

# 2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Public  Private

**Cover Sheet**

Type of School  
(Check all that apply)

Elementary  Middle  High  K-12  
 Charter  Title I  Magnet  Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. Agnes Tomlinson

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

Official School Name George Hall Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 1108 Antwerp Street

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

Mobile

Alabama

36605-4899

City

State

Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Mobile

State School Code Number\* 049

Telephone (251) 221-1345

Fax (251) 221-1348

Web site/URL www.hall.mce.schoolinsites.com

E-mail atomlins@mcpss.com

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

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Principal's Signature

Name of Superintendent Dr. Roy Nichols Jr.

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Mobile County Public School System

Tel. (251) 221-4000

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

Date \_\_\_\_\_

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Mr. Fleet Belle

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

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

Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

---

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

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2007-2008 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2002 and has not received the No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district wide compliance review.
6. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available. Throughout the document, round numbers to the nearest whole number to avoid decimals, except for numbers below 1, which should be rounded to the nearest tenth.

### DISTRICT (Question 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:          64   Elementary schools  
       20   Middle schools  
     \_\_\_\_\_ Junior High Schools  
       18   High schools  
     \_\_\_\_\_ Other  
      102  TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:         6940   
     Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:  8403

### SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located  
 [ X ] Urban or large central city  
 [ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban are  
 [ ] Suburban  
 [ ] Small city or town in a rural are  
 [ ] Rural
4.   4   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
Pre K	34	26	60	7			0
K	36	34	70	8			0
1	51	33	84	9			0
2	41	42	83	10			0
3	43	44	87	11			0
4	39	33	72	12			0
5	32	25	57	Other			0
6			0				
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL</b>							<b>513</b>

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: \_\_\_\_\_ % American Indian or Alaska Native  
 \_\_\_\_\_ % Asian or Pacific Islander  
 99 \_\_\_\_\_ % Black or African American  
 \_\_\_\_\_ % Hispanic or Latino  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ % White

**100 % TOTAL**

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

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year \_\_\_\_\_ 15 \_\_\_\_\_ %

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

<b>( 1 )</b>	Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year	62
<b>( 2 )</b>	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	17
<b>( 3 )</b>	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	79
<b>( 4 )</b>	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	542
<b>( 5 )</b>	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.15
<b>( 6 )</b>	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	15

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_ Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented \_\_\_\_\_ 0 \_\_\_\_\_

Specify languages: 0

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals \_\_\_\_\_ 98 \_\_\_\_\_ %

Total number students who qualify: \_\_\_\_\_ 501 \_\_\_\_\_

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: 11 %  
44 Total Number of Students Serve

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

<u>0</u>	Autism	<u>0</u>	Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u>	Deafness	<u>2</u>	Other Health Impairment
<u>0</u>	Deaf-Blindnes	<u>9</u>	Specific Learning Disabilit
<u>0</u>	Emotional Disturbanc	<u>21</u>	Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u>	Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u>	Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>6</u>	Mental Retardation	<u>0</u>	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>6</u>	Multiple Disabilities		

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

**Number of Staff**

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>29</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialist	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>
Support Staff	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>57</u>	<u>0</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of 18 : 1 students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1

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

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Daily student attendance	98 %	96 %	98 %	97 %	98 %
Daily teacher attendance	98 %	98 %	97 %	58 %	49 %
Teacher turnover rate	5 %	7 %	5 %	5 %	1 %
Student drop out rate (middle/high	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
Student drop-off rate (high school	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %

Please provide all explanations below

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

George Hall Elementary, a true community school, provides educational services for 513 students in pre-kindergarten through fifth grade. The student body is 99% African American, and 98% of our students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Hall is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools/Council on Accreditation and School Improvement. Our mission is to enable students to reach their full potential, pursue skills for life-long learning, and to believe in the worth and dignity of self and others. Our motto is 'Drawing strength from the past to work toward a better future'. The School was built in 1964 and was named for the first teacher from this community employed by the Mobile County Board of Education. George Hall was a renowned African American writer who was also known for his proficiency in mathematics and English. In the early days of segregation, Hall was a junior high school but returned to its elementary status in 1991.

George Hall Elementary is located in the Maysville community, an inner-city residential area in downtown Mobile, Alabama. The neighborhood consists of two large federal housing projects and several residential areas, with most residents living below the poverty level. The majority of Hall students live in single parent homes. Our parents are very young and most did not graduate from high school. As a neighborhood or community school, Hall has no buses so most students walk to and from school each day.

At the end of the 2003-04 academic year, and years of declining test scores, the Alabama State Department of Education identified George Hall as a 'failing' school. Working together, the Mobile County School district, the business community, and the local education foundation researched School districts around the country, and designed a model that is similar to a plan in Denver, CO. The Mobile model called for reconstitution of the school. In addition to a signing bonus, incentives awards would be given based on student performance. This model is called Transformation and George Hall Elementary became synonymous with this process. When the doors opened on a new academic year in August 2004, Hall had truly been transformed! The school and grounds were cleaned, murals were painted and bulletin boards were hung. The new administrators recruited staff from Mobile County and the surrounding districts. The new staff had been carefully chosen because they had both a strong work ethic and a shared vision that all students will meet or exceed academic performance levels set by the district and the state. Teachers and administrators participated in intensive, high quality staff development and a new core reading program was implemented. We have worked diligently to build positive, trusting relationships with the community we serve. Having achieved 100% of AYP goals for the past three years, Hall is now a vibrant part of this community.

A collective sense of commitment embraces the students, teachers, parents, staff and community stakeholders of George Hall Elementary, and this sense of unity sets it apart from other elementary schools. The collective spirit is reflected in the belief that all children will learn, and it is our responsibility to teach each student to be an active, engaged participant in the learning process. Each year we look beyond the regular scope of the school day and devise new, innovative strategies to increase student achievement. Our faculty was particularly concerned about the overall benefits of our extended day program. We realized that the students who most needed the intervention were not staying. As a result of this, our faculty voted to extend the normal school day by one hour so all students could participate in some type of intervention or enrichment. We recognize that we serve students who struggle with living in generational poverty, but we accept no excuses. We are committed to our school community and will do 'whatever it takes' to ensure the success of each child.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### 1. **Assessment Results:**

Hall students participate in the state assessment system for the Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test (ARMT), the Stanford Achievement Test -Tenth Edition (SAT10), the Alabama Direct Assessment of Writing (ADAW), and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). Students in grades 3-5 take the ARMT and SAT10 assessments. DIBELS is administered to students in grades kindergarten-3 at the beginning, middle and end of each school year. Students in grade 5 take the ADAW. The Mobile County Public School System requires elementary students in kindergarten- grade 5 to take quarterly Criterion Reference Tests (CRT) in reading and mathematics. As part of Transformation, Hall students in kindergarten through grade 5 also take pre and post Criterion Reference Tests each year. These assessments provide valuable data to determine strengths and weaknesses for each student, teacher, class, grade level, and school.

The assessment system for the state of Alabama uses achievement levels to determine proficiency and Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). Level I indicates that the student did not meet academic content standards. Level II indicates that the student partially met academic content standards. Level III meets and Level IV exceeds academic content standards. Assessment data is provided by the Alabama State Department of Education on the web at [www.alsde.edu](http://www.alsde.edu). Click on 'Accountability Reporting' to download assessment results and the state report card. The SAT10 is administered, and items from this test are pulled to augment the ARMT. The SAT10 is not used to determine AYP.

ARMT assessment results for 2007 indicate that 95% of Hall's fifth grade students met or exceeded proficiency in mathematics and 93% met or exceeded proficiency in reading. Fourth grade scores show 97% of our students meeting or exceeding proficiency in mathematics and 94% in reading. Hall's third grade students performed extremely well with 100% meeting or exceeding mastery in mathematics and 95% in reading. We are so proud of our students and humbled by their commitment to academic success.

ADAW scores from 2007 indicate that 76% of Hall's students met or exceeded proficiency standards set by the state by scoring a Level III or Level IV.

As a result of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) we are able to drill down and disaggregate data by subgroup. Hall is 99% black and 98% free and reduced lunch; with 44 students (11%) identified for special education services and no Limited English Proficiency students we were quickly able to identify our subgroups.

Hall teachers continuously analyze and reflect on assessment data. Grade level teams collaboratively develop and administer common formative assessments to determine mastery of Course of Study standards. These assessments inform our instruction. We are aware of what our individual students know and what they need to learn.

### 2. **Using Assessment Results:**

At the beginning of each school year state assessment results are analyzed and reviewed. This data is disaggregated and interpreted by our teachers. We identify strengths and weaknesses, and we look for trends. We review the data for similarities and differences within the school, grade levels, and individual classrooms. Using this data, the School Action for Excellence (SAE) Plan is updated collaboratively. Once it is revised, the SAE plan is reviewed quarterly by the faculty and Federal Programs.

We believe that assessment data must be continuously and carefully analyzed. We felt the best way to make time to look at data would be to have grade levels meet once each week for 50 minutes during the school day. These weekly data meetings were so successful that we developed a master schedule so that each grade level would meet twice each week for fifty minutes. During these meetings, teachers collaboratively review the results of common formative assessments administered to students. Intervention groups are planned for students who did not master the standards, and best practices are shared. Our long-term planning takes place during monthly job-embedded days for each grade level. These job-embedded meetings have fostered trust among all teachers so that we all work together for the success of our students.

All of our teachers utilize TestTrax/QuizTrax, a copyrighted service of Edutrax, Inc. This website allows teachers to download student data from state and district assessments. Both websites display disaggregated data.

### **3. Communicating Assessment Results:**

During the first semester of each year, Hall teachers have individual meetings with parents to discuss the results of state assessments and pre CRTs. Working together, parents and teachers develop personal educational goals for each student, and develop strategies to achieve these goals. Assessment data is also shared during parent-teacher conferences and monthly Parent Meetings.

Data on display is located throughout Hall Elementary. Located in the lobby is the district implemented dashboard which displays local school data from state and local assessments, current year goals, and quarterly CRT results. The dashboard also shows attendance data and staff development goals. Throughout the building, graphs of CRT information, DIBELS benchmark results, Media Center circulation rates, and Reading Renaissance participation rates are displayed.

Progress reports for all students are mailed home every three weeks. First and third quarter report card conferences are held and parents must meet with the teachers to receive the report card. Second and fourth quarter report cards are mailed home.

We realize the importance of school and home working together and we prefer to meet individually with parents whenever possible. We even do 'Home Visits'! Working as a team, parents and the school can focus on what is important--the success of the child.

### **4. Sharing Success:**

George Hall Elementary has made great progress over the last several years and we are committed to sharing our success story with other schools in the district and throughout the state. Through the Rewards and Sanctions Accountability Plan our school has been recognized by the Alabama State Department of Education for Closing the Gap, Meeting the Gap, and Exceeding the Gap. Recently, George Hall received the prestigious Torchbearer School Award.

Hall has hosted Leadership Alabama for the past three years. This group is comprised of business and education leaders from throughout the state. Dr. Doug Phillips, noted biologist, author, and educator was a member of Leadership Alabama last year. He is the host of the Alabama Public Television series Discovering Alabama. Dr. Phillips selected Hall as the subject of one episode. Dr. Phillips has joined Hall as a Partner in Education and has sponsored numerous trips into the Mobile Delta for teachers and students.

George Hall teachers participate on several levels with the Alabama Best Practices Center. Participation has afforded Hall teachers the opportunity to present best practices and school success with schools from across the state. George Hall has shared its story with Decatur City Schools, and many schools have visited George Hall to see first hand the changes taking place. The success at Hall has been the topic of articles written for The Anniston Star, The Alabama Best Practices Newsletter, Business Week and Forbes. As a member of the 21st Century Learners Program, a technology initiative designed to elevate classroom teaching techniques and to better prepare students for the ever-changing technologically advanced world, George Hall developed a wiki site (<http://georgehall.wetpaint.com>). This site is student generated and the goal is to improve reading vocabulary. This website has had hits from as far away as New Zealand. As a result of our success with the website, Microsoft will visit Hall in February to interview and film our students.

Hall hosts many district schools and has served as an Alabama Reading Initiative demonstration site. Most recently, over 100 educators and business leaders from the Richmond and Columbia South Carolina school districts visited Hall to learn more about our success.

## **PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

---

### **1. Curriculum:**

The curriculum at George Hall is research-based, data driven, and student-centered. Using the Alabama Course of Study as our guide, expectations for student learning are clearly defined. The rigorous academic program offered at Hall supports best practices in education.

As an Alabama Reading First Initiative (ARFI) School, the core reading program is Open Court. This reading program has had a high level of success for our students due to direct and explicit instruction, especially in phonics. Through the use of routines and structure, the teacher has multiple opportunities to model the strategies that good readers use. Students practice and apply the strategies. Students learn to make sense of language. Instruction is differentiated and small group instruction is critical. Hall teachers have received extensive professional development through the Alabama Reading Initiative and the Alabama Reading First Initiative. We understand the framework of explicit instruction, and have the skills needed to implement the core reading program and provide the specific interventions our struggling readers need. Programs do not solely teach children how to read and comprehend. It is the knowledge and expertise of the teacher that moves students.

The philosophy of our math curriculum is to build problem solvers. Our goal is for students to think and reason independently, and apply what they know. Hall teachers have been trained through the Maysville/Mobile Mathematics Initiative. This standards-based reform mathematics program relies heavily on professional development for teachers. Teachers learn new student-centered teaching methods that provide the opportunity for all students to understand and use the mathematics needed in the new millennium. Students are learning to understand math and apply what they have learned. Our students learn math concepts, not just memorize procedures. Students use tools and objects to model problems, and justify their thinking. Students are taught a variety of data collection activities and lessons are designed to expose students to concepts and vocabulary beyond their current grade level.

The writing curriculum focuses on teaching the Narrative, Descriptive and Expository modes. Two writing support teachers model lessons and serve as a support for the teachers. Using the district writing rubric as a guide, our teachers created an assessment rubric for each grade level and determined an appropriate point value for each standard. This rubric was developed to ensure our students understand the components required to produce a quality paper. A large selection of picture books serves as a foundation for writing lessons. We use the I Do, We Do, You Do model of teaching. Teachers incorporate explicit, shared and independent writing activities in their lessons, and they conference with individual students about their writing. The success of the writing curriculum at Hall is due to the amount of collaboration on each grade level. Teachers develop and discuss common writing lesson plans. During data meetings and job-embedded meetings teachers score papers together to standardize their scoring. We hold a school wide writing fair each spring.

### **2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:**

The Open Court reading series is our core reading program. This scientifically research-based instructional program addresses the five components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency. Hall has a two and one half hour uninterrupted reading block. As an ARI and an ARFI school, we receive the support of two reading coaches who work with students and teachers daily. As our teaching and coaching proficiency has increased, our students' test scores have followed. This increase can also be attributed to the high expectations we have had from the start. We realize that one assessment cannot be used to measure a child's school success. We carefully aligned our state and local standards with the objectives from our standardized and benchmark assessments. Teachers build rigor into reading assessments, thereby continually raising expectations for all students.

At the beginning of this journey, the goal of leaving no child behind seemed to be an improbable task. With a structured environment, highly qualified teachers that implement the routines of our core reading program daily, and the continual support of high-quality professional development, the number of students at risk has decreased to a point that we can now successfully individualize each students' intervention plan.

### **3. Additional Curriculum Area:**

Exposure to music and fine arts has a positive impact on student achievement. Understanding this influence and positive relationship, George Hall employs a full time music teacher. Music lessons, with a strong reading emphasis, are provided weekly to students. Upper elementary grades are taught reading skills that improve fluency through rhythm and beat. Lower elementary students are taught in a rebus format using words/symbols. This year, we were able to provide students the Music in Education keyboarding lab. This technology-based keyboarding lab provides group instruction and individualized assessment. Students are instructed on individual keyboards and are actively engaged in music lessons. Our music teacher has received intensive staff development in all aspects of the program.

Another component of our music program curriculum is instruction in the Orff musical instruments. Orff instruments are modeled after wooden African instruments. These tone bar instruments are part of an entire learning approach that helps students become sensitive listeners and considerate participants as they play together in an ensemble. Our students enjoy these instruments and they have been a positive learning experience.

Hall students participate in the district's Honor Choir. Under the direction of our music teacher, Hall students learn and perform seven selections as part of the choir.

#### **4. Instructional Methods:**

The teachers at George Hall utilize a variety of research-based instructional strategies and activities. Instruction is differentiated so that all students can be successful. Students are actively engaged in the learning process. Our instruction is student-centered, and we teach students to think independently and to apply what they know in different situations. Through cooperative learning, and the consistent use of our computer lab, our students have acquired, and use higher-order thinking skills. Instruction in reading is very explicit and follows specific routines. In the areas of reading and writing, teachers use the I Do, We Do, You Do explicit model of instruction. Teachers incorporate modeled, shared, and independent activities in their classroom.

At Hall we are especially proud of our STEP Program which we developed and refined over a two year period. Using Richard DuFour's book *Whatever It Takes* as a guide, we realized that we had to look at how individual students learned and what interfered with their learning. Our pyramid of interventions evolved into our STEP Program. We shifted our building resources and used our time wisely so that we were able to pinpoint student weaknesses and provide intervention to every student each day. Our school is a learning community and our students are achieving at high levels. This was a real turning point in the transformation process!

#### **5. Professional Development:**

High quality, sustained, and continuous professional development has transformed George Hall into a results-oriented professional learning community. One facet of Hall's professional development is the yearly book study that engages the entire faculty. *Whatever It Takes* (Richard DuFour, 2004), *Put Reading First* (National Institute of Literacy, 2001), *Bringing Words To Life* (Isabel Beck, 2002), *The Morning Meeting Book* (Roxann Kriete, 2002), and *Locating and Correcting Reading Difficulties* (James Shanker & Eldon Ekwall, 2003) are some of the titles we have studied in the last three years. We have received, and provided staff development to other faculties on Ruby Payne's *A Framework for Understanding Poverty*, Robert Marzano's *Classroom Instruction That Works*, Harry Wong's *The First Days of School*, and Anne Conzemius' *The Power of SMART Goals*. As a member of the 21st Century Learners Program, a technology initiative, Hall teachers participate in Illuminate sessions via teleconferences.

Each summer Hall teachers participate in three weeks of professional development. This professional development is aligned with our School Action for Excellence Plan and focuses on areas of weakness identified by the faculty. This professional development continues throughout the year. Each summer Hall hosts the Summer Math Conference and many of our teachers are presenters. Hall's professional development plan is implemented throughout the year and the plan provides on-site support for side-by-side training.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 3 Test ARMT  
 Edition/Publication Year 2006 Publisher Harcourt and Brace

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April		
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	95	86	79		
% "Exceeding" State Standards	60	40	30		
Number of students tested	72	65	92		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April		
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	100	86	83		
% "Exceeding" State Standards	88	40	55		
Number of students tested	72	65	92		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April		
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	94	86	83	47	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	70	51	46	12	
Number of students tested	63	83	70	115	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April		
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	97	92	86	46	
% "Exceeding" State Standards	86	75	70	17	
Number of students tested	63	83	70	114	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	93	84	73		
% "Exceeding" State Standards	60	43	25		
Number of students tested	78	75	89		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April		
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	95	82	74		
% "Exceeding" State Standards	68	35	45		
Number of students tested	78	75	89		
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100		
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April			
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	77	50			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	77	94			
Percent of total students tested	100	99			
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April			
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	83	59			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	76	95			
Percent of total students tested	99	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April			
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	73	51			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	79	75			
Percent of total students tested	100	99			
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April			
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	82	58			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	79	75			
Percent of total students tested	100	99			
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	51	42	37	15	15
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	72	65	92	96	117
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	98
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	69	56	51	20	21
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	72	65	92	96	119
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	59	44	45	26	24
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	63	83	70	116	82
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	81	61	61	33	33
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	63	83	70	116	82
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	56	44	31	26	24
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	78	75	89	75	102
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	April	April	April	April	April
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards	66	41	51	29	29
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested	78	75	89	75	102
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
1.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
2.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
3.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					