

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. Mary Harvey Bixler

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

Official School Name East Millsboro Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 29346 Iron Branch Road

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

Millsboro

Delaware

19966-1199

City

State

Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Sussex

State School Code Number* Delaware

Telephone (302) 934-3222

Fax (302) 934-3227

Web site/URL www.eastmillsboro.com

E-mail mbixler@irsd.k12.de.us

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. Susan Smith Bunting

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

District Name Indian River School District

Tel. (302) 436-1000

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. Charles M Bireley

(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: _____ 7 Elementary schools
 _____ 2 Middle schools
 _____ 0 Junior High Schools
 _____ 2 High schools
 _____ 3 Other
 _____ 14 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 10549
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 12770

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 are
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural are
 Rural
4. _____ 0 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 _____ 28 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	21	12	33	7	0	0	0
K	66	70	136	8	0	0	0
1	64	58	122	9	0	0	0
2	66	60	126	10	0	0	0
3	52	55	107	11	0	0	0
4	60	51	111	12	0	0	0
5	57	48	105	Other	0	0	0
6	0	0	0				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							740

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 1 | % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| 1 | % Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 24 | % Black or African American |
| 15 | % Hispanic or Latino |
| 59 | % 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 16 %

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	57
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year	62
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	119
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	740
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.16
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	16

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 10 %
- | | |
|----|---|
| 75 | Total Number Limited English Proficient |
|----|---|

Number of languages represented 4

Specify languages: Spanish
Korean
Chinese
Turkish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals 55 %

Total number students who qualify: 405

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: 16 %
120 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>17</u>	Other Health Impairment
<u>0</u>	Deaf-Blindnes	<u>96</u>	Specific Learning Disabilit
<u>1</u>	Emotional Disturbanc	<u>15</u>	Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u>	Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u>	Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>2</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:

Number of Staff

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>42</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialist	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>
Support Staff	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>
Total number	<u>69</u>	<u>15</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	96 %	95 %	95 %	95 %	96 %
Daily teacher attendance	96 %	97 %	96 %	97 %	95 %
Teacher turnover rate	2 %	2 %	1 %	2 %	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

Turn-over rate is relatively stable and generally linked to retirements.

PART III - SUMMARY

East Millsboro Elementary (EME) is located in the small town of Millsboro, Delaware and is one of seven elementary schools in the Indian River School District. Our school community embraces the challenge and mission of reaching all 740 students and assisting them in realizing the behavioral and academic skills required to reason, communicate, and master rigorous Delaware standards. EME defies the odds associated with a semi-rural blue-collar community where 55 % of our population is low income and diversity is represented in our 40% minority population. Our local employment opportunities consist of goods and service industries with major poultry companies representing the larger businesses.

EME is proud of the professional and community commitment that have bolstered its student achievement. Concerted interactions have contributed to the increase in achievement and a significant decrease in student achievement gaps. Our efforts to improve learning for students were recognized nationally in 2006 when our school received the Education Trust's 'Dispelling the Myth Award' and was described by Achievement Alliance education writer, Karen Chenoweth, as 'an academic powerhouse'. Additionally, EME was selected as a State of Delaware Model of Excellence School in 2006. These followed a superior rating since the inception of Delaware school ratings along with multiple years where 90% or more of the student population have met or exceeded the state standards in math, reading, science, and social studies.

EME is recognized as a school community where parent, teachers, and community collaborate for the benefit of its students. As a community school in a state with choice options, our at-capacity enrollment includes 105 choice students, which represents 14 % of our student population and reflects the public esteem for our program. Parents, community members and organizations partner in multiple ways. Our Parent Teacher Organization actively supports school initiatives. We have a strong mentoring program with 75 adult mentors and additional community support in terms of many classroom volunteers. EME has multiple partnerships which work together to help students and families overcome barriers to success. Powerful resources include the Boys & Girls Club, Kiwanis, Sussex County Child Health Coalition, The American Legion, Creative Mentoring, and the UofD. These partnerships assist East Millsboro in preparing students for the social and intellectual challenges of the work place and world and include targeted goals tied to social, safety, behavioral, emotional, vocational, health and academic supports. These partnerships are associated with our federal grant- 'Partnerships Extending Reaches.'

We attribute our successes to the cohesiveness of our professional community structure. We have designed a 'blue print' guiding us in reaching all students. Foundations include a culture of high expectations tied to consistent research-based instructional practices associated with Learning Focus Theory.

Teachers' knowledge of data and their use of technology are key factors contributing to our success. EME's staff has developed competence in recording and analyzing student growth and making data-driven instructional and program decisions. Based on past student data, EM can prevent failure by projecting who needs alternate or additional pathways toward the curricular targets. Targeted time opportunities support a Summer Explorers' Program, Fall Foundations and Winter Wizards after-school opportunities, along with a morning jumpstart tutoring.

The development and use of a calendar-based and prioritized curriculum map aligned to standards and grade level expectations keeps our instructional priorities on target. The further development of grade-level common assessments with joint scoring provides dialog and collegial sharing as teachers talk about instructional strategies for successful student learning. Providing weekly Professional Learning Community time ensures that our curriculum, assessments, and instructional lesson formats are logically designed to reflect best-practice and standards expectations.

Each staff member has a critical role to play in ensuring that each student's instructional and personal/social growth needs are addressed. Community partnerships, positive recognition programs, and community and peer mentors build confidence and self-esteem. Teachers, paras, and specialists work together to expand students' foundational experiences and learning. Technology is infused in multiple ways including individually-paced learning in reading and math. These opportunities have accelerated the 'closing of the gap' for our students.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Multiple indicators including the Delaware Student Program (DSTP) serve to guide EME in designing an academic program that meets all students' needs. This assessment is currently administered in grades 2 through 10. Since 1998 the DSTP has served as the measure of progress for end-of-cluster grades (3,5,8, and 10). Since 2006, the DSTP has assessed all grade levels 2 through 10. . There are 5 performance levels with a 3 being (Meets), 4 (Exceeds), and 5 (Distinguished). The data presented will focus on grades 3 and 5, as the more recently adopted assessments are not yet supported by 3 years of data. The State website is: <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/programs/aab/>. Several extremely challenged students in an Intensive Learning Center at EME have an alternate assessment evaluated by the state. Called DAPA, it is a measure of growth toward goals in portfolio format.

Our growth results reveal our initial emphasis on meeting the standard and EMEs focus on targeting services. The growth and refinement of our Student Support Process and better use of data have aided EME in moving from mediocre beginnings towards addressing the needs of the 'at-risk' students and simultaneously assisting in moving the 'meets' students to 'exceeds categories through a greater emphasis on extending and refining lesson planning.

In 1998 only 57% of our grade 3 readers met or exceeded the standard by demonstrating understanding. Their SAT-9 mean was only 45 NCE. Our fifth grade demonstrated slightly stronger foundations with 63% meeting and exceeding the standard and their initial Sat-9 NCE at 48. As a composite group, the fifth grade has forged steadily ahead in Reading. Their mean scaled score has steadily improved in reading along with their percentage meeting & exceeding the standard rising to 99% with 59 of these readers exceeding the standard % ('03-39%, '04-42%, 05-44%, 06-54%, 07-59%). Grade 3 has improved in reading to the point that for the last 5 years 93% (or greater) of the students have meet the standard with a progressive increase in the % exceeding the standard to a high of 67% in 2006. In 2007 when there was a drop in exceeding from that high in 2006 to 46% exceeding. Likewise, the grade 3 SAT-10 reading scores had risen to a high of 71 NCE in 2006 before a decline in 2007 to a 65 NCE.

Grade 5 student writing has improved from 82% meeting/exceeding in 2003 to 91% in 2007. A similar pattern is evident in mathematics in grade 5 ('03-83%, '04-88%, 05-95%, 06-94%, 07-95%). There are some ups and downs in the patterns over the years. In a school with 4 to 5 classrooms at each grade level, a maternity leave, new staff, or an emotional trauma such a critical illness in a teacher's family can affect classroom progress. Unfortunately, all three of these occurred in our 3rd grade staffing last year ('06-'07).

Confronting achievement gaps has challenged us to use additional learning opportunities including: pre-learning, extended-year, homework help for ESL, and early-start programs. Our shared responsibility for student growth tailored to individual needs is reflected in the disaggregated data. In assessment years containing statistically significant grade level subpopulations, our low income, African Americans, and Hispanic reading students' patterns show they are catching up or matching the school's composite scores in both reading and writing. The ESL students have responded well to both push-in and pull-out opportunities as the Hispanic population has blossomed to surpass the composite score of all third graders meeting and exceeding (92%) with the Hispanic subpopulation demonstrating 100% mastery of the gr. 3 reading in 2007. In the 2007 writing results, the grade 3 meet and exceed data shows that both the Hispanic and African American populations actually scored higher (92%,88% respectively) than the total population where 87% met and exceeded in writing. There were also little differences in their SAT-10 2007 scores.(total mean NCE of 65NCE, AA 64 NCE, and Hispanic 65 NCE). The same holds true for grade 5 in reading. The parallel examination of students who exceed the standard by achieving the exceeds status reveals there is still room for growth for all 3 subpopulations in all content areas. As subpopulations %ages have risen in the exceeds category, so too has the composite populations %age of exceeds risen. Progress is being made in mathematics as we continue to work with scaffolding techniques to reduce the gap. The pattern of percentages speak for themselves. What is not evident in this reporting is the relationship between the state mean scores and EME's scores. We have ranked well above the state mean in the last several years. And when our school is compared to other state schools with similar compositions of free and reduced percentages, we realize our modifications have accelerated a closing of the gap.

2. Using Assessment Results:

East Millsboro looks through multiple lenses to determine, 'Are we achieving our purpose and meeting the needs of all students?' Data Driven Decisions are focused around four key questions: 1.) What is it we want our students to learn? (The curricular connection)

2.) How do we know students are learning it?

East Millsboro uses student data to match instruction to student needs. Beginning in Kindergarten a student Excel database provides a lens to students' skill progress. This database grows with a grade level over time and reflects all common assessments including reading theme tests, math unit tests, writing rubric scores, quarterly school-wide assessments including the Star Test of Reading and Mathematics, and the DSTP. Primary students have word recognition scores, oral reading fluency scores, comprehension indicators, and phonics. The database assists in focusing on the learning of each student, class, subpopulation and grade level. Using pivots and sorts the analysis begins. The forum for the discussion is each grade level's Professional Learning Community.

3.) What do we do if students are not getting it? Who needs extra support? Can a teacher share a successful strategy? Are there differences in subpopulations? Each grade level has designated times which allow for flexible focuses based on the needs of their learners for writing, math or reading.

4.) What do we do if students already know it? (We need to concentrate more efforts in analyzing this!) A student 'safety-net' arises from the interplay of data, the curriculum, and extra-time. Technology is infused in and includes individually-paced learning in reading and math.

The database of student progress can also be used to predict performance. Based on past student data, EME can prevent failure by projecting who needs alternate or additional pathways toward the curricular targets. These opportunities have accelerated a 'closing of the gap' and an adjustment of the focus for those with stronger foundational skills -from 'meeting' the standard to 'exceeding' the standard.

Additionally, at the end of a school year, we use the freshly released DSTP data (usually available 5/28-5/31) and other data (including attendance and discipline) as the catalyst for discussion, problem-solving, and decision-making during our inservice day aptly named 'DATA DAY'. The crux of the day involves examining student data in disaggregated manners to see- Did we meeting all students' needs? The examination of the '07 data recognized the need to approach math in more hands-on and visual formats with African American males. We also recognized, due to a change in staff for 06-07, some third grade teachers needed more support in terms of modeling and curriculum. By the end of this day we have developed a 'blueprint' of pathways that include adjusted time, curriculum, parent support, professional development, motivation considerations, and intervention strategies to guide us for the next school year.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Clear communication is vital to ensure our goals of 'All students will meet or exceed the state standards.' We must elicit parent understanding and support and community involvement in recognition, rewards, and mentoring opportunities. Multiple methods are used to share progress toward targeted goals through the school's monthly newsletter, school website, and the state newspapers. The latter not only publishes results and features news articles about growth between the current year and the previous year, but also compares EME to schools throughout the state. School performance data is presented during public session to the local Board of Education. Delaware Student Testing Program results are shared with parents via graphs and strength and need indicators. Administration at EME meets with students prior to testing in a motivational 'Test Talk' to review previous levels and set challenging goals. We also share results individually with students in June in a post conference Accolade or Awareness meeting. Additionally, parents have the opportunity to meet regarding their child's progress using the information from the database as fodder for discussion. If a child experiences difficulty, a Student Support Meeting is initiated to meet with parents and staff to develop a plan of action. The EME school profile is available in distributable form to parents and interested community along with being available on-line at <http://www.doe.k12.de.us/programs/aab/>. EM's School Improvement Committee, which is comprised of parents, community members, and staff, scrutinizes data as it designs its plan and allocates funds for the succeeding year. Classroom teachers have a variety of methods of keeping parents informed of progress. They include the following: signed tests, nightly practice including parent support tips, weekly curriculum updates, communication agenda books; and Friday packets reflecting weekly progress, and conferences. More formal communications involve progress reports and report cards.

4. Sharing Success:

Communicating successes and obstacles with others brings clarity to our mission while providing opportunities for others to benefit and grow from our own experiences. In-district and state professional opportunities are sharing forums for our administration, reading specialist and involved teachers. Topics have included Closing the Gap, Reaching the ESL Learners, Instructional Strategies, Dealing with Special Needs, and Developing Extended- Thinking Skills. Several staff members are involved in regional training for Trailblazer's mathematics or are involved at the state level with curriculum projects. Our school philosophy embraces technology as a tool for learning. Smartboards are in every classroom in our school, providing access to stimulating information, visual learning tools, and interactive lessons. Other schools visit to learn how to integrate technology successfully into the curricula and accommodate learning styles. Our teachers present to or mentor other teachers in classroom applications.

Many of our school's strengths can be attributed to the unity of our district and joint opportunities to arrange staff inservice opportunities for our staff. The Learning Focus lesson model and strategies are used across district. Consequently, district professional staff has a common language with which to dialogue which assists in district curriculum mapping and alignment opportunities.

Our EME staff has been actively involved with sharing successes. As the recipient of the State of Delaware Model of Excellence Award in 2006, we have presented to state administrators our school's successes in the 2006 Sharing Forum. Likewise, we have had school teams come to our site to see and hear about our blueprint for success and data collection and analyses techniques. We have helped other schools set up their data and shared our Data Day focus questions and format. In the fall of 2006, a team from EM presented in a panel format our school at The Education Trust National Conference. Our principal presented at the National State Governors' Council in Spring 2007. Relying on our school's team spirit and respect for collaborative learning, we will continue to share our successes with others, recognizing continual change is a never-ending process.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Our staff meets weekly as professional learning communities to ensure that our curriculum, assessments, and instructional lesson formats are logically designed to reflect both best practice and our standards expectations. At East Millsboro curriculum mapping has become the logical method of working towards greater school improvement. Each subject area is formatted by grade level in a prioritized calendar-based mapping template which includes the curricular priorities in the format of Essential Questions, key concepts, vocabulary, activities, assessment and mastery expectations, and resource materials clearly defined by grade level to ensure all students have access to a consistent robust curriculum. The curriculum maps allow staff to examine student learning horizontally across a grade level and vertically across grades and content areas and ensure appropriate pacing. The value of a strong curriculum became the foundation for focused teaching and learning. Additionally, EME's staff has been actively involved in a district initiative to align curriculum with the state Grade Level Expectations (GLEs). A major by-product has been healthy discussion about learning and instruction.

A balanced literacy program. Invitations to Literacy, provides literature experiences that expands visions while boosting student enjoyment of reading. Guided and explicit instruction expands the five reading components of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Key reading strategies are emphasized. The SRA program, Horizons, has been adapted as a supplement to provide improved phonological development in the formative years of reading. Additionally, multiple non-fiction and technical text opportunities has been incorporated and expanded to link and expand concepts in a variety of subject areas including science and social studies. Reading and writing are naturally integrated. Student assessments have been tailored to match classroom activities and standard expectations that require students to write effectively in narrative, persuasive, and informative formats. Students are challenged to use writing as an important means of communicating beginning in Kindergarten using 'Kid Writing'. Writing processes are in place involving prewriting using a graphic organizer, drafts, revisions, and the use of rubrics for evaluation.

In mathematics, the NSF research-based Math Trailblazers program has been implemented in all classrooms K-5. This program emphasizes the power of process through emphasizing reasoning and problem-solving. The instruction encourages cooperative learning and peer communication in discovering and exploring math concepts through investigation. The instruction emphasizes hands-on, activity-based learning with multiple methods of accomplishing a task. To assist teachers in guiding students in the development of understandings in more exploratory methods, teachers of EME have participated in 'Math Club'. These are collegial meetings in which grade levels prepare for up-coming units and share successful instructional strategies that provoke thinking and ensure experiences meet all students' needs and learning styles.

The Indian River District is involved in the state's Science Coalition. The associated Smithsonian Project Science Kits allow students to experience the world of science via a hands-on approach. The kits are aligned to the Delaware State Science Standards. Students relish the opportunity to learn about nature through a sensory approach, and heavily dependent upon students' observational skills as they experiment and draw conclusions about the world about them. Discussion and written expression are additionally used to summarize and cement the key learning concepts. Additionally, our students profit from proximity and learning opportunities with an Outdoor Education Center at nearby Ingram's Pond. Lead science teachers are actively involved in the state and district training of their peers.

Our social studies curriculum has been evolving over the past several years. We have been moving away from a textbook approach to one that is tightly aligned to the standards and uses authentic artifacts and social-studies linked trade books. Teachers are involved in a district project with the University of Delaware to refine our social studies curriculum to emphasize evaluative thinking, multiple perspectives, and consider commonalities and differences among cultures, communities, and events.

EME students expand their learning in multiple formats including art, music, physical education, vocal and instrumental music, and technology. Technology includes both individually-paced curriculum in reading and math and the equipping of students with foundations in tech applications. Identified students are challenged in a gifted program called ExCEL. All students in grades 1-3 are exposed to critical and creative thinking lessons through PEP (Primary Enrichment Program).

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

The Delaware ELA content standards are our curriculum. A challenge was locating rich curricular-linked resources that not only aligned with the content skills but also reflected features of a well-designed reading program. A district committee with representative lead teachers from each elementary school delved into the current reading research and narrowed the potential materials through a year-long pilot. Subsequently, Houghton Mifflin's 'Invitations to Literacy' was endorsed and chosen. Our language arts committee recognized its strength in cultivating home-school literacy connections. We value Invitations to Literacy's systematic and spiraling skills/ strategies and the full integration of LA standards components of reading, writing, viewing, speaking, and listening. However, the program is not a panacea for our diverse populations' needs. We have been challenged to adapt and flex the foundational core literature to accommodate both student needs and our prioritized and standards-based curriculum mapping. This mapping does not entirely align with the Houghton Mifflin's scope and sequence and philosophy. The literature expectations assume students have both strong prior knowledge and developed concepts and vocabulary. Our teachers have had inservicing in the critical importance of equalizing opportunities for meaningful encounters with the text by arranging flexible grouping for acceleration of the readiness for reading by building background or scaffolding the learning for students. Besides these instructional strategies, an emphasis and awareness of vocabulary in context and the use of advance story organizers assist our ESL and other at-risk populations. Teachers model and teach specific comprehension strategies rather than simply cover selections. We have revised unit assessments to match our goal of moving students from literal levels to interpretive and evaluative levels in formats requiring student writers to summarize, compare & contrast, reflect on perspective, consider causal relationships, and construct support. To ensure students meet our goal that all students will read varied genres with understanding by mid-third grade, we have been forced to become more resourceful with time and instructional strategies. We have hired several part-time retired teachers to provide additional small group acceleration and reinforce strategies in the form of additional guided instruction in before, during and after school formats.

Additionally, reading assessments that evaluate fluency and sight word recognition have expanded and enhanced our reading program with stronger phonemic and phonetic components.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

3 Summer Explorers. The traditional school day does not afford enough contact hours to meet EME's improvement committee's aggressive subgoals: All students will meet or exceed state standards in the four core content areas and community support will be fostered to address physical, academic, social and emotional needs through increased partnerships with individuals, groups, and businesses. The design includes three targets 1)Acquiring, Integrating, and Extending Skills and Knowledge 2)Developing Productive Habits of Mind (self-regulated thinking, critical & creative thinking) and 3)Positive Attitudes about Life and Learning. Social components include the recognition and celebration of individual efforts. The Summer Explorers Program targets the 30 students deemed most at-risk in (exiting K,1,2) and 30 (exiting 3,4,5). Summer Explorers strives to excite student's curiosity with visual, hands-on, project-based learning themes linked to social studies, arts, sciences or math that integrate reading, writing, speaking and thinking. The Summer Explorers program for K, 1, & 2 includes the eight major components of literacy instruction: reading aloud to children, shared reading, guided reading, independent reading, modeled writing, shared writing, guided writing, and independent writing. Emphases are on expanding students' experiences and horizons in an enriching thematic environment that reflects a constructivist approach to learning. Taught by teachers, additional tutoring is provided by volunteers for at least one hour per week along with small flexible grouping support. Two hours of reading-linked instruction per day will be differentiated by the levels of the students. The primary students in (k-2) will be working towards mastering and applying the reading fundamentals. BOOST-UP is integrated into the literacy strand for exiting kindergarten students. Research from Boost-up shows that by following a routine of vestibular balance activities, gross and fine motor and visual acuity exercises, children on average make a six-month reading gain. Students select from themes. In the intermediate Explorer's Program (3-5), students develop and use comprehension strategies including recognizing confusion, adjusting one's strategies, and identifying and summarizing main ideas and important details. Our reading specialist works with students and staff to identify critical strategies for each child to strengthen. Topics include: 'The Civil War.- It's Place in American History', Environmental Studies at Outdoor Education Center -'What Lives Here?'. The secondary goals relate to motivating students to love learning.

Parent partnerships include 3 elements. Working with our partnerships, we will provide parenting sessions with the goal of addressing common family problems and sharing successful parenting methods. including: building responsibility, developing good decision-making skills, encouraging resistance to peer pressure,

promoting cooperation, and dealing with anger. The second component, Building Home Foundations, involves sessions that provide an understanding of the standards and expectations for each grade level with concrete ways parents can help their child study and learn.

4. Instructional Methods:

East Millsboro's staff has profited from quality exposure to eminent learning theorists and models of learning within the past eight years. Robert Marzano introduced us to effective classroom strategies in his sharing of his research through McREL.

Additionally, Dimensions of Learning provided us with a framework of thinking to use in planning for quality instruction. More recently, our staff has strengthened and expanded these concepts in a train the trainer relationship with Learning Concepts Corporation. An outgrowth of a district endeavor, our school has worked to infuse research-based instructional strategies in the classroom. Key strategies that impact achievement are now integrated into unit and lesson instructional / planning frameworks. One strategy involves the consistent use of the lesson/ unit goals in the form of essential questions. Students know what the learning is about! Common lesson frameworks throughout the school provide various levels of learning from the acquisition of a new skill to opportunities to extend and refine that learning, and finally to authentic or meaningful use lesson opportunities. The distinct lesson framework incorporates strategies linked to thinking skills, summarizing opportunities, vocabulary strategies, graphic organizers, the value of non verbal representations, and the value of active learning and collaborative structures. These strategies and lesson frameworks are used consistently throughout East Millsboro. Thinking skills are explicitly taught through modeling. Students expect the acquisition lesson will include an activating aspect to connect to prior learning and experiences, they expect a teaching or modeling aspect with distributed practice opportunities and summarizing opportunities. They recognize the importance of verbal and written opportunities designed to reflect, clarify, build connections, question or summarize their learning. Students learn best in environments that address individual learning styles and learning needs. The use of acceleration and previewing enriches and sets an atmosphere in which students can feel confident. With a blend of differentiated instruction and heterogeneous learning opportunities, students are active participants in reciprocal teaching and other peer learning arrangements. Recognition and positive feedback are instructional strategies that motivate learning. We use a weekly student broadcast to share student accolades in academics or character in a congratulatory positive format.

5. Professional Development:

In our quest to have all students meet and exceed the standards, a three-pronged pathway has helped EME make progress towards our goal. The administration and Leadership Team attended Rick DuFour's workshop (7/03) on the power of professional learning communities. In September 2003, we made the first step by providing a weekly block of time for our PLC Teams to devote time to prioritizing and mapping the curriculum in a calendar approach (Heidi Jacob's approach). With curriculum maps in place, the realization that monitoring student progress toward the curricular targets needed the PLC Teams' knowledge of ExCEL spreadsheets and student progress data. For the school year 2005 we contracted with the UD and Delaware DOE to help facilitate a 90 hours data cluster that would examine student progress on common assessments in math, reading, and writing. PLC Teams expanded student data spreadsheets with skill and grade progress on student assessments and Delaware State Testing Program Scores. Understanding the power of technology for data entry, sorting, and pivot tables comparisons helped determine the student needs. The data cluster boosted staff competence and confidence in analyzing student growth and making rational instructional and program decisions. Analysis has expanded over time. The PLC team can monitor an individual's learning or examine patterns of students' learning in disaggregated manners by race, gender, and instructor. An aligned prioritized curriculum data analysis of student progress is accompanied by the third prong of our inservice planning, instructional frameworks and strategies. The timing was right for the Learning Focus lesson frameworks. Dr Max Thompson's professional development sessions addressed Leadership and Instructional Strategies. Introduced at the district level in a train-the-trainer format, EME wrote a grant proposal to bring Learning Focus consultants for two consecutive years to ensure our staff were secure in the strategies. Using the PLC as a forum, the continued development and refinement of grade-level common assessments and joint scoring have provided healthy dialog and collegial sharing as teachers talk about instructional strategies for successful student learning.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 3 Test Delaware State Testing Program
 Edition/Publication Year Criterion Refer Publisher Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	93	96	100	97	97
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds (Per. Level 4 & 5)	46	67	56	53	53
Number of students tested	98	88	84	88	80
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	4	1	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	5	1	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	91	95	100	95	98
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	31	55	33	39	50
Number of students tested	55	40	35	41	30
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	90	90	100	91	
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	35	55	15	36	
Number of students tested	20	20	14	22	9
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	100		100		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	33		36		
Number of students tested	15	8	11	5	3
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	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	99	97	100	96	86
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds (Per. Level 4 & 5)	59	54	44	42	39
Number of students tested	86	98	82	101	87
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	3	4	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	3	5	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	97	96	99	89	81
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	39	40	43	36	30
Number of students tested	36	45	32	36	27
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	100	90		84	80
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	39	28		32	20
Number of students tested	18	29	8	19	15
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceedind					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding					
Number of students tested	6	4	3	5	2
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	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	89	99	98	90	92
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds (Per. Level 4 & 5-Exceeds, Distinguished)	57	62	54	43	50
Number of students tested	107	95	96	100	89
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	3	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	3	0	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	83	98	98	91	86
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	43	44	37	28	43
Number of students tested	63	45	44	46	37
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	80	100	100	75	77
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	36	45	10	18	31
Number of students tested	25	22	20	28	13
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	88	82	92		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	59	36	50		
Number of students tested	17	10	12	4	5
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	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	95	94	95	88	83
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds (Per. Level 4 & 5-Exceeds, Distinguished)	43	39	48	39	26
Number of students tested	98	103	90	114	98
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	3	3	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	3	3	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	89	90	89	76	76
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	28	28	46	28	0
Number of students tested	46	50	37	46	33
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	86	83	82	74	80
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	9	20	9	17	20
Number of students tested	22	30	11	23	15
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	92				
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	50				
Number of students tested	11	4		7	2
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	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	87	87	91	89	76
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds (Per. Level 4 & 5-Exceeds, Distinguished)	7	4	7	4	0
Number of students tested	107	94	96	100	89
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	4	1	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	4	1	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	83	84	89	89	68
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding- (Per. Level 4 (Exceeds) Level 5 (Distinguished))	3	3	0	0	5
Number of students tested	63	44	44	46	37
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	92	86	80	82	62
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding -(Exceeds)	4	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	25	22	20	28	13
3. hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	88		90		
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per Level 4 & 5)	6		9		
Number of students tested	17	9	11	4	5
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	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	91	83	89	87	82
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds (Per. Level 4 & 5-Exceeds, Distinguished)	7	7	7	11	5
Number of students tested	98	102	90	114	98
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	3	5	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	3	6	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	85	82	81	83	73
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding- (Per. Level 4 (Exceeds) Level 5 (Distinguished))	4	1	2	7	0
Number of students tested	46	49	37	46	33
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	86	87	72	74	71
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	0	7	9	0	6
Number of students tested	22	30	11	23	17
3. hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	91				
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	18				
Number of students tested	11	4		7	2
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	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	97	96			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds (Per. Level 4 & 5- Exceeds, Distinguished)	64	51			
Number of students tested	88	90			
Percent of total students tested	99	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	2			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	5	2			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	93	93			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Level 4 & 5, exceeds, distinguished)	43	32			
Number of students tested	40	44			
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	91	94			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Level 4 & 5, Exceeds, Distinguished)	56	34			
Number of students tested	23	18			
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding					
Number of students tested	6	9			
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	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	97	94			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds-	68	62			
Number of students tested	91	96			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	2			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low-income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	96	92			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	63	57			
Number of students tested	46	49			
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	88	100			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Level 4)	53	56			
Number of students tested	17	18			
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	100	93			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Level 4)	80	57			
Number of students tested	15	14			
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	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meets or Exceeds	99	100			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeds (Perfor. Level 4)	76	69			
Number of students tested	108	104			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	98	100			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Level 4))	70	63			
Number of students tested	59	56			
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	96	96			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Lev. 4)	61	44			
Number of students tested	23	23			
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	100	100			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Performance Level 4)	71	69			
Number of students tested	17	16			
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	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meeting & Exceeding	96	93			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Levels \$ & %, Exceeds, distinguish	64	50			
Number of students tested	97	102			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	1			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	1			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	93	89			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Level \$ & %, exceeds and distinguis	46	35			
Number of students tested	44	52			
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	96	82			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	46	9			
Number of students tested	26	22			
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
meeting & Exceeding		91			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Levels 4 & 5)		45			
Number of students tested	7	11			
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	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards					
Meeting & Exceeding	78	94			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding (Per. Level 4 5, Distinguished , Exceeding)	4	11			
Number of students tested	97	102			
Percent of total students tested	99	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	2			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	2			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	61	92			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	4	8			
Number of students tested	44	52			
2. African American					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding	73	91			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding	0	0			
Number of students tested	26	22			
3. Hispanic					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
Meeting & Exceeding		100			
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Exceeding		27			
Number of students tested	7	11			
4.					
% "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard					
% "Exceeding" State Standards					
Number of students tested					

**FORMAT FOR DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS**

Applying schools must use the format of this data display table for Reading (language arts or English) and Mathematics.

Provide the following information for all tests in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics. Show at least three years of data. Complete a separate table for each test and grade level, and place it on a separate page. Explain any alternative assessments.

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year SAT10 200 Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

Scores are reported here as _____

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	65	71	70	63	66
Number of students tested	98	88	84	88	80
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	4	1	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	5	1	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	62	67	64	59	62
Number of students tested	55	40	64	41	30
2. African American	64	65	64	54	
Number of students tested	20	24	64	22	9
3. Hispanic	65	62	59		
Number of students tested	15	10	12		3
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Scores are reported here as NCEs

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	73	73	73	61	59
Number of students tested	86	98	82	101	87
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	3	5	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	3	6	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	67	69	73	57	54
Number of students tested	36	45	73	32	27
2. African American	72	67	73	59	53
Number of students tested	18	29	73	19	15
3. Hispanic					
Number of students tested	7	4	3		2
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Scores are reported here as NCEs

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	70	77	74	75	77
Number of students tested	107	95	96	100	74
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	3	0	0	1
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	3	0	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	64	71	64	69	70
Number of students tested	63	44	64	38	27
2. African American	63	72	64	67	63
Number of students tested	25	22	64	28	13
3. Hispanic	67	67	59		
Number of students tested	17	10	12		5
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Scores are reported here as NCEs

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	72	73	73	74	75
Number of students tested	98	103	90	114	81
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	3	3	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	3	3	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	68	69	69	73	71
Number of students tested	46	50	69	32	23
2. African American	62	65	69	70	67
Number of students tested	22	30	69	23	17
3. Hispanic	74				
Number of students tested	11	4	5		2
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Scores are reported here as _____

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	76				
Number of students tested	88	90			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	2			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	2			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income	69				
Number of students tested	40	44			
2. African American	72				
Number of students tested	23	18			
3. Hispanic					
Number of students tested	6	9			
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Scores are reported here as _____

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	78	72			
Number of students tested	97	102			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	1			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	1			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income	73	68			
Number of students tested	44	52			
2. African American	75	64			
Number of students tested	26	22			
3. Hispanic		53			
Number of students tested	7	11			
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 2 Test Staford Achievement Test- Reading Compre

Edition/Publication Year SAT-10 Publisher Harcprt Educational Measurement Systems

Scores are reported here as _____

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	70	66			
Number of students tested	91	96			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	2			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	2			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income	69	63			
Number of students tested	46	49			
2. African American	63	64			
Number of students tested	17	18			
3. Hispanic	74	63			
Number of students tested	15	14			
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					

Scores are reported here as _____

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
Testing Month	March	March			
SCHOOL SCORES*					
Total Score	68	62			
Number of students tested	108	10			
Percent of total students tested	100	100			
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0			
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. low income	64	59			
Number of students tested	59	56			
2. African American	61	57			
Number of students tested	23	23			
3. Hispanic	63	59			
Number of students tested	17	16			
4.					
Number of students tested					

If the reports use scaled scores, provide the national mean score and standard deviation for the test.

	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATIO					