

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2009 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program**

---

Type of School: (Check all that apply)  Elementary  Middle  High  K-12  Other  
 Charter  Title I  Magnet  Choice

Name of Principal: Mrs. Kay Coe

Official School Name: Nixon Elementary School

School Mailing Address:  
200 Nixon Drive  
Hiawatha, IA 52233

County: 57 State School Code Number\*: 57-1053-0558

Telephone: (319) 558-2188 Fax: (319) 294-9242

Web site/URL: www.cr.k12.ia.us E-mail: kcoe@cr.k12.ia.us

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Superintendent\*: Dr. David Markward

District Name: Cedar Rapids Community School District Tel: (319) 558-2000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Melissa Kiliper-Ernst

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

Original signed cover sheet only should be mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as USPS Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

---

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of 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.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2008-2009 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, or 2008.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district:
- |           |                     |
|-----------|---------------------|
| 24        | Elementary schools  |
| 6         | Middle schools      |
| 0         | Junior high schools |
| 3         | High schools        |
| 1         | Other               |
| <b>34</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>        |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 8391

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 8151

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

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

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

4. 8 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

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

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

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	10	20	30	7			0
K	21	28	49	8			0
1	26	26	52	9			0
2	26	27	53	10			0
3	18	30	48	11			0
4	30	27	57	12			0
5	27	25	52	Other			0
6			0				
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL</b>							341

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
1 % Asian  
9 % Black or African American  
3 % Hispanic or Latino  
     % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
86 % White  
     % Two or more races  
100 % **Total**

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 23 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	32
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	43
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	75
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	328
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.229
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	22.866

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 0 %

Total number limited English proficient 0

Number of languages represented: 0

Specify languages:

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 38 %

Total number students who qualify: 129

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 free and reduced-price school meals 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: 13 %

Total Number of Students Served: 43

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>2</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>0</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>13</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>20</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>8</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

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>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>
Support staff	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>36</u>	<u>8</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 24 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Daily student attendance	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	90%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Teacher turnover rate	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

Teacher turn over rate increased at the end of 2007-2008 school year, we had 3 teachers leave Nixon, one to become an administrator, on got married and moved, the third changed to the district her children attend.

Teacher attendance in the 2007-08 school year was atypical because 3 teachers took maternity leave.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2008 are doing as of the Fall 2008.

Graduating class size	<u>0</u>	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	<u>0</u>	%
Enrolled in a community college	<u>0</u>	%
Enrolled in vocational training	<u>0</u>	%
Found employment	<u>0</u>	%
Military service	<u>0</u>	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	<u>0</u>	%
Unknown	<u>0</u>	%
<b>Total</b>	<u><b>100</b></u>	<b>%</b>

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

Nixon Elementary School, located in Hiawatha, Iowa is one of 24 elementary schools in the Cedar Rapids Community School District. The District is the second largest in the state, serving approximately 18,000 students and encompassing 121 square miles. Nixon uniquely serves the two bedroom communities, Hiawatha and Robins, as well as part of the City of Cedar Rapids. A PK-5 building, Nixon enrolls approximately 320 students, including 20 students who are served on Individual Education Plans (IEPs) by the District's special education Level II Behavior Focus Program. These students are bussed to Nixon from their home schools located in other parts of the District. The demographic make up of Nixon nearly mirrors the District with 36% of families qualifying for free and reduced lunch.

The Nixon parent community is a diverse group consisting of working class families where both parents work, many in minimum wage jobs. The Parent Teacher Association (PTA) does an excellent job of designing and offering community building events for families at no cost to attendees. Events are well attended by parents and Nixon supporters, often with standing room only involvement. Student led conferences are 100% attended, and parents are very supportive of teachers' academic expectations. A vibrant business partnership with the Lowes Home Improvement Center has resulted in broad community support for students and staff. Lowes provides monthly reading volunteers, lunch buddy mentors, and professional expertise and resources for many school community projects.

The mission at Nixon is to provide opportunities for all students to be lifelong learners and responsible citizens. Staff members are committed to providing a learning environment where all students can enjoy academic and social emotional success. Teachers are dedicated to modifying instruction as needed, implementing best practice research-based strategies, providing direct instruction, and using regular assessment to continually monitor progress. This includes students with special needs, who are fully integrated in all core curricular instruction. The dedicated staff members are flexible, and embrace the continuous improvement model, recognizing that their work is never done.

In 2003 Nixon Elementary served as a pilot school for the Iowa Professional Development Model. This learning opportunity served as the catalyst for a paradigm shift in the instructional delivery model. A key to the model includes job-embedded staff development identified through the Plan-Do-Study Act Cycle. Changing teacher behavior based on actual student achievement data has been very powerful. Staff development focus areas include frequent data review, learning for all staff, and accountability for staff implementation of best practice strategies. These practices are consistent with the embraced District guiding principle of continuous improvement.

The Nixon continuous improvement journey has included the adoption of the Professional Learning Community model. Working collaboratively, grade level groups meet bi-monthly to review student, classroom, and building assessment results to continually reflect on how to ensure that all students are successful. Teachers have high expectations and learning targets are clearly identified. Students monitor their progress using their own GAP (Graphs and Progress) folder; teachers monitor their classrooms on a posted data center; and grade level teachers monitor all student progress during collaborative and ongoing scheduled conversations.

Nixon staff members take their mission seriously; failure is not an option. They continually try to improve processes and practices in the quest for success for all.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### 1. Assessment Results:

The Cedar Rapids Community School District uses multiple assessments to measure student achievement regularly throughout the school year. The primary indicator of academic achievement is the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). ITBS is given in grades 3-11. The State of Iowa has established a trajectory point each year for grade level proficiency in mathematics and reading achievement. Proficiency is defined as students performing above the 40th national percentile rank. Students scoring at or above the 89th percentile rank are performing at the 'high' level. ITBS data on 3rd and 5th grade students performing in the high range was not available until 2005. The descriptors of student proficiency are available on the Iowa Department of Education's web site <http://www.iowa.gov/educate>. The proficiency standard is applied to all subgroups as identified by federal guidelines.

Nixon achieved consistent gains in the percent of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scoring in the proficient range from 2004 to the present year. This is true in both mathematics and reading. In 2003, students were generally scoring in the 60 percent proficient range (60 percent of the students were scoring above the 40th national percentile). For the past four years, 80 percent or more of our 3rd-5th graders have been proficient. This includes the subgroups of students with IEPs and those students receiving free or reduced price meals. More specifically, in 2007, 100% of the free and reduced lunch 5th graders were proficient in reading comprehension and 67% of the IEP 5th graders were also proficient. That same year 100% of the African American sub-group students were proficient on the reading subtest. Additionally, 100% of this same group of students was proficient on the mathematics subtest across all student subgroups.

The longitudinal ITBS data is very strong. Comparing students ITBS results year to year suggests that the longer students attend Nixon, the more proficient they become. For example, 79% of 3rd graders were proficient in 2007; 83% of the same group of students proficient in 2008. This is true for both reading and mathematics. Consistent growth has been a positive trend at Nixon. The percentage of students proficient at Nixon is higher when compared to the nation, state, and other Cedar Rapids elementary schools.

Information on the state assessment system may be found on web site:  
<https://www.edinfo.state.ia.us/data/aprchart.asp?s=00090000>.

### 2. Using Assessment Results:

The Nixon staff uses the analysis of assessment results as part of the instructional decision-making model. Each grade level team meets bi-weekly with the counselor, reading coach, principal, and school psychologist to review formative and summative data, discuss learning needs, and develop instructional strategies for any students not meeting learning targets during core instruction. ITBS, District benchmarks, and weekly formative assessments are all utilized to make informed decisions about student needs. The collaborative review of multiple assessment results in a menu of intervention strategies for small student groups and individual students.

In addition to the bi-weekly grade level meetings, staff members participate in monthly building level meetings to review summative building and District data. Building level reading and mathematics Action Research Teams review data, establish building level achievement goals, and draft recommendations for staff development and instruction based on the results. Most importantly, all Nixon students review and graph their own assessment results in a Graphs and Progress (GAP) folder. These graphs on weekly reading and mathematics assessments help students monitor their own progress. Based on individual results, teachers and students set attainable goals and monitor progress on a weekly basis.

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

Communicating assessment results with students, staff, and parents is a key component to continuously improving. At the building level, there is regular communication of assessment results to the entire staff. A variety of communication tools are used including staff meetings, email, building data centers, and shared folders on the District Intranet keep assessment results in the forefront. Communication enables everyone to see the specific and individual roles that each plays in the bigger picture of school-wide success. Building leadership teams and reading and mathematics Action Research Teams utilize assessment results to develop building goals, which are an integral part of the school improvement plan.

At the parent and student level, progress is communicated in a variety of ways. For example, progress on building and District assessments is displayed on highly visible bulletin board centrally located at the school. Along with the data, realistic building and grade level goals are also communicated. Assessment results are also shared via school newsletter and Web site. Individual ITBS results are mailed home with a parent information letter. During scheduled conferences, teachers share home improvement strategies for students who are not proficient. A portion of each PTA meeting is also devoted to focusing on student achievement results.

Formal student progress reports are sent home three times each year to indicate how students are progressing toward grade-level learning outcomes. Student-led conferences are also conducted. During these meetings, students share their GAPs (Graphs and Progress reports) and other relevant artifacts as evidence of their own learning. Additionally, teachers use comparative data to articulate growth relative to their teaching peers as well as other schools, the state, and the nation. Parents sign and return daily planners with any questions or comments for the classroom teacher.

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

Nixon staff believes that collaborative conversations and the sharing of successful professional practices is our responsibility. Staff members meet periodically as part of committees that focus on sharing school achievement successes and best practice strategies. Examples of various student achievement results and effective classroom tools and strategies are posted on the District Web site for both internal and external review and assistance. As staff has had the opportunity to share success stories, they've been asked to host numerous visitors from inside and outside of the District. Nixon elementary humbly shares successes and struggles as a way to learn from others and become better practitioners.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

### 1. Curriculum:

The Cedar Rapids Community School District is dedicated to improving student performance in communication, mathematics, science, and visual and performing arts as well as student social, emotional, and behavior development. The District's curriculum facilitators regularly collaborate with teachers and administrators to provide a comprehensive, guaranteed, and viable curriculum for all students. Student performance goals are articulated in the District's comprehensive school improvement plan and Nixon's school improvement goals are aligned with the learning goals of the District. Curriculum effectiveness is monitored through systematic formative and summative assessments at the building and District levels. Additionally, classroom data centers and student data folders are used to track progress mathematics and language arts benchmarks and have been aligned with ITBS. Teacher committees continually review the benchmarks and progress toward attainment of student learning expectations.

The language arts core curriculum provides for a balanced literacy approach, which scaffolds teacher support in reading and writing. Teacher read alouds, shared (whole group) reading, small group reading, and independent reading provide opportunities for students to practice literary skills with and without support. The foundation of instruction centers on the literary pillars of comprehension, vocabulary development, fluency, and phonemic awareness/phonics. In developmentally appropriate ways, students are asked to interpret, analyze, and respond using fiction and nonfiction text. Literacy experiences in reading, writing, listening, and speaking provide opportunity for students to develop as learners.

Daily mathematics instruction is focused on the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards, numbers and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, data analysis/probability, and problem solving. The District utilizes a research-based program, Every Day Mathematics, which is aligned with the standards and provides many hands-on, real-world learning opportunities. Students gain an understanding of the multiple mathematical strategies they can apply when problem solving.

The science curriculum is rooted in the scientific method and provides opportunities for students to investigate Life, Earth, and Physical Science using interactive materials provided in kit format. The kits are integrated with many literacy skills.

Fine Arts are highly regarded in the community and District, and students have daily opportunities in general music and visual art. Classroom experiences provide for a strong skill set and appreciation for the arts. District business partners sponsor many fine arts experiences in and out of school. The Cedar Rapids Symphony / Orchestra Iowa sponsors brass ensembles, string quartets, and string teachers in each elementary building. The District supports 4th and 5th grade students to attend symphony and theater performances. Along with effective curriculum and instruction, visiting artists and field trips further enhance art appreciation.

A guiding principle in classrooms is the brain research that connects academic success with social/emotional well being. Community building activities and class meetings are designed to develop trust and mutual respect between teachers and students, and student to student. Classroom activities have a strong literacy component and are rich in real world scenarios that address numerous topics including bullying and conflict management. As with all District elementary schools, Nixon has a full time counselor to support this instruction.

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

Through frequent analysis of building data, the Nixon staff recognized the need for a school wide focus on literacy development. This focus has led to the development of comprehension and fluency strategy kits for every classroom. Teachers have studied such sources as Stephanie Harvey, Tim Rasinski, and Linda Hoyt, and

have identified and deployed a wide variety of comprehension and fluency strategies. Through the implementation and collaborative sharing of these strategies during model teaching at staff development sessions, teachers have developed confidence in their ability to differentiate instruction and meet the needs of all students. Progress is monitored weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annually through the review of comprehensive assessment data. Bi-weekly data conversations between the principal, reading coach, and grade level teams help to identify specific instructional needs when students fall below the learning targets.

The commitment to quality literacy instruction takes place in 120 minute literacy blocks. Time is allocated to whole group core instruction, leveled reading, and integrated writing and language skills. Teachers team with special educators during this block of time to ensure that all students receive core instruction that is differentiated based on student learning needs.

In the fall of 2008 the District adopted the McMillan reading series. This adoption has provided additional support of the instructional strategies already in place. Staff continuously strive to improve literacy instruction and to be proactive in response to student needs. Staff are committed to doing whatever it takes to ensure that students can read and write.

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

Nixon Elementary uniquely serves students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for behavior disorders who live on the northeast side of Cedar Rapids. The integration of these students into the general student population has resulted in a focus on social emotional curriculum. In addition to daily community circle, class meetings, counselor lessons, and District curriculum, monthly vertical team lessons have been designed. These KFC (Kids of Character) lessons are delivered on the mornings of early dismissal days in place of regular curriculum instruction. The lessons are designed by the Social Emotional Committee and the principal and are often developed using current data for student referrals to the office resulting from misbehavior. During each monthly lesson, teachers and other building staff members work with small groups of mixed age students who have recess together. The lessons include a community circle topic, a hands-on experience with a particular topic, and often application of the skill being studied. For example, when respect was identified as an area of concern, KFC lessons on manners were taught, which modeled mutual respect.

Staff members have enjoyed these opportunities to closely connect with students in and across grade levels. The lessons have helped to develop and support a culture of building-wide community, where all adults are responsible for all students' social emotional well-being.

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

It is the teacher that makes the difference! This is the cornerstone for success. Nixon Elementary is committed to getting the right tools into teachers' hands, model and practice a variety of strategies, and review data to make sure instructional practices are making the difference. Staff have made a significant paradigm shift by always asking, "What do I (teacher) need to do differently, so the student is successful?" rather than asking, "I taught that, I wonder why they don't get it?" Refining, changing, and differentiating instruction are the basis for frequent and common conversations in staff meetings.

The instructional learning environment is established through a continuous improvement approach. Collaboratively, the teachers and students create ground rules to which everyone agrees. A mission statement is written to reflect key components of the agreed upon learning environment and focus of the work ahead. Class meetings are regularly led by students and are used for problem solving and engaging everyone in data driven discussions. SMART goals are established with input from students and progress toward these goals is tracked in the classroom data display where charts and graphs reflect achievement levels. Similarly, students track their own individual progress with data folders which are used to share progress during student-led conferences.

When assessment results indicate that students need extra or different instruction in a specific skill or concept, teachers identify various strategies such as flexible grouping of students or adhoc grouping support. Over time, data are collected to determine the effectiveness of the new strategy. This is an ongoing cycle that is inherent in continuous improvement efforts.

## **5. Professional Development:**

On-going, job-embedded staff development identified through data is a result of continuous improvement efforts. During staff meetings, teachers review data and share strategies that address issues identified in the data. If there is a need to research strategies and design learning opportunities, a building Action Research Team takes the lead. There are three Action Research Teams at Nixon - communication, mathematics, and social emotional. These teams meet monthly to design professional learning experiences for all staff. The staff development sessions occur during grade level meetings, regular staff meetings, and on early release days. Improving student achievement is the focus of all professional development at Nixon.

Teachers develop annual career development plans using specific goals. At Nixon teachers have requested to identify shared and common goals. This has helped develop a professional learning culture that is collaborative and reflective.

The District also provides staff development on specific District initiatives including the introduction of new curriculum material and the implementation of continuous improvement processes and tools. The District also uses data to determine areas of need. Surveys, assessments, and staff input help determine professional development focus areas and specific actions to meet the identified needs.

## **6. School Leadership:**

Building leadership structure is inclusive and data driven. All staff members participate in one of three Action Research Teams -- Mathematics, Communications, and Social Emotional. These are aligned with the three goals of the school improvement plan. Teachers select the team or are assigned to a team by the principal. Staff members are given an annual opportunity to join different committees. The Building Leadership Team is made up of the Chairperson of each ART committee, a special education teacher, special area staff, and grade level representatives. The six-member Building Leadership Team is responsible for setting and communicating direction for the school improvement plan.

At all leadership levels, teachers review data including academic assessments and perception data collected from formal surveys and informal conversations. During the data review, plans may be put in place and strategies tested. This Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle is used repeatedly.

Nixon also has a building Resolution Team, made up of primary, intermediate, and special education teachers as well as teaching associates (para-professionals). This leadership team addresses specific concerns generated by staff members. Nixon staff believe that problem-solving should occur with those at or nearest to the source of the issue. If the result is not satisfactory at that level, the Resolution Team is called upon to find a solution. The minutes of all committee and team meetings are emailed to all staff and stored in public folders on the District Intranet.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills

Edition/Publication Year: 2001-2002

Publisher: Riverside Publishing

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	89	89	88	74	69
high state standard	37	32	33	0	0
Number of students tested	54	54	40	58	51
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	85	78		71	36
high state standard	15	22			
Number of students tested	13	18		21	14
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. (specify subgroup): IEP</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	90			80	
high state standard	20			0	
Number of students tested	10			10	
<b>4. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Data was not available for the students scoring in the high state standard for the 2004-2005 and 2003-2004 year. The application would not allow the cell to be blank, therefore a 0 was inserted.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2001-2002

Grade: 3 Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills  
Publisher: Riverside Publishing

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
intermediate plus high standard	80	87	85	69	63
high state standard	13	24	38	0	0
Number of students tested	54	54	40	58	51
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
intermediate plus high standard	69	78		52	36
high state standard	0	17			
Number of students tested	13	18		21	14
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. (specify subgroup): IEP</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	60			50	
high state standard	10				
Number of students tested	10			10	
<b>4. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The data for the percent of students in the high proficiency range was not available for the 2004-05 and 2003-04, as we were not collecting state wide data on 3rd graders at that time. The application would not allow the cell to be blank, therefore a 0 was put in.

Subject: Mathematics  
Edition/Publication Year: 2001-2002

Grade: 4 Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills  
Publisher: Riverside Publishing

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
intermediate or high state standard	88	88	78	82	84
high state standard	39	38	31	35	13
Number of students tested	49	42	55	55	50
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	74	85	68	44	54
high state standard	21	31	42	13	
Number of students tested	19	13	12	16	13
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. (specify subgroup): IEP</b>					
Intermediate plus high state standard	60		70	54	
high state standard	10		30	8	
Number of students tested	10		10	13	
<b>4. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2001-2002

Grade: 4 Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills  
Publisher: Riverside Publishing

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	80	86	80	73	80
high state standard	31	36	20	24	25
Number of students tested	49	42	55	55	49
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	53	85	75	71	67
high state standard	16	23	8	6	17
Number of students tested	19	13	12	16	12
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. (specify subgroup): IEP</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	90			80	
high state standard	22			0	
Number of students tested	10			10	
<b>4. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5

Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills

Edition/Publication Year: 2001-2002

Publisher: Riverside Publishing

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
intermediate plus high on state standards	100	85	75	91	77
high on state standards	37	38	22	0	0
Number of students tested	35	53	59	54	57
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
intermediate plus high on state standard		75	35	93	42
high on state standard		25	5		
Number of students tested		12	20	14	12
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. (specify subgroup): IEP</b>					
intermediate plus high on state standard		67	53	70	
high on state standard		27	12		
Number of students tested		11	17	10	
<b>4. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Data was not available for the percent of students scoring in the high state standard range for 2004-2005 and 2003-2004. The application would not allow for empty cells, therefore a 0 was inserted.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2001-2002

Grade: 5 Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills  
Publisher: Riverside Publishing

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	91	91	68	87	86
high state standard	29	21	12	0	0
Number of students tested	35	53	59	54	57
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard		83	35	86	68
high state standard		8	0		
Number of students tested		12	20	14	12
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. (specify subgroup): IEP</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard		64	47	50	
high state standard		18	6		
Number of students tested		11	17	10	
<b>4. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Data was not available for the high performance level in 2004-2005 and 2003-2004, the application would not allow us to leave it blank, therefore a 0 was inserted.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2001-2002

Grade: 5 Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills  
Publisher: Riverside Publishing

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	91	91	68	87	86
high state standard	29	21	12	0	0
Number of students tested	35	53	59	54	57
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2001-2002

Grade: 5 Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills  
Publisher: Riverside Publishing

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
intermediate plus high state standard	91	91	68	87	86
high state standard	29	21	12	0	0
Number of students tested	35	53	59	54	57
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. (specify subgroup):</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes: