U.S. Department of Education
2010 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) [] Charter [**X**] Title I [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal: Mrs. Marsha Shaver

Official School Name: Kingston Elementary

School Mailing Address:
Post Office Box 149
Kingston, AR 72742-0149

County: Madison State School Code Number*: 5100-007

Telephone: (479) 665-2835 Fax: (479) 665-2577

Web site/URL: http://jasper.k12.ar.us E-mail: mshaver@jasper.k12.ar.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.

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Mr. Kerry Saylors

District Name: Jasper Tel: (870) 446-2223

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.

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Doug Brasel

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.

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

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*
The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. 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 2009-2010 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 2004.

6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.

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: (per district designation)

3	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
0	Middle/Junior high schools
3	High schools
	K-12 schools
6	**TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 9370

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
[X] Rural

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

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

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	7	6	13	**6**	8	8	16
K	11	14	25	**7**	4	14	18
1	12	7	19	**8**	12	6	18
2	9	8	17	**9**	7	11	18
3	12	9	21	**10**	14	10	24
4	8	12	20	**11**	7	6	13
5	8	7	15	**12**	7	3	10
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					247

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

2 %	American Indian or Alaska Native
0 %	Asian
0 %	Black or African American
1 %	Hispanic or Latino
0 %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
97 %	White
0 %	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: 2 %

This rate is 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.	4
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	2
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	6
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	246
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.024
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	2.439

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: 69 %

Total number students who qualify: 171

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: 11 %

Total Number of Students Served: 26

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

0	Autism	0	Orthopedic Impairment
0	Deafness	5	Other Health Impaired
0	Deaf-Blindness	10	Specific Learning Disability
0	Emotional Disturbance	8	Speech or Language Impairment
2	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
1	Mental Retardation	0	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0	Multiple Disabilities	0	Developmentally Delayed

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

	Number of Staff	
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	1	0
Classroom teachers	21	3
Special resource teachers/specialists	1	0
Paraprofessionals	4	2
Support staff	1	0
Total number	28	5

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 **12 :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%.

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Daily student attendance	96%	99%	97%	96%	97%
Daily teacher attendance	87%	86%	84%	88%	89%
Teacher turnover rate	13%	9%	19%	24%	15%
Student dropout rate	0%	6%	0%	1%	1%

Please provide all explanations below.

Daily Teacher Attendance: Teacher attendance was calculated by using the secretary's attendance from her planning book which lists the days that teachers were absent. Three years were calculated looking at the same months for the three years. Estimations were used based on the information from grades k-12. The absentee rate for the whole school appears rather high in the 80% range. However, calculations for elementary teachers only showed the absentee rate improving considerably. When then professional development days were taken out of the above equation for elementary teacher, attendance rates continued to improve.

Below is the attendance rate using the data as explained above.

Calculated for Elementary Teachers only;

2008-09---96%

2007-08--95%

2006-07--95%

2005-06--95%

2004-05--96%

The calculations with professional development taken out showed a gain of about 1.5% to 2.0%. There is definitely a correlation between student achievement and teacher attendance as can be seen with Kingston Elementary and Kingston Junior/Senior High achievements.

Teacher Turnover Rate: The rates above are hand figured by looking at school yearbooks. The above calculations are for grades PreK -12. The percentages seem quite high, however there are only 22- 25 staff members each year, therefore, when there is a turnover of 2 to 5 teachers--it affects the percentages tremendously. The turnover rate for elementary is much lower: Percentages were based on 8 teachers for elementary in the above order: 25% (two teacher changes); 0%, 11%, 12%, 0%.

Student dropout rate: This information is from NORMES (The National Office for Research on Measurement and Evaluation System). The drop out rate in 2007-08 was 6%. Perhaps this is because of small student population. Even one student dropping out would increase the drop out rate considerably.

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

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

Graduating class size	12	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	33	%
Enrolled in a community college	33	%
Enrolled in vocational training	17	%
Found employment	17	%
Military service	0	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0	%
Unknown	0	%
Total	**100**	%

PART III - SUMMARY

The small community of Kingston lies in the picturesque Kings River Valley of Northwest Arkansas. Tucked on a hillside overlooking the valley is the Kingston Public School. Established in 1925 the school has always been, and continues to be, the hub of the community. The area surrounding the school is rural. Most activities in the community usually involve the school. The mission for this institution has been the same for many years. A long line of outstanding administrators, educators, and concerned citizens has left a legacy of high learning expectations for the school that have been passed down from generation to generation. This tiny school has been widely recognized through the years for outstanding accomplishments. Some of those include: consistently good/high test scores; both state and national, superior basketball teams that were top in district many years, and some making it to the state levels and championships, and state and national wins for FCCLA, FBLA, and FFA. Students are encouraged to participate and excel in geography bees, spelling bees, science fairs, math carnivals, quiz bowls, and other local, state, and national events.

The school takes an active part in community projects. Many years ago the school held fundraisers to help in getting a volunteer fire department implemented into the community. That fire department now helps the school by annually teaching fire prevention and safety to the students. The annual Fair on the Square is held in the spring each year in the town of Kingston. The entire day is spent with school children taking a big part in the day's festivities.

A feeling of community and school ownership is instilled in students from pre-K through 12th grade. Children are taught to take care of the environment by recycling. Students and teachers are responsible for highway cleanup along scenic Highway 21 which runs along Kings River. School and community pride is also evident in the number of volunteers who donate their time every year at the school. Last year over 2000 volunteer hours were logged. Parents, school employees, students, and community members did painting and upgrading of buildings and the playground, painting restroom and dressing rooms, and cleaning in the gym. They worked on landscaping and countless other needed projects.

Since good health habits are advocated, many people in the school /community participated in the Madison County Health Coalition 2009-2010. Activities were planned that encouraged families to exercise and eat balanced diets. A Better Health Grant received at the school lead to the construction of a walking track on the elementary playground. Volunteers built the cement track, and children and faculty use it daily. Five blood drives are held at the school annually.

A unique feature of the school is the return of past graduates to teach at their alma mater, even though they may have passed up opportunities for larger salaries elsewhere. While we have had many former students that have become doctors, lawyers, accountants, legislators, professors, nurses and many other distinguished professions, many go on to become educators. Last year, all the elementary teachers were former Kingston graduates. They expressed a desire to teach in the school where they were taught. This is a great tribute to the school's history as a caring and teaching school. Although Kingston has almost 70% of its students at low socioeconomic status, learning is not compromised because of poverty. Small class sizes contribute to the ability of teachers to see that at risk students are not allowed to fall through the cracks. Intervention is swift and deliberate. When the school was first established, its nickname was "Little Harvard". While that nickname is no longer used, it seems to be an applicable description for the school today.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

There are two places where information regarding our school performance and assessment scores can be found: http://normessasweb.uark.edu and www.tlionline.net.

Our students participate in ACTAAP. The following categories indicate performance levels: 1) Advanced, meaning that a student scores above average, 2) Proficient, which is what is required to indicate that a student is "meeting the standard", 3) Basic, which would indicate that the student is in need of remediation of specific skills and does not meet the standard required and 4) Below Basic. This is the lowest level that a student can score, and would indicate that the student is in severe academic jeopardy.

Our school does not have enough students within a subpopulation to compare disparities.

Over the last five years Kingston Elementary has consistently met or exceeded the requirements set forth by the No Child Left Behind Act for the area of math and literacy. Our greatest accomplishment in the last two years has been growing our students to higher levels. For many years our students would achieve at the level of proficient but we saw few students moving from the proficient level to the level of advanced. In the last two years we have observed this change. More students are scoring at the level of advanced. We attribute this gain to having a more concise, and aligned curriculum. We also contribute our success to teacher training in higher level thinking and our commitment to present students with higher level questions and learning assignments.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Our school uses The Learning Institute to provide interim assessments to students. Teachers select the specific learning objectives they will be teaching during a period of time and assessments are built from these SLEs. Once students have taken the interim assessment, the data is examined. Teachers are asked to look at trends they see in student scores, what area of weakness may be tied to a former learning objective, and what SLEs may reflect student misconceptions of learning. These discussions are held during team meetings as well as during our Professional Learning Community meetings.

Once a specific trend, weakness, or misconception is determined, a plan of action is developed. The plan may include teachers re-teaching a concept in a different manner than they taught previously. It could mean that more training is needed for a teacher in a certain area. We continued to see that our students in grade three scored lowest in measurement. The third grade teacher then participated in training on math and measurement.

Several times while examining our data we have found that our alignment in curriculum was not as strong as we thought. For example in one case, the vocabulary that a teacher used in third grade math to instruct their students, did not match the vocabulary that the fourth grade teacher used to instruct their students. The following year the teachers agreed to match their vocabulary by exposing students to both terms. Students were then able to transfer their learning from grade to grade.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Students and parents are given a copy of their state assessment scores, as well as a copy of their interim assessment scores. State assessment scores are published in the local paper.

At the beginning of the school year, Kingston Elementary holds an open house for students and parents to attend. Parents are given a copy of their child's performance records. Parents are able to meet and discuss with their child's teacher how their child performed on the previous school year assessment and what the expectation is for the student the current year. Students are included in the conversation and depending on the ability of the student, they are asked to set goals for themselves for the next state assessment.

When students take an interim assessment, they review their results within one to two days of taking the assessment. Students are able to ask for clarification or more assistance in understanding the material.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Our teachers are very proud of the success their students have achieved. Many of our teachers serve as math and science facilitators. During meetings, conferences and workshops our teachers are vocal in sharing the success they see and have often invited other teachers from outside our district to peer visit.

Our teachers would be willing to allow other teachers to observe their teaching strategies, share lesson plans and how they utilize interim assessment to differentiate instruction for students. Whatever we can offer to help students achieve at a higher level, we are more than willing to do.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

In each of the four core curricular areas, our teachers begin with the Arkansas Frameworks. Based upon the framework, teachers then determine how best to meet the needs of the students. Our teachers are provided training in a variety of reading and math programs and are allowed to select which method would best serve the students based upon the students' previous year's performance. While we have adopted specific textbooks in each of the core areas, teachers are not limited to using only the textbook. Teachers keep record of learning activities and assignments so that they may be reviewed and later used to determine the most effective method for teaching the skill or framework.

Language Arts: The adopted text is through McGraw Hill. Students are instructed using a balanced literacy approach which emphasizes phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension and the writing process. Teachers utilize strategies from ELLA, ELF and Literacy Lab. Students are encouraged to independently read through the use of the Accelerated Reading Program and providing them time within their scheduled day.

Mathematics: The adopted text for math instruction is through Harcourt. The teachers, however, have been extensively trained in Everyday Math and still incorporate the methods and strategies they have previously learned. Instruction is delivered through a variety of methods depending on the concept being taught and needs of the students.

Social Studies: The adopted text is Harcourt. Students are instructed using a literacy based method, where students read published print relating to the concept as well as write about their thoughts, learning and experiences. Students participate in re-enactments, debates and visit local sites pertaining to concepts taught.

Science: The adopted text is Glencoe. Since our students participate in interim assessments in the area of science, we also utilize materials and learning activities through The Learning Institute. Science is expected to be hands on and once again reading and writing about science is emphasized at each grade level. Students are required to participate in our school wide science fair beginning at kindergarten.

Music and Art: While student do attend music and art instruction weekly, both are embedded into social studies and language arts instruction. Fine Arts teachers work with core teachers as they plan lessons and use opportunities to reinforce art and music.

Spanish I and Spanish II are taught at the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades in Kingston's School.

2a. **(Elementary Schools) Reading**:
(This question is for elementary schools only)

Teachers are trained in the methods of Early Literacy Learning in Arkansas (ELLA), Effective Literacy (ELF) and in Literacy Lab, depending on the grades that they provide instruction. These programs were selected because they provided all components of a balanced reading program and provided teachers with on-going support and training. Beginning in kindergarten, students are assessed through DIBELs and monitored closely. Data gathered then determines which specific student skills show areas of strength or weakness. A reading plan is then developed to meet the students' needs. Students are provided time within their daily schedules to practice reading and work in small groups and individually with teachers to address any weak skill.

2b. **(Secondary Schools) English:**
(This question is for secondary schools only)

At Kingston, there is one English teacher for grades 7-12. She has become very familiar with Arkansas frameworks in reading and writing skills. She understands that for students to be good writers, they must be good readers as well. She has been trained in literacy lab and incorporates high yield strategies into her lesson preparation and student training. She has great success on benchmarks and on the 11th grade literacy scores. She requires all students to read 4 books each grading quarter and take AR (Accelerated Reader) tests. She invites faculty and community members to attend classes to give book talks. The principal also does book talks with the classes. She works cooperatively with the science teacher to have longer instruction blocks when she needs them. She plans remediation time daily and packets for those students who did not score proficient or advanced on the benchmarks. She interviews these students in the class by giving them 5 minutes of her time daily to ask them questions for content understanding.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

Our students are provided with mathematic instruction that not only provides them with concrete mathematical skills but enables them to be problem solvers and life long learners. Students are encouraged and taught how to look for new and innovative ways to solve mathematical problems. They are taught to search for patterns, predict outcomes and record and analyze the results that they collect. Students work not only independently but often work in groups to solve math problems. Because they work often in collaborative groups, students become more adept in their communication and social skills. These valuable skills will be a great asset to them as they move from the public school world into the world or industry.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

Once again, the lack of a diverse population limits the categories of subpopulations that our teachers are able to work with.

Kingston teachers differentiate in a variety of methods, all depending on the needs of the student, regardless if the student is served by an IEP. Students are allowed to select options in demonstrating their understanding of learned concepts. For example, after reading a novel some students may select to write an essay, whereas other students may select to construct a poster summarizing the story. Teachers not only differentiate through the product of student work but also the learning environment itself. Students are allowed to work individually, in groups or in pairs. Multiple medias are also incorporated as often as possible in order to meet the needs of visual, auditory and tactile learners.

5. **Professional Development:**

Once all school data is collected and reviewed, teacher teams examine trends. The teams determine areas of strength and areas of weakness. We use teacher surveys, examine student work, and results from our interim assessments to guide us to needed professional development. Once an area of weakness has been determined, research begins to be collected as to what program, training, materials etc. are needed in order to strengthen our school. Some teachers choose to participate in training over the summer while some attend on-going trainings through-out the year.

Kingston teachers participate in Professional Learning Communities as well. During this time, teachers discuss SLEs, curriculum alignment and instructional strategies they have found to be successful. They share knowledge they have acquired through trainings and work collaboratively to solve problems.

6. **School Leadership:**

The principal at Kingston Elementary is a visible and active part of the school. She leads her staff by personally continuing to grow professionally and not only encourages her staff but provides opportunities for them to grow professionally. The principal is daily in classrooms completing Classroom Walk Throughs (CWTs) observations or simply interacting with students and teachers.

Ms. Shaver meets with each teacher weekly to discuss teacher concerns, student concerns, current interim assessment data, and progress on individual student plans and the overall well being of the teacher. She consistently observes and provides feedback to teachers and is diligent in creating an atmosphere where teacher, student and parent ideas can be shared and honored. She is open with information and works hard to make sure her staff knows changes in regulations, laws and polices. She values instruction time and creates a learning schedule that reflects that belief.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 10 Test: End of Course Geometry

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Questar

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	67	55	76	95
% Advanced	19	17	5	35	58
Number of students tested	27	12	22	17	19
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85				100
% Advanced	23				55
Number of students tested	14				11
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population that reflects percentages for students in 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades.

Subject: Reading Grade: 11 Test: 11th Grade Literacy Benchmark

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	79	43	45	82
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	10	19	14	20	17
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	9	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				45	
% Advanced				0	
Number of students tested				11	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Mar	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	80	100	83	88
% Advanced	78	55	83	25	38
Number of students tested	18	20	12	12	16
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		75			82
% Advanced		50			27
Number of students tested		16			11
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	78	80	75	83	69
% Advanced	50	30	33	33	44
Number of students tested	18	20	12	12	16
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		75			63
% Advanced		25			36
Number of students tested		16			11
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	93	93	59	71
% Advanced	76	62	53	24	18
Number of students tested	17	13	15	17	17
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91			58	71
% Advanced	73			33	21
Number of students tested	11			12	14
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	93	94	77	65
% Advanced	47	31	47	24	6
Number of students tested	17	13	15	17	17
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81			75	64
% Advanced	45			33	7
Number of students tested	11			13	14
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	83	88	67	32
% Advanced	71	33	44	28	0
Number of students tested	14	18	16	18	19
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		90	81	59	33
% Advanced		50	45	42	0
Number of students tested		10	11	12	12
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are the combined population.

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	77	69	78	53
% Advanced	64	33	38	22	0
Number of students tested	14	18	16	18	19
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			63	75	67
% Advanced			36	25	0
Number of students tested			11	12	13
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 6 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	69	70	61	51
% Advanced	89	50	29	33	9
Number of students tested	18	16	17	18	11
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		63	60	58	
% Advanced		45	20	33	
Number of students tested		11	10	12	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under section School Scores are for combined population.

Subject: Reading Grade: 6 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	56	76	77	54
% Advanced	83	25	29	33	27
Number of students tested	18	16	17	18	11
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		63	70	67	
% Advanced		27	20	42	
Number of students tested		11	10	12	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Score are for the combined population.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 7 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	57	58	51	60
% Advanced	32	14	21	38	20
Number of students tested	19	21	19	8	10
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	53	60		
% Advanced	25	18	20		
Number of students tested	12	17	10		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Reading Grade: 7 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	62	68	76	60
% Advanced	16	24	21	38	0
Number of students tested	19	21	19	8	10
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	58	58	70		
% Advanced	8	29	10		
Number of students tested	12	17	10		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 8 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exam

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	58	44	50	60
% Advanced	17	16	0	17	4
Number of students tested	18	19	9	12	25
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	40			62
% Advanced	23	20			6
Number of students tested	13	10			16
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population.

Subject: Reading Grade: 8 Test: Augmented Benchmark Exams

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Pearson

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	76	77	64	72
% Advanced	59	26	33	8	8
Number of students tested	18	19	9	12	25
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	70			69
% Advanced	54	30			6
Number of students tested	13	10			15
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined populations.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 9 Test: End of Course Algebra 1

Edition/Publication Year: 2009 Publisher: Questar

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Mar	Apr	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	56	62	70	85	94
% Advanced	17	9	20	15	69
Number of students tested	23	32	10	20	16
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	2	1	2	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	8	3	17	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	56		70	
% Advanced	18	6		10	
Number of students tested	17	18		10	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data under the section School Scores are for the combined population and scores reflect percentages for 8th and 9th graders.