92%	30	39
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	79.10%	53	67
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	77.92%	60	77
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	83.33%	30	36
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	78.87%	56	71
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	88.46%	69	78
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	82.11%	78	95
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	93.22%	110	118
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	75.90%	63	83
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	76.92%	40	52
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	90.24%	74	82
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	83.58%	56	67
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	50.91%	28	55
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>80.00%</b>	<b>1188</b>	<b>1485</b>

R2A7

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Knowledge by School  
Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	78.38%	58	74
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	79.59%	78	98
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	84.13%	53	63
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	76.27%	45	59
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	72.09%	62	86
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	38.89%	21	54
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	66.67%	14	21
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	41.18%	28	68
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	59.09%	52	88
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	62.07%	18	29
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	35.29%	12	34
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	58.18%	32	55
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	59.68%	37	62
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	70.97%	22	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	63.16%	48	76
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	65.85%	54	82
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	80.49%	66	82
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	100.00%	13	13
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	75.68%	84	111
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	60.53%	46	76
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	74.00%	37	50
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	61.76%	42	68
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	51.06%	48	94
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	29.82%	17	57
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>64.47%</b>	<b>987</b>	<b>1531</b>

R2A8

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools  
Grade 3 - Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II by School  
Passing >=3 Achievement Level**

District Name	School Name	% Passing	# Passing	All Students
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	81.25%	52	64
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	67.86%	57	84
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	67.57%	50	74
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	72.60%	53	73
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	61.22%	30	49
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	70.37%	19	27
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	45.71%	32	70
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	63.37%	64	101
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	55.88%	19	34
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	41.03%	16	39
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	63.24%	43	68
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	70.51%	55	78
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	86.11%	31	36
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	70.83%	51	72
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	85.00%	68	80
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	78.13%	75	96
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	83.90%	99	118
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	66.67%	56	84
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	72.22%	39	54
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	76.74%	66	86
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	38.81%	26	67
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	33.93%	19	56
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>67.55%</b>	<b>1020</b>	<b>1510</b>

R2A9





**APPENDIX B**

**DATA REPORTS FOR DISAGGREGATED GROUPS**

***FOR ROUND TWO SCHOOLS***



### Notes for Reading the Tables in the Appendices

- ◆ In order to maintain confidentiality of individual student information and to avoid presenting data from groups that are too small to provide reliable achievement estimates, AEC has used the Minnesota reporting policy of not reporting group data for fewer than 10 students. As a result, any data cell that includes fewer than 10 students is signified by a notation (\*).
- ◆ The reader should note that, while there may be many notations in cells particularly on the disaggregated tables, each of those notations represents actual achievement data for fewer than 10 students, and these data are aggregated into the totals for the tables in the body of the report.



**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 1 - Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	77.78%	28	36	78.95%	15	19	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	71.88%	23	32	82.14%	23	28	*	*	*
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	77.27%	34	44	*	*	*	*	*	*
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	56.92%	37	65	*	*	*	46.15%	6	13
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	55.00%	22	40	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	42.55%	20	47	40.00%	12	30	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	46.67%	14	30	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	43.90%	18	41	43.75%	7	16	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	38.71%	24	62	30.77%	8	26	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	94.74%	18	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	76.67%	23	30	72.73%	8	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	54.55%	24	44	57.89%	11	19	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	57.14%	16	28	*	*	*	*	*	*
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	84.21%	16	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	47.83%	22	46	33.33%	6	18	36.36%	4	11
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	79.31%	23	29	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	70.59%	36	51	66.67%	12	18	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	81.82%	18	22	81.82%	9	11	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	52.83%	28	53	38.46%	5	13	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	58.33%	21	36	63.64%	14	22	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	69.49%	41	59	63.27%	31	49	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	52.46%	32	61	56.86%	29	51	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	28.89%	13	45	34.38%	11	32	*	*	*

R2B1

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	67.74%	21	31	*	*	*	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	60.61%	20	33	61.54%	16	26	*	*	*
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	73.53%	25	34	*	*	*	54.55%	6	11
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	71.74%	33	46	*	*	*	*	*	*
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	57.45%	27	47	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	40.00%	18	45	34.48%	10	29	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	60.00%	12	20	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	42.59%	23	54	50.00%	10	20	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	46.43%	26	56	50.00%	11	22	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	78.26%	18	23	75.00%	9	12	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	35.48%	11	31	54.55%	6	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	56.41%	22	39	38.89%	7	18	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	61.76%	21	34	*	*	*	*	*	*
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	63.16%	12	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	50.00%	19	38	*	*	*	38.46%	5	13
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	44.74%	17	38	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	73.33%	33	45	63.64%	14	22	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	62.50%	20	32	46.67%	7	15	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	37.50%	15	40	36.84%	7	19	22.22%	4	18
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	66.67%	18	27	64.29%	9	14	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	62.22%	28	45	58.33%	21	36	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	49.37%	39	79	50.00%	34	68	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	36.84%	21	57	30.77%	12	39	*	*	*

R2B2

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 1 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	86.11%	31	36	84.21%	16	19	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	75.00%	24	32	78.57%	22	28	*	*	*
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	88.64%	39	44	*	*	*	*	*	*
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	75.38%	49	65	*	*	*	69.23%	9	13
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	55.00%	22	40	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	40.43%	19	47	36.67%	11	30	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	63.33%	19	30	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	42.50%	17	40	38.89%	7	18	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	48.39%	30	62	23.08%	6	26	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	89.47%	17	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	63.33%	19	30	54.55%	6	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	56.82%	25	44	57.89%	11	19	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	50.00%	14	28	*	*	*	*	*	*
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	100.00%	19	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	47.83%	22	46	33.33%	6	18	36.36%	4	11
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	79.31%	23	29	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	76.92%	40	52	78.95%	15	19	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	72.73%	16	22	81.82%	9	11	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	60.38%	32	53	38.46%	5	13	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	63.89%	23	36	72.73%	16	22	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	64.41%	38	59	59.18%	29	49	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	60.66%	37	61	60.78%	31	51	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	31.11%	14	45	34.38%	11	32	*	*	*

R2B3



**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	58.06%	18	31	*	*	*	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	60.61%	20	33	69.23%	18	26	*	*	*
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	85.29%	29	34	*	*	*	72.73%	8	11
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	76.09%	35	46	*	*	*	*	*	*
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	63.83%	30	47	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	28.26%	13	46	24.14%	7	29	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	60.00%	12	20	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	35.19%	19	54	35.00%	7	20	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	44.64%	25	56	40.91%	9	22	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	65.22%	15	23	50.00%	6	12	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	41.94%	13	31	45.45%	5	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	51.28%	20	39	38.89%	7	18	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	67.65%	23	34	*	*	*	*	*	*
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	68.42%	13	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	42.11%	16	38	*	*	*	38.46%	5	13
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	52.63%	20	38	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	73.33%	33	45	68.18%	15	22	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	65.63%	21	32	53.33%	8	15	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	45.00%	18	40	42.11%	8	19	27.78%	5	18
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	48.15%	13	27	40.00%	6	15	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	62.22%	28	45	63.89%	23	36	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLINE MAGNET ELEMENTARY	44.30%	35	79	47.06%	32	68	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	40.35%	23	57	33.33%	13	39	*	*	*

R2B4

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 1 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=40 Words Correct Per Minute**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	80.56%	29	36	78.95%	15	19	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	71.88%	23	32	75.00%	21	28	*	*	*
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	72.73%	32	44	*	*	*	*	*	*
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	68.57%	48	70	*	*	*	64.29%	9	14
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	64.10%	25	39	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	44.68%	21	47	40.00%	12	30	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	63.33%	19	30	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	48.78%	20	41	61.11%	11	18	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	41.94%	26	62	26.92%	7	26	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	73.91%	17	23	66.67%	8	12	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	86.67%	26	30	90.91%	10	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	58.14%	25	43	63.16%	12	19	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	53.57%	15	28	*	*	*	*	*	*
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	78.95%	15	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	63.04%	29	46	50.00%	9	18	36.36%	4	11
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	79.31%	23	29	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	76.92%	40	52	63.16%	12	19	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	86.36%	19	22	90.91%	10	11	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	64.15%	34	53	46.15%	6	13	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	54.29%	19	35	59.09%	13	22	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	70.69%	41	58	70.83%	34	48	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	56.67%	34	60	59.62%	31	52	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	34.88%	15	43	38.71%	12	31	*	*	*

R2B5

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 2 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=75 Words Correct Per Minute**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	74.19%	23	31	*	*	*	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	74.19%	23	31	*	*	*	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	73.53%	25	34	62.96%	17	27	*	*	*
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	77.78%	28	36	*	*	*	58.33%	7	12
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	91.30%	42	46	*	*	*	*	*	*
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	70.21%	33	47	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	58.70%	27	46	51.72%	15	29	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	90.00%	18	20	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	47.27%	26	55	47.62%	10	21	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	54.39%	31	57	54.55%	12	22	41.67%	5	12
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	77.78%	21	27	73.33%	11	15	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	64.52%	20	31	90.91%	10	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	69.23%	27	39	72.22%	13	18	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	67.65%	23	34	*	*	*	*	*	*
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	63.16%	12	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	57.89%	22	38	*	*	*	46.15%	6	13
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	65.79%	25	38	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	77.78%	35	45	77.27%	17	22	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	66.67%	22	33	66.67%	10	15	54.55%	6	11
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	57.50%	23	40	50.00%	9	18	36.84%	7	19
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	64.29%	18	28	66.67%	10	15	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	73.33%	33	45	75.00%	27	36	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	62.03%	49	79	67.65%	46	68	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	47.27%	26	55	47.22%	17	36	*	*	*

R2B6

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 3 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=95 Words Correct Per Minute**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	70.00%	14	20	*	*	*	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	71.88%	23	32	66.67%	16	24	83.33%	10	12
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	76.74%	33	43	*	*	*	*	*	*
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	86.44%	51	59	*	*	*	56.25%	9	16
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	69.23%	27	39	57.89%	11	19	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	82.61%	19	23	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	53.19%	25	47	66.67%	10	15	18.18%	2	11
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	74.24%	49	66	71.43%	25	35	50.00%	8	16
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	68.97%	20	29	62.50%	10	16	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	79.41%	27	34	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	66.67%	28	42	93.33%	14	15	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	76.32%	29	38	*	*	*	63.64%	7	11
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	68.75%	11	16	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	63.33%	19	30	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	78.38%	29	37	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	67.57%	25	37	73.33%	11	15	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	88.46%	23	26	87.50%	14	16	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	66.67%	36	54	69.23%	9	13	58.82%	10	17
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	79.41%	27	34	88.24%	15	17	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	90.63%	58	64	90.20%	46	51	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	83.33%	50	60	83.02%	44	53	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	50.98%	26	51	48.57%	17	35	*	*	*

R2B7

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Knowledge by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	61.29%	19	31	*	*	*	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	63.64%	21	33	61.54%	16	26	*	*	*
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	76.47%	26	34	*	*	*	54.55%	6	11
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	71.74%	33	46	*	*	*	*	*	*
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	61.70%	29	47	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	30.43%	14	46	24.14%	7	29	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	65.00%	13	20	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	35.19%	19	54	30.00%	6	20	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	41.07%	23	56	40.91%	9	22	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	65.22%	15	23	58.33%	7	12	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	32.26%	10	31	27.27%	3	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	51.28%	20	39	27.78%	5	18	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	52.94%	18	34	*	*	*	*	*	*
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	63.16%	12	19	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	55.26%	21	38	*	*	*	46.15%	6	13
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	44.74%	17	38	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	66.67%	30	45	59.09%	13	22	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	56.25%	18	32	20.00%	3	15	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	50.00%	20	40	36.84%	7	19	33.33%	6	18
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	64.29%	18	28	60.00%	9	15	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	55.56%	25	45	55.56%	20	36	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	43.04%	34	79	47.06%	32	68	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	29.82%	17	57	20.51%	8	39	*	*	*

R2B8

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 3 - Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II by School**  
**Disaggregated by Poverty, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education Categories**  
**Passing >=3 Achievement Level**

District	School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch			English Language Proficiency			Special Education		
		% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total	% Pass	# Pass	Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	61.90%	13	21	*	*	*	*	*	*
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	46.88%	15	32	32.00%	8	25	53.85%	7	13
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	56.82%	25	44	*	*	*	*	*	*
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	72.13%	44	61	*	*	*	52.94%	9	17
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	55.00%	22	40	36.84%	7	19	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	69.57%	16	23	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	40.82%	20	49	26.67%	4	15	15.38%	2	13
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	56.06%	37	66	52.78%	19	36	37.50%	6	16
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	55.17%	16	29	37.50%	6	16	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	38.24%	13	34	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	44.19%	19	43	46.67%	7	15	*	*	*
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	61.54%	24	39	*	*	*	45.45%	5	11
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	87.50%	14	16	*	*	*	*	*	*
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	50.00%	15	30	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	74.36%	29	39	*	*	*	*	*	*
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	65.79%	25	38	40.00%	6	15	*	*	*
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	65.38%	17	26	68.75%	11	16	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	55.56%	30	54	50.00%	7	14	29.41%	5	17
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	61.76%	21	34	72.22%	13	18	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	75.00%	51	68	75.93%	41	54	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	36.67%	22	60	32.08%	17	53	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	30.77%	16	52	27.78%	10	36	*	*	*

R2B9



**APPENDIX C**

**DATA REPORTS FOR RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS**

***FOR ROUND TWO SCHOOLS***





**Notes for Reading the Tables in the Appendices**

- ◆ In order to maintain confidentiality of individual student information and to avoid presenting data from groups that are too small to provide reliable achievement estimates, AEC has used the Minnesota reporting policy of not reporting group data for fewer than 10 students. As a result, any data cell that includes fewer than 10 students is signified by a notation (\*).
- ◆ The reader should note that, while there may be many notations in cells particularly on the disaggregated tables, each of those notations represents actual achievement data for fewer than 10 students, and these data are aggregated into the totals for the tables in the body of the report.



**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 1 - Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension by School**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing>=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian		
		% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	72.73%	8	11	14	84.31%	43	51
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	76.92%	10	*	*	*	*	79.63%	43	54
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	75.00%	9	12	*	83.10%	59	71
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	56.72%	38	*	*	*	*	*	*	83.33%	10	12
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	53.33%	8	15	*	76.19%	48	63
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	42.86%	12	28	16	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	12	48.00%	12	25
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	44.44%	8	*	*	*	26	34.62%	9	26
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	37.93%	11	29	31	38.71%	12	31
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	14	92.86%	13	14
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	75.00%	9	*	*	*	14	78.57%	11	14
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	55.56%	10	18	11	45.45%	5	11
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	69.23%	18	26
OGILVIE	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	74.36%	29	39
OWATONNA	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	87.10%	27	31
ROBBINSDALE	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	45.00%	9	20	*	63.46%	33	52
ROCHESTER	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	20	92.59%	25	27
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	63.64%	7	11	16	79.25%	42	53
SPRING LAKE PARK	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
ST. CLOUD	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	92.86%	13	*	*	*	*	89.86%	62	69
ST. PAUL	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	14	50.00%	7	14
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	71.43%	10	*	*	*	19	63.16%	12	19
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	68.18%	30	*	*	*	*	77.78%	14	18
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	62.50%	20	*	*	*	25	48.00%	12	25
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	33.33%	7	21	4	23.53%	4	17

R2C1

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Comprehension by School**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing >= 41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian	
		% Pass	# Pass / Total	% Pass	# Pass / Total	% Pass	# Pass / Total	% Pass	# Pass / Total	% Pass	# Pass / Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	80.70%	46 / 57
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	79.27%	65 / 82
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	85.19%	46 / 54
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	75.93%	41 / 54	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	47.37%	9 / 19	*	*	79.69%	51 / 64
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	34.48%	10 / 29	75.00%	12 / 16	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	58.82%	10 / 17	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	43.48%	10 / 23	*	*	31.25%	10 / 32	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	43.48%	10 / 23	45.71%	16 / 35	91.67%	22 / 24
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	*	*	83.33%	15 / 18	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	16.67%	3 / 18	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	25.00%	4 / 16	*	*	91.30%	21 / 23
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	40.00%	6 / 15	*	*	*	*	70.00%	21 / 30
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	72.41%	21 / 29
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	63.64%	7 / 11	*	*	63.33%	38 / 60
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	45.83%	11 / 24	83.72%	36 / 43
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	75.00%	9 / 12	*	*	66.67%	8 / 12	92.00%	46 / 50
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	12 / 12
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	72.22%	13 / 18	*	*	*	*	86.25%	69 / 80
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	36.36%	4 / 11	*	*	60.78%	31 / 51
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	*	*	*	*	64.29%	9 / 14	88.24%	15 / 17
ST. PAUL	FARNWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	54.55%	18 / 33	*	*	*	*	84.21%	16 / 19
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	52.17%	24 / 46	*	*	58.62%	17 / 29	58.33%	7 / 12
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	34.78%	8 / 23	33.33%	7 / 21	*	*

R2C2

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 1 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding by School**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian				
		% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass			
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	81.82%	9	11	85.71%	12	14	92.16%	47	51
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	84.62%	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	87.04%	47	54
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	91.67%	11	12	*	*	*	94.37%	67	71
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	77.61%	52	67	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	83.33%	10	12
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	53.33%	8	15	*	*	*	69.84%	44	63
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	39.29%	11	28	56.25%	9	16	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	68.00%	17	25	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	40.00%	8	20	*	*	44.00%	11	25	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	31.03%	9	29	64.52%	20	31	89.66%	26	29
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	92.86%	13	14	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	66.67%	8	12	*	*	64.29%	9	14	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	55.56%	10	18	45.45%	5	11	73.08%	19	26
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	74.36%	29	39
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	31	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	40.00%	8	20	*	*	*	71.15%	37	52
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	80.00%	16	20	88.89%	24	27
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	68.75%	11	16	80.77%	42	52
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	92.86%	13	14	*	*	*	*	*	86.96%	60	69
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	57.14%	8	14	75.47%	40	53
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	78.57%	11	14	*	*	68.42%	13	19	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	63.64%	28	44	*	*	*	*	*	72.22%	13	18
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	65.63%	21	32	*	*	64.00%	16	25	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	28.57%	6	21	41.18%	7	17	*	*	*

R2C3

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Decoding by School**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing>=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian		
		% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	% Pass	# Pass	
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	73.68%	42	57
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	81.71%	67	82
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	87.04%	47	54
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	79.63%	43	54	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	68.42%	13	19	*	75.00%	48	64
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	17.24%	5	29	58.82%	10	17	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	64.71%	11	17	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	31.82%	7	22	*	*	28.13%	9	32	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	43.48%	10	23	45.71%	16	35	24
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	83.33%	15	18	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	38.89%	7	18	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	18.75%	3	16	*	82.61%	19	23
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	46.67%	7	15	*	*	*	63.33%	19	30
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	79.31%	23	29
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	36.36%	4	11	*	58.33%	35	60
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	45.83%	11	24	43
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	83.33%	10	12	*	*	66.67%	8	12	50
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	12	12
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	77.78%	14	18	*	*	*	80.00%	64	80
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	45.45%	5	11	*	64.71%	33	51
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	53.85%	7	13	17
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	60.61%	20	33	*	*	*	78.95%	15	19
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	47.83%	22	46	*	*	55.17%	16	29	12
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	30.43%	7	23	47.62%	10	21	*

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 1 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing >=40 Words Correct Per Minute**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian		
		% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	81.82%	9	71.43%	10	90.20%	46	51
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	76.92%	10	*	*	*	*	81.48%	44	54
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	58.33%	7	*	*	90.14%	64	71
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	69.44%	50	72	72	*	*	*	*	83.33%	10	12
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	73.33%	11	*	*	77.42%	48	62
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	39.29%	11	68.75%	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	60.00%	15	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	65.00%	13	*	*	44.00%	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	34.48%	10	51.61%	16	79.31%	23	29
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	63.64%	7	81.25%	13	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	91.67%	11	*	*	78.57%	11	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	61.11%	11	*	*	73.08%	19	26
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	68.42%	26	38
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	83.87%	26	31
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	61.90%	13	*	*	70.59%	36	51
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	80.00%	16	96.30%	26	27
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	66.67%	8	75.00%	12	81.13%	43	53
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	92.86%	13	14	14	*	*	88.41%	61	69
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	57.14%	8	79.25%	42	53
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	71.43%	10	14	14	61.11%	11	*	*	*
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	76.74%	33	43	43	*	*	64.71%	11	17
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	63.64%	21	33	33	62.50%	15	24	24	24
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	36.84%	7	35.29%	6	*	*	*

R2C5



**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 2 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing >=75 Words Correct Per Minute**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian					
		% Pass	# Pass / Total	% Pass	# Pass / Total	% Pass	# Pass / Total	% Pass	# Pass / Total	% Pass	# Pass / Total				
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	89.47%	51	57			
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	81.71%	67	82			
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	85.19%	46	54			
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	92.59%	50	54	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	73.68%	14	19	*	*	79.69%	51	64		
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	48.28%	14	29	*	*	*	*			
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	88.24%	15	17	*			
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	50.00%	12	24	*	*	43.75%	14	32	*			
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	47.83%	11	23	59.46%	22	37	88.00%	22	25
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	*	81.82%	9	11	85.00%	17	20	*	*	
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50.00%	9	18	*	*		
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	80.00%	12	15	68.75%	11	16	*	*	87.50%	21	24	
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	70.00%	21	30		
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	72.41%	21	29		
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	45.45%	5	11	*	*	73.33%	44	60		
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	81.40%	35	43		
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	91.67%	11	12	*	*	62.50%	15	24	94.00%	47	50	
SOUTH KOOCHECHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	12	12		
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	83.33%	15	18	*	*	*	*	92.59%	75	81		
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	69.23%	36	52		
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	71.43%	10	14	70.59%	12	17	
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	72.73%	24	33	*	*	*	*	84.21%	16	19		
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	71.74%	33	46	*	*	62.07%	18	29	66.67%	8	12	
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	55.00%	11	20	47.62%	10	21	*	*		

R2C6

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 3 - Deno's Oral Fluency by School**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing>=95 Words Correct Per Minute**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian		
		% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	86.27%	44	51
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	89.47%	51	57
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	83.33%	10	12	*	81.36%	48	59
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	86.36%	57	66	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	52.63%	10	19	83.33%	10	12	12
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	80.95%	17	21	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	70.59%	12	17	*	*	51.61%	16	31	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	68.57%	24	35	77.14%	27	35	25
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	60.00%	9	15	78.57%	11	14	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	70.83%	17	24	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	89.47%	17	19	42.86%	6	14	29
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	50.00%	7	14	47
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	83.33%	30	36
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	87.72%	50	57
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	15	75.00%	15	20	42
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	83.33%	10	12	*	*	75.00%	9	12	63
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	88.24%	15	17	100.00%	16	83.33%	10	12	68
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	80.33%	49	61
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	83.33%	10	12	*	*	58.82%	10	17	17
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	90.00%	36	40	90.91%	10	94.12%	16	17	13
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	78.38%	29	37	*	*	94.74%	18	19	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	52.17%	12	23	50.00%	12	24	*

R2C7

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 2 - Gates-MacGinitie Word Knowledge by School**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing >=41 Normal Curve Equivalents**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian	
		% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total	% Pass	# Pass Total
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	82.46%	47
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	82.93%	68
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	83.33%	45
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	77.78%	42	54	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
CROOKSTON	WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	57.89%	11	19	*	78.13%	50
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	24.14%	7	29	64.71%	11	17
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	70.59%	12	17
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	26.09%	6	23	*	*	34.38%	11	32
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	39.13%	9	23	45.71%	16	35
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	61.11%	11	18
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	33.33%	6	18
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	12.50%	2	16	*	*	86.96%
NORTH ST. PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	33.33%	5	15	*	*	*	73.33%	22
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	75.86%	22
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	45.45%	5	11	*	66.67%	40
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	83.72%	36
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	75.00%	9	12	*	*	50.00%	6	12
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	12
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	44.44%	8	18	*	*	*	88.75%	71
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	36.36%	4	11	*	70.59%	36
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	71.43%	10	14
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	51.52%	17	33	*	*	*	84.21%	16
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	43.48%	20	46	*	*	62.07%	18	29
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	17.39%	4	23	28.57%	6	21

R2C8

**Minnesota Reading First Program 2007 - Round 2 Schools**  
**Grade 3 - Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment II**  
**Disaggregated by Racial/Ethnic Categories**  
**Passing>=3 Achievement Level**

District	School	Native American		Asian		Hispanic		African American		Caucasian		
		% Pass	Total	% Pass	Total	% Pass	Total	% Pass	Total	% Pass	Total	
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	UNIVERSITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	88.24%	45	51
ANOKA-HENNEPIN	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	81.03%	47	58
AUSTIN	NEVELN ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	50.00%	6	12	*	70.00%	42	60
CASS LAKE-BENA	CASS LAKE-BENA ELEMENTARY	72.06%	49	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MINNEAPOLIS	BANCROFT ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	26.32%	5	19	73.33%	11	15	11
MINNEAPOLIS	BETHUNE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	66.67%	14	21	*
MINNEAPOLIS	JENNY LIND ELEMENTARY	*	*	41.18%	7	17	*	*	42.42%	14	33	*
MINNEAPOLIS	RAMSEY FINE ARTS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	52.78%	19	36	60.00%	21	35	25
MINNEAPOLIS	RISEN CHRIST	*	*	*	*	46.67%	7	15	66.67%	10	15	*
MINNEAPOLIS	SHINGLE CREEK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	37.50%	9	24	*
MINNEAPOLIS	WAITE PARK ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	47.37%	9	19	13.33%	2	15	29
NORTH ST PAUL	RICHARDSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	42.86%	6	14	47
OGILVIE	OGILVIE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	36
OWATONNA	WILSON ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	81.03%	47	58
ROBBINSDALE	NEILL ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	77.27%	17	22	42
ROCHESTER	RIVERSIDE CENTRAL ELEMENTARY	*	*	66.67%	8	12	*	*	66.67%	8	12	64
SOUTH KOOCHICHING	INDUS ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SPRING LAKE PARK	WOODCREST ELEMENTARY	*	*	82.35%	14	17	81.25%	13	16	75.00%	9	12
ST. CLOUD	DISCOVERY COMMUNITY ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	68
ST. PAUL	CROSSROADS SCIENCE PROGRAM	*	*	61.54%	8	13	*	*	52.94%	9	17	18
ST. PAUL	FARNSWORTH AEROSPACE ELEMENTARY	*	*	69.05%	29	42	100.00%	12	64.71%	11	17	14
ST. PAUL	HANCOCK/HAMLIN MAGNET ELEMENTARY	*	*	27.03%	10	37	*	*	52.63%	10	19	*
ST. PAUL	PAUL & SHEILA WELLSTONE ELEMENTARY	*	*	*	*	25.00%	6	24	37.50%	9	24	*

R2C9