

2006-2007 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program
U.S. Department of Education

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

Name of Principal: Mrs. Sheryl A. Robinson

Official School Name: Jefferson Elementary School

School Mailing Address: 9 Summit Drive

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| <u>Farmington</u> | <u>MO</u> | <u>63640-1641</u> |
| City | State | Zip Code |

County: St. Francois State School Code Number: 4040

Telephone: (573-701-1360) Fax: (573-701-1369)

Web site/URL: <http://www.farmington.k12.mo.us/jefferson/> srobinsn@farmington.k12.mo.us
School e-mail Principal's e-mail

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

(Principal's Signature) Date: _____

Name of Superintendent: Dr. W. L. Sanders

District Name: Farmington R-7 School District, 1022 Ste. Genevieve Ave., Farmington, MO 63640-1641

Telephone: (573-701-1300)

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date: _____

Name of School Board President: Dr. Dennis D. Robinson

(School Board President's Signature) Date: _____

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

NCLB-BRS (June 1, 2006)

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2006-2007 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2001 and has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II – DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available

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

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

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure \$6,961

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure \$8,221

SCHOOL. (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- Urban or large central city
- Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
- Suburban
- Small city or town in a rural area
- Rural

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

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

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------|--|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | | | | | 7 | | | |
| K | | | | | 8 | | | |
| 1 | 41 | 51 | 92 | | 9 | | | |
| 2 | 46 | 38 | 84 | | 10 | | | |
| 3 | 38 | 52 | 90 | | 11 | | | |
| 4 | 38 | 30 | 68 | | 12 | | | |
| 5 | | | | | Other | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | |
| Total Students In The Applying School | | | | | | | | 334 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 97 % White
1 % Black or African American
0 % Hispanic or Latino
1 % Asian/Pacific Islander
1 % American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 7%
 [This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.]

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year | 9 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year | 13 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 22 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1. | 334 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.1 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 7 |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: <1%
 Total Number Limited English Proficient: 2
 Number of languages represented: 2
 Specify languages: (Hispanic, Asian)
9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 51%
 Total number students who qualify: 176

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

10. Students receiving special education services: 22%
 Total Number of Students Served 73
 Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to the conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>4</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>2</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>13</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>43</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>1</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>7</u> Mental retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | |

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

| | <u>Full-time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Administrator(s) | <u>1</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Classroom Teachers | <u>15</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>7</u> | <u>4</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>3</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Support Staff | <u>10</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Total number | <u>36</u> | <u>4</u> |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 20:1

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

| | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 95% | 99% | 97% | 99% | 97% |
| Daily teacher attendance | 95% | 94% | 96% | 97% | 97% |
| Teacher turnover rate | 8% | 4% | 0% | 16% | 0% |
| Student dropout rate (middle/high) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Student drop-off rate (high school) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

PART III – SUMMARY

Walk in any classroom at Jefferson Elementary and witness a school family celebrating learning. At every grade, one will find students reading alone or with a friend and/or students writing and sharing their masterpieces with friends or family. It is apparent, Jefferson teachers and staff value and are committed to providing excellent instruction each day.

Approximately 70 miles south of St. Louis, you will find Farmington, Missouri, a city of tradition and progress. Jefferson Elementary, one of the three elementary schools in Farmington, houses first through fourth grades. Like the city of Farmington, Jefferson Elementary is known for its strong tradition of educating and supporting all students in their quest for attaining educational excellence to meet the challenges of the 21st century. Over the years, the Jefferson staff has been on course uniting shared visions, expectations, and expertise into a cohesive highly focused, rigorous, standards based curriculum with high expectations for all students. Effective school leadership has fostered mutual respect, trust, and risk-taking among staff, students, and parents. The school administration has valued, supported, and provided opportunities for collaboration and communication among staff helping align district curriculum, assessments, and instruction with state standards. Maximizing our finite resources, grade levels and individual teachers share resources and materials. The entire staff takes responsibility for and is committed to supporting the education of all students.

The Jefferson staff shares common beliefs. Every child can learn and be successful. Through caring and trusting relationships with families and the community, a school environment has been created conducive to optimal learning for all students. Jefferson's progressiveness is apparent through continuous monitoring of teaching and learning methods to meet the individual needs of our learning community. Differentiated instruction within nurturing classrooms has better met the learning needs of all students. Flexible grouping in reading has provided a more prescriptive approach to meet the diverse needs of our students. In addition, curriculum integration has been utilized to increase student understanding by teaching across disciplines according to natural connections rather than teaching subject material in isolation. Supporting best practices of how children learn, is the daily preparation of real life relevant lessons for Jefferson students, utilizing higher-level thinking skills and questioning techniques. Students are assessed frequently using testing results to drive instruction. Data is disaggregated and shared with the staff across all grade levels. With this process and the strong belief in each child's capabilities, Jefferson has continued to experience gains on all MAP assessments.

Because of the safe, positive, caring and welcoming school environment, Jefferson students want to be at school. The student attendance rate has remained high (95% or above). A counselor and social worker are ready at all times to support students and families. Jefferson's counselor provides weekly instruction on character building, self-esteem, and bully prevention. Daily students are recognized for their talents, successes, and accomplishments. Our media center, a literacy rich environment, monitored by a highly qualified staff, is open before and after school for students and parents. After and before school tutoring is provided by staff for students needing additional support in the areas of math and reading. Students enjoy music, art, library, and physical education each week led by highly qualified staff working to integrate the curriculum to reach district and state standards. A highly qualified special services and reading specialists team support the diverse learning needs of Jefferson students.

Our motto: No child will be left behind at Jefferson! Every student – every day!

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

The Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) is the statewide assessment required under the No Child Left Behind Law. From 1998 to 2005, the MAP was administered at grade levels 3,7,11 in communication arts and grade levels 4,8,10 in mathematics. To meet the 2006 federal requirements, the MAP was given to students at grades 3-8 in reading and mathematics, grade 10 in mathematics and grade 11 in reading. Achievement levels for the earlier phase of the test were step one, progressing, nearing proficiency, proficient, and advanced. Current achievement levels are aligned with the NAEP levels of below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced. The MAP achievement level indicates how well a student has mastered the standards in reading and mathematics. For example, a student who scores at the advanced level in communication arts can read above grade level and evaluate complex literature. A student who scores at the advanced level in mathematics can solve multi-step problems and demonstrate a mastery of mathematical reasoning. Information about the MAP can be found at: <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/index.html>.

The MAP test is both a criterion and norm referenced test. The criterion referenced portion of the test is written by Missouri educators and is aligned to the Missouri Grade Level Expectations (GLE's) which is based on the Missouri Show-Me Standards, both of which were developed by Missouri educators and stakeholders. The nationally norm-referenced portion of the test is the Terra Nova, developed by CTB/McGraw-Hill and has also been aligned to the GLE's. The Terra Nova results allow for parents and educators to compare their students to students across the nation.

Over the past three years, Jefferson Elementary has shown an upward trend in the percentages of students in the proficient or advanced categories for both communication arts and mathematics. MAP data from 2004-2006 indicate that the percentage of students in the proficient or advanced categories in communication arts rose from 49% to 72%. The percentage of students in the proficient or advanced categories in mathematics rose from 57% to 79%. The figures for 2004 and 2005 represent only one grade level, while the 2006 figures reflect grades three and four.

Data from three subgroups are included in the assessments results for Jefferson Elementary. The three subgroups include white, free and reduced lunch, and Individual Education Plan (IEP.) The students in all three subgroups performed above state standards and meet AYP targets in all three years of reported data. The IEP subpopulation did not have the number of students necessary to form an actual subpopulation for AYP reporting but did, however meet the target. Generally, the trend was positive over the three year period with one year of decreasing performance in the IEP subpopulation for 2005. This decrease in performance was successfully addressed with a strategic intervention team to establish more inclusion of students into the regular education curriculum and classrooms.

Jefferson Elementary has a mission to increase student achievement for all students. Data indicates that Jefferson Elementary is fulfilling its mission and will continue to do so. The staff at Jefferson Elementary uses MAP, benchmarking, and formative common assessment data to improve student achievement through differentiated instruction, after-school tutoring, and parent contact. The percentage of students in proficient and advanced indicate the commitment the principal and staff at Jefferson Elementary have in providing a quality education for all students.

2. Using Assessment:

Data from all forms of student assessments are used regularly at Jefferson Elementary to inform decision-making regarding curriculum and instruction to enhance student performance and to meet the needs of all students. The data analysis process includes data from the MAP, district-wide formatives and district-wide bi-annual benchmark assessments. The Elementary Level Instructional and Curriculum Coordinator (ICC) facilitates the analysis of MAP data at Jefferson Elementary. The principal and entire staff are very involved in the analysis process and analyze the reports at both the student and building level. The analysis results are used to strengthen the curriculum process and to enhance instructional strategies. One report that teachers use regularly is the item benchmark description report which provides information on the percentage of students who answered each item correctly. This information helps teachers determine which parts of the curriculum needs reinforcement.

District-wide formative assessment results are analyzed by the principal and all staff at Jefferson Elementary School. Teachers use the data to determine how well students have mastered specific curricular objectives and whether or not re-teaching is necessary. Teachers also use the results of the formatives to group students for differentiated instruction and for placement in the after school tutoring program. Revision of the formative assessments occurs annually if the results from the assessments indicate a need for a change.

The benchmark assessments are developed by the ICC using Classroom Manager software. These assessments are given in early fall and early spring. The results are analyzed by the classroom teachers and principal to help form flexible groupings for remediation, enrichment, and differentiated instruction. The data results are analyzed also at the building level to inform the principal regarding overall student performance. Data-based decision making is an important step taken by the staff at Jefferson Elementary to improve student performance.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Jefferson prides itself in active communication among parents, students and staff. Assessment results are communicated with parents in various ways. The MAP results, strengths and weaknesses are explained and reviewed in detail during the parent teacher conference. A video explaining the MAP process is available to the parents on request. A district and school website is an active tool in communicating with busy parents as they search for answers to frequent questions about assessments. The state also has a website with all assessment information of the school and district, available at the click of a mouse. In addition, daily, weekly and monthly newsletters, telephone calls, emails and student work samples are provided to parents.

Jefferson is in constant communication with the local web master for the district, our school television producer/director, the local newspapers and the radio stations. The principal is available with a current email address and serves as a daily car valet and ambassador to the 150+ students who are dropped off by their parents at Jefferson each morning.

4. Sharing Success:

Jefferson Elementary is one of three elementary schools (grades 1 – 4) in the Farmington R7 School District. An ICC oversees the coordinating of the curriculum objectives, formative assessments and benchmarking in each of the three buildings. Grade level meetings are held regularly to provide opportunities for teachers to share successes using the best teaching and learning practices available. The ICC uses teams of teachers from each of the elementary buildings when sharing, writing or revising

formative assessments and or benchmarks. Several staff members at Jefferson teach professional development and education curriculum classes for local colleges and universities.

Jefferson Elementary anticipates and looks forward to sharing all our proven and successful techniques to other interested districts. Jefferson Elementary has hosted representatives from districts across the state to observe teaching, reading practices, and assessment development. This allows sharing of best practices and innovative instructional strategies throughout the learning community.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Jefferson Elementary School implements the district curriculum that has been closely aligned to the Missouri State Standards and the Grade Level Expectations (GLE's). The district has aligned the subject areas of communication arts, math, and science both vertically and horizontally. Grade levels follow curriculum timelines to assure all students receive a spiraled curriculum meeting state standards and GLE's. Collaborative planning of curriculum and instructional strategies for all students is a vital part of each teacher's week.

Instruction for reading is a balanced literacy approach with the use of leveled literature books and selections from the basal reader. Reading instruction includes comprehension, decoding strategies, vocabulary development, fluency and critical thinking. Flexible grouping for two and one-half hours a day, in grades two, three and four are initially based on reading levels, state and national tests, local formatives, and benchmarks.

In the past three years, writing has become a key component supporting all content areas at Jefferson Elementary. The reason for writing is to communicate ideas for authentic meaningful purposes. Jefferson is a writing community where both teachers and students write. The components of writing that are emphasized are the writing process, the art, and the craft. Students are taught the writing process through Writer's Workshop supported by the Six Traits of Writing. Students understand that writing requires planning, first draft, revision, editing, and sharing. Jefferson believes readers are writers and writers are readers.

Problem solving and thinking are the foundation of mathematics for all Jefferson students. The use of multiple methods and resources strengthen the communication of mathematical ideas, concepts and application. Calendar math, math journals, math literature, and math manipulatives are some of the ways academic achievement is increased in mathematics. The role of discussion, writing, and active student engagement have shown to be effective classroom practices. Observing mathematics in the real world, rather than limited to the pages of a textbook, is crucial. Students are encouraged to connect and apply their learning to their home and the community.

The science curriculum has recently been updated to match the GLE's. Science and social studies curriculum is integrated into the reading and math subject areas. Science continues to focus on exploring the student's world through an inquiry based approach using discovery. Hands-on materials are utilized for conceptual and concrete learning.

The arts curriculum consists of visual arts and music, both taught by highly qualified teachers. Students are taught the appreciation of the arts in "their" world as well as an appreciation of the history of famous artists and musicians. Various performances of musicals throughout the year are a part of the music curriculum as well as dramas and reader's theatre in the regular education classroom.

The health/wellness and PE curriculum has implemented the National Wellness Policy in the areas of weight control, exercise, and healthy eating. Jefferson has switched the recess period before lunch for all grades to comply with the federally mandated Wellness Policy.

2a. Reading:

Like students across the United States, Jefferson students will face future challenges requiring proficiency in applying reading and writing for real-life purposes. Creating and developing lifelong readers and writers are the goals of the Jefferson faculty. Quality literature is at the heart of reading and writing at Jefferson. Two to two and a half hours of uninterrupted time are set aside each day for reading and writing. Instruction and exposure to high quality literature is presented in many formats utilizing mini-lessons, read alouds, shared reading, guided reading, partner reading and lastly independent reading. The principal and the teachers model reading and writing daily. Students are encouraged to select and choose what books they read and what writing they do. High quality instruction is provided through whole group, small groups, flexible groups, and as needed, provided individually. Reading and writing activities and lessons are designed to motivate students to read and write for meaningful purposes. Emphasis in reading instruction builds reading vocabulary, word recognition and decoding strategies and most importantly comprehension. As students read, they are encouraged to make connections to the text.

Early intervention for struggling readers is a team effort. Highly qualified Title One teachers, special education teachers, special area teachers, classroom teachers and the principal work to ensure every student's learning needs are met. Assessment of reading progress is continuous and informs instruction. Student reading and writing are monitored through conferences with the teacher as well as peer conferences. Jefferson uses multiple avenues to collect assessment information. Teacher observation, running records, Rigby PM, SRI, and district formatives are but a few assessments. The introduction of the Reading Wall in the principal's office is a ready reference for all staff to keep informed at a glance, students who are at risk. Intervention is immediate and focused. Assessment results indicate the reading and writing program at Jefferson is highly effective and reflects academic gains for each Jefferson student.

3. Additional Curriculum Area: Library

The library curriculum fully supports the school curriculum and the outlined educational standards for the state of Missouri and the federal government. Technology and grade level appropriate literature is a catalyst to open the world for Jefferson students. Reading Counts, a networked-based computer generated program, used in the library has become an invaluable tool for differentiated instruction. Reading Counts provides intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, encouraging students to read for aesthetic and efferent purposes. The entire student body of Jefferson has been challenged to achieve a minimum of 25 points this year for reading literature. Points are based on the complexity of the book being read. The Jaguar Trophy Wall, a new addition to encourage reading based on increments of 25 points, contains trophies with each student's name. As 25 points are attained, the student actively works to gain 25 more points to move their trophy on the wall and hopefully end in the Winner's Circle with 500 points. As of January 2007, a majority of Jefferson students have met the challenge and have achieved 25 points or more.

Another curriculum boost for reading is the Patch Club which encourages students to read different genres of literature. As the goal for each literature genre is reached, students receive a patch representing the genre. The patches are placed on vests which have been made by the teachers. A building wide game, called Super Sleuth encourages students to locate and research information. The principal announces daily clues sending students streaming to various resources to make educated predictions and to quickly find solutions.

Parents and volunteers actively read with students before, during and after school. The Jefferson Parent Teacher Group continuously supports the library by having book fairs and fundraisers. Community partnerships with banks, car dealerships, and businesses adopt a grade level and provide books, pizza, and

field trips. The Jefferson library has enhanced student's love of reading and serves as the foundation for supporting and enhancing curriculum.

4. Instructional Methods:

Instructional decisions are based upon two components: content decisions and process decisions which match instruction to the needs of individual learners. Creativity and flexibility remain important elements of effective instruction. At times a highly teacher centered- whole class method is effective. Other times, collaboration and cooperative methods increase motivation and high levels of cognitive understanding. Some of the ways Jefferson has found to be effective instructional practices is by utilizing small groups: think pair share, jigsaw, brainstorming, guided reading groups, and literature circles. Guided discussion is used to review information and promote understanding, or to apply learning. Graphic organizers and journaling have been successful instructional methods. In addition, mini lessons are designed to help students learn literacy skills and become more strategic readers and writers. Teachable moments provide opportunities to apply what students are learning in authentic reading and writing activities. With all instructional methods operating at Jefferson, positive student achievement and positive effects on student self esteem have increased student learning.

5. Professional Development:

Opportunities for professional development are ongoing, researched based, and have provided the faculty with greater resources to make informed decisions regarding instruction and assessment. The Jefferson faculty shows active interest and commitment to teaching and learning. Creativity and flexibility are hallmarks of Jefferson faculty as new ideas and materials are integrated through differentiated instruction. Changes are implemented based on reflection as situations arise that prove ineffective. Collaboration within grade levels, including special education and special area classes, are across grade levels and have provided valuable time to discuss, model, and plan strategies to meet the diverse needs of our learning community. Communication regarding data collection and feedback are used regularly to improve instruction. Under the leadership of our administrator, specific collaboration and communication through professional development have significantly increased critical thinking skills with an emphasis on problem-solving. Through professional development, the Jefferson faculty has been challenged to find ways to make curriculum more challenging, rigorous, and student centered. Through pro-active professional development, the Jefferson faculty has been able to respond to educational issues that improve student learning and increase academic achievement.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

FORMAT FOR STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

[Data Display Table for Reading (language arts or English) and Mathematics]

Subject Math Grade 4 Test Missouri Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year Current Year Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| <i>SCHOOL SCORES*</i> | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 78 | 49 | 27 | 34 | 48 |
| % Advanced State Standards | 35 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 81 | 72 | 99 | 77 | 141 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 68 | 57 | 57 | 35 | 30 |
| % Advanced State Standards | 32 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students tested | 28 | 23 | 21 | 17 | 33 |
| 2. Free/Reduced (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 66 | 57 | 49 | 23 | 39 |
| % Advanced State Records | 26 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 3 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 30 | 45 | 26 | 70 |
| | | | | | |

FORMAT FOR STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

[Data Display Table for Reading (language arts or English) and Mathematics]

Subject Communication Arts Grade 4 Test Missouri Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year Current Year Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>SCHOOL SCORES*</i> | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 62 | | | | |
| % Advanced State Standards | 30 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 81 | | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | | | | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 2 | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 61 | | | | |
| % Advanced State Standards | 29 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 28 | | | | |
| 2. Free/Reduced (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 49 | | | | |
| % Advanced State Records | 23 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 35 | | | | |
| | | | | | |

FORMAT FOR STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

[Data Display Table for Reading (language arts or English) and Mathematics]

Subject Communication Arts Grade 3 Test Missouri Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year Current Year Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | April | April | April | April |
| <i>SCHOOL SCORES*</i> | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 79 | 52 | 51 | 55 | 38 |
| % Advanced State Standards | 38 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students tested | 84 | 88 | 70 | 96 | 123 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 99 | 96 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 63 | 42 | 60 | 39 | 36 |
| % Advanced State Standards | 38 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 3 |
| Number of students tested | 16 | 23 | 21 | 17 | 33 |
| 2. Free/Reduced (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 80 | 57 | 49 | 23 | 39 |
| % Advanced State Records | 40 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 3 |
| Number of students tested | 40 | 30 | 45 | 26 | 70 |
| | | | | | |

FORMAT FOR STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

[Data Display Table for Reading (language arts or English) and Mathematics]

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Missouri Assessment Program

Edition/Publication Year Current Year Publisher CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | April | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <i>SCHOOL SCORES*</i> | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 77 | | | | |
| % Advanced State Standards | 36 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 84 | | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | | | | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 4 | | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 1 | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 69 | | | | |
| % Advanced State Standards | 38 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 16 | | | | |
| 2. Free/Reduced (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Proficient Plus Advanced | 68 | | | | |
| % Advanced State Records | 38 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 40 | | | | |
| | | | | | |