

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

Type of School: (Check all that apply) Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal: Ms. Tonya Gubin

Official School Name: Lincoln Elementary School

School Mailing Address:
210 Gould Street
Beaver Dam, WI 53916-1997

County: Dodge State School Code Number*: 0336-0100

Telephone: (920) 885-7396 Fax: (920) 885-7399

Web site/URL: www.beaverdam.k12.wi.us E-mail: gubint@beaverdam.k12.wi.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*: Dr. Donald Childs

District Name: Beaver Dam Unified School District Tel: (920) 885-7300

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: Ms. Beverly Beal-Loeck

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)
- | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| 7 | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
| 1 | Middle/Junior high schools |
| 2 | High schools |
| | K-12 schools |
| 10 | TOTAL |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 11383

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. 2 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 | | | 0 | 6 | | | 0 |
| K | 18 | 11 | 29 | 7 | | | 0 |
| 1 | 15 | 27 | 42 | 8 | | | 0 |
| 2 | 24 | 22 | 46 | 9 | | | 0 |
| 3 | 24 | 19 | 43 | 10 | | | 0 |
| 4 | 22 | 19 | 41 | 11 | | | 0 |
| 5 | 11 | 24 | 35 | 12 | | | 0 |
| TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL | | | | | | | 236 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 2 % American Indian or Alaska Native
1 % Asian
2 % Black or African American
17 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
70 % White
8 % 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: 12 %

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. | 10 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 18 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]. | 28 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1. | 238 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4). | 0.118 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100. | 11.765 |

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 14 %

Total number limited English proficient 32

Number of languages represented: 1

Specify languages:

Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 62 %

Total number students who qualify: 147

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: 31

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>6</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>1</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>9</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>3</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>19</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>3</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>13</u> | <u>2</u> |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>7</u> | <u>2</u> |
| Support staff | <u>2</u> | <u>2</u> |
| Total number | <u>26</u> | <u>10</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 17 :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% | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| Daily teacher attendance | 97% | 97% | 97% | 97% | 97% |
| Teacher turnover rate | 24% | 6% | 0% | 12% | 6% |
| Student dropout rate | % | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Please provide all explanations below.

Many of our teachers have taken leadership roles in the district which accounts for the majority of the turnover. The other factor is our SAGE (Student Achievement Guarantee in Education) funding keeps student to teacher ratios at 1:15. Because enrollment fluctuates in certain grades, we have needed fewer teachers in some years.

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 | <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> | % |
| Total | <u> </u> | % |

PART III - SUMMARY

For over five years, Lincoln has been one of the most innovative of the district's seven elementary schools. Despite a poverty rate that has more than doubled in four year to 62% and an ELL population that has also doubled to 31%, the Lincoln leadership and staff have had a laser-like focus on continuous improvement with a specific emphasis on literacy. For over a decade, the school was a Reading Recovery training site, producing Reading Recovery teachers for every elementary school in the district. It was also the home of the two reading specialists - one of whom is now the school's principal and the other of whom is principal of another district K-5 building - who were instrumental in developing and implementing the district's Comprehensive Literacy Framework, which is now the district-wide literacy program. The previous principal, who led many of the school's initiatives, is now the district's director of teaching and learning. These three led the Lincoln staff to the point of Lincoln becoming the initial site of the reading program and developed the school as a demonstration site for the rest of the district's K-5 staff and for other districts wishing to replicate Lincoln's successes. It is not a surprise the five of the district's seven elementary grade-level leaders are Lincoln staff. Seventeen teachers in the building have advanced degrees and three have been awarded teacher of the year in the district. The school's leadership has focused as diligently on staff capacity-building as it has on continuously-improving student achievement.

Lincoln's traditions and milestones surround parent involvement and service to the community. An overnight outdoor trip for our 5th grade students exposes them to environmental issues while being a culmination to their career at Lincoln. Our 5th grade safety patrols and student council provide additional leadership opportunities. The parent/teacher organization sponsors many family nights, such as a dance, a breakfast, a reading night, and a fall festival. Once a month, we host "Read Around Lincoln" and invite guest readers to read books to our students. Books are given to each child as well on his/her birthday. The student council has sponsored service projects to help the Ronald McDonald House, cancer walks, and homeless shelters.

Despite rapid increases in poverty and in non-native English speakers, Lincoln School's students' test scores continue to improve and generally score above their counterparts in other schools and other districts. The implementation of building consultation teams (BCT's), true professional learning communities, has fostered problem-solving around struggling learners that have proven successful. In addition, extending time by way of the school's after-school 21st Century Community of Learners program allows students to apply reading, writing, thinking and problem-solving skills in social environments that are different than the structures of the regular school day. It also allows further development of the character traits typified in the six pillars of character espoused by the district: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship. These activities provide a cultural enrichment that children in poverty otherwise would never experience.

Finally, also noteworthy is the fact that, while special education scores continue to reflect a gap in performance, the literacy initiative in combination with the BCT's and after-school program have led to a reduction in the number of special education referrals. The vast majority of special education placements at Lincoln school are coming from outside the school as a consequence of both in-district and out-of-district mobility.

Lincoln school and its outstanding staff are a lighthouse for the community they serve, a model for the state, and a safe harbor for the students they serve: truly a Blue Ribbon School of Excellence.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

An analysis of test data must begin with the premise that, because the n at each grade level is small, variability appears large. That is, the impact of a single student moving one way or another can reflect a larger percentage in any category than a reliable estimate of movement would otherwise reflect. That said, evaluation of student performance in reading and mathematics at grades 3, 4 and 5 shows a general upward trend in the percentage of students scoring at state proficiency levels or above. It must be noted that the trend lines exist despite the near-doubling of the poverty level in the school from about 35% in 2005 to 62% in 2009, based on the school's participation levels in the free- and reduced-lunch program. This is also despite the doubling of the English Language Learner population to 31 students over the same time frame. The school's largest performance gap lies in the sub-population of students with disabilities: a gap repeated across the district and the target of specific school and district improvement plans and targeted interventions.

Third-grade scores over the four-year period, 2005-2008 (latest available data) show an increase of 4% in reading proficiency from 75% to 79%; however, the two intervening years, 06 and 07, saw peaks of 91% and 93%, respectively. These are attributable to inter-group variability not including small increments in variability of sub-populations.

The same trend line is visible in math proficiency, growing from 69% to 79% (a statistically-significant increment), with the corresponding peaks in 06 and 07 at 97% and 82%, respectively. Students with disabilities showed growth from 11% proficiency to 17% in reading, with similar peaks of 50% and 33% between; and from 0% to 17% in math with intermediate peaks of 75% and 33%.

Fourth-grade scores show significant growth over the 5-year period, 2004-2008, from 65% proficiency in both reading and math to 86% proficiency in both. Peaks in the 90% range were observed in 05 and 07. Disabled students showed almost no growth in reading over the five years, although peaks in 05 and 07 contributed to the peaks for the whole population each year. Mathematics proficiency, however, showed a gain from 28% to 50% over the same period.

Fifth-graders showed a more consistent trend line over the four years, 2005-2008. Reading proficiency advanced from a low of 64% in 2005 to a high of 91% in 2008, while math proficiency advanced from 72% in 05 to 97% in 08. Fifth-graders with disabilities over the same period showed no growth in reading (0%); but math proficiency grew from 33% to 100%.

An analysis of the 2007-2008 fifth grade over a 3-year period in both reading and math shows a steady performance, neither significantly declining nor improving. Because performance levels for this class were high to begin with, there was little room for movement. Ninety-two percent scored proficient or above in reading in 3rd grade, and 97% scored proficient or above in math. As 4th-graders, they were at 91% and 94%; and in 5th-grade, they again scored 92% and 97%. These data are all available on the State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction website, www.dpi.wi.gov, on its Wisconsin Indicators of School Success (WINSS) site. Proficiency levels are determined on the basis of scale scores. Each of the four levels, Minimal, Basic, Proficient and Advanced has a separate range with a "cut score" floor/ceiling based upon normed state results, which have been adjusted at least twice since 1996. Students scoring in the Proficient or Advanced ranges are deemed to have met the standards in each area.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Lincoln Elementary uses assessment on a daily basis. As a staff, we have worked on formative assessments to guide our instruction. An assessment table was created this year listing assessments by grade level. This table lists formal and informal assessments, as well as mandatory and optional assessments. The Lincoln staff revises the assessment table annually.

In reading, informal running records are done daily to guide instruction and tailor instruction to each student. When students are not making gains in reading, running records are examined to diagnose reading problems. The running records are also used in our RtI model. Benchmark assessments are done formally twice a year and recorded on our data wall. This enables us to make instructional decisions about Tier 1, 2, and 3 interventions, such as Reading Recovery, Title I instruction, ELL instruction, and staff development. This data is triangulated along with state testing data and Measures of Academic Progress assessments to determine where changes need to be made. Currently, the Lincoln staff is working on assessment rubrics for writing that are tied to state standards and current literacy models.

In math, power standards and assessments have been created. Students not meeting grade-level benchmarks in math receive targeted interventions for three to six weeks in their area of weakness. Pre- and Post-assessments are shared at building consultation team meetings, where the majority of assessment data is analyzed. Building Consultation Team meetings allow specialists and teachers to look at data with new eyes and determine the next course of action.

Results from the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination are analyzed at our May late start in-service meeting. ELL and Special Education subgroups are carefully scrutinized. Test items that are lower than the state average are examined to determine if there are gaps or overlaps in our curriculum. Trends and patterns are identified and then team-based instructional adjustments are made for the following year.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Beaver Dam Unified School District is a Policy Governance district. As such, the Board of Education has adopted ends policies identifying the expected academic, citizenship and life skills outcomes for all students completing their educations in the district. To hold staff accountable for results, the board actively monitors student progress through quarterly reports from all schools. These are data-rich reports using standards-based performance data in targeted goal areas set in each of the three ends policies areas. Each report is received and accepted by the board as “In Compliance,” “Insufficient Data to Evaluate at This Time” or “Not in Compliance” with adequate progress toward achieving the ends policies. School board meetings are televised on our local cable access channel for public viewing, and the reports are presented and discussed at one meeting; then further discussed, questions asked and answered and final action taken at the next meeting. Each School reports status and progress on academic, citizenship and life skills goals, objectives, improvement plans and intervention strategies. The summative end-of-year report assesses the relative level of success of the activities and interventions and identifies whether goals should be renewed and/or new goals adopted. Student performance data is the centerpiece of these reports, and they are posted on the district website, www.beaverdam.k12.wi.us. In addition, the website contains annual school performance reports required by the State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction summarizing state assessment results, attendance and graduation rates, post-secondary matriculation data and a host of other indicators.

The district has parent advisory committees at the school site level and for programs such as Title I, Gifted/Talented, and ELL. In addition, Lincoln School’s 21st Century Community of Learners Grant program has an advisory committee dealing with program sustainability and development for its after-school program. All of these forums receive student performance data, along with explanations of what the data indicate, as do the adult and teen-age mentors of needy elementary students in our district-wide Partners Are Learning (PALs) program. Announcements featuring student performance information are featured on our

local cable access channel. In addition, the district website has a Facebook presence and a Superintendent's Blog that share data. The superintendent features schools and student performance information on his monthly radio show, Spotlight on Schools, over WBEV, the local AM radio station. Other means of communication of students' assessment results include press releases in our local paper, The Daily Citizen, and in school newsletters. The district maintains a system through its website that allows parents to login and check on their children's progress 24/7, and progress reports are sent home at regular intervals between report cards.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Lincoln Elementary hosts many visitors from surrounding schools that come to observe our teaching practices. Throughout the years, teachers from other districts have watched Lincoln's teachers demonstrate reading and writing workshop procedures. For example, at least twenty teachers in the last two years have observed how our building has seamlessly implemented The Daily Five (a reading workshop structure) across kindergarten through second grade. As a Blue Ribbon School, we would encourage schools from our surrounding districts to observe the teaching practices that we have collaborated on.

Our special education staff is known for their excellent parent relations and teaching techniques. Our learning disabilities teacher is the lead teacher for all the special education teachers in the district, including speech, occupational therapy, early childhood, etc. As a Blue Ribbon School, we would continue our quest to close the achievement gap between special needs students and the regular education population. The credibility a Blue Ribbon Award gives to a school may help us to reach out to other Pupil Services staff members.

We have already begun to share our staff development model with the other schools in our district. The data wall and our staff development on writing were shared with the other seven elementary schools in the district. Several of our teachers and the principal represent the district on the Wisconsin State Reading Association committees. This communication at a state level creates a network of collaboration we will use if chosen as a Blue Ribbon School.

Finally, our 21st Century Learning Community Grant has permitted us to create an extended day program that extends learning from the early morning hours until late at night. Through this grant, we have partnered with our community organizations and businesses to create a lifetime love of learning. Once again, this model will be shared with others.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Classroom Instruction That Works by Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock is the methodology that is used with our teachers. Our new teachers, whether veteran or new to the field, are mentored on the strategies presented in this book for their first year of work in the district. Teachers are then evaluated on whether or not the strategies are being implemented in their classrooms. Our mantra “It is the how, not the what, that has the biggest impact on student achievement” guides the teachers’ principles of instruction. Some of the strategies include advanced organizers, questioning techniques, summarizing and note taking, identifying similarities and differences, setting objectives and providing feedback, and inductive thinking processes.

Staff development has been occurring at the Lincoln building meetings in order to make sure the 21st Century Learning Skills are fostered in the classroom. Communication and oral language development are explicitly taught during the language arts block and applied in the content areas. Critical thinking skills are taught throughout the core curriculum areas by creating lessons that require making complex choices, understanding the interconnections among content, and synthesizing information. Working appropriately and productively with others helps to bridge the cultural differences at our school as well as to produce leadership and responsibility within our students. By creating units with the 21st century skills in mind, we are helping to create students that go beyond the basic mastery of skills to being successful contributors of society.

Lincoln Elementary’s core curriculum includes a comprehensive literacy framework, FOSS science, Everyday Math, and social studies. The components of the comprehensive literacy framework which include writing workshop, mentor texts, shared reading, guided reading, and literature discussion groups are interwoven across the content areas throughout the day. Extensive staff development for the last five years on the framework has yielded higher tests scores, lowered special education referrals, and has met the needs of the gifted and talented students. Writing across the curriculum has been a recent focus at Lincoln. Vertical articulation of the writing process has helped teachers to lift the expectations of writers by clearly defining standards and benchmarks.

The comprehensive literacy framework draws on the work of noted literacy researchers and experts such as Fountas, Pinnell, Dorn, and Clay. Reading Recovery is our foundational piece in the framework. Throughout grades K-5, the emphasis is on the self-regulation of reading and writing behaviors. Oral language and critical thinking are focused on from their first day at Lincoln. Teachers use authentic literature in reading and writing for authentic purposes in the content areas and differentiate for each individual student need which includes conferencing with students to scaffold learning.

Everyday Math is delivered instructionally in much the same manner. Writing, reasoning, and analytical questioning focus the students on the math process, not just correct answers. FOSS science and social studies additionally are instructed in much the same way. Nonlinguistic representations actively engage students in higher level thinking. Cooperative learning is used to encourage oral language development, acceptance of multiple hypotheses, and 21st century learning skills. In fact, technology is integrated throughout the curriculum with a focus on bridging the gap between Beaver Dam, Wisconsin and the world.

The Lincoln students are offered an array of visual and performing arts opportunities. Band, orchestra, chorus, music, and art are offered during the day. In addition, our extended day program, the Lincoln Station, provides enrichment activities such as Drums Alive, Scien-artists, and sign language. Students can participate in the community theater, which is headed by our gifted and talented teacher. Lincoln has also partnered with the Spanish class at the high school for a Hispanic reading day to encourage foreign language participation.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

(This question is for elementary schools only)

At a universal level, the district core reading program provides a balanced literacy framework for all students that utilizes a leveled-books approach to reading development. Balanced literacy is supported by an assessment program which utilizes running records based on Reading Recovery® methodology and practices. In general, assessment practices, instructional delivery models, and staff development are shaped by the theories of a comprehensive literacy framework. Since effective phonics instruction helps children apply what they learn about letters and sounds to reading, Beaver Dam's balanced literacy approach is augmented by phonics instruction in grades K and 1 by using the Literacy Links program. The approach to reading incorporates the Six Pillars of Literacy, including: comprehension, phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and writing. Beyond the formalized classroom lessons provided by general and special educators, reading support is differentiated at the universal, selected, and targeted levels through small group, tutorial, supplemental, or individualized instruction.

This comprehensive approach to balanced literacy incorporates a wide range of oral, reading and writing activities to provide education for all students. More recently Beaver Dam Unified School District (BDUSD) expanded its use of the 6+1 Traits model of writing instruction and assessment, which has been accepted as a best practice to complement the reading program. Within a Writer's Workshop structure, the seven traits (Ideas, Organization, Voice, Word Choice, Sentence Fluency, Conventions, and Presentation) provide a framework for teachers to reinforce successful writing practices and design new instructional lessons and strategies to address areas where students struggle. In general, the 6+1 Traits Writing Model offers classroom materials and professional development designed to build teacher understanding of knowledge of the characteristics of quality writing and improve teachers' skills in implementing strategies to help students write more effectively. This traits-based approach to writing instruction utilizes classroom-based analytical assessments of student writing to meet the needs of teachers for diagnostic assessment data on which to base their instruction.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Similar to the developmental approach to literacy, the Beaver Dam Unified School District (BDUSD) mathematics curriculum utilizes two main programs: Everyday Math 2007, K-5 and Connected Math Project, 6-8. Collectively, these programs provide a seamless approach to mathematics instruction, assessment, and learning. These programs are aligned to National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) Standards and reflect a standards-based approach to mathematics that contains in-depth mathematics content, which fosters higher levels of problem-solving ability, conceptual understanding, and reasoning among students while balancing the important role of basic skills, computation, algorithms, and mathematical fluency. These programs encourage students to connect broad practice, apply, connect, and extend their mathematical understandings, as well as articulate their thinking. Collectively, these materials provide appropriate learning opportunities for all students (i.e. learning styles, multiple intelligences, challenging and remedial techniques). Finally, well-developed assessments and practical home connections are integrated to provide a well-rounded math experience. The primary goal of these standards-based programs is to be successful with teachers and students, and continue to move Beaver Dam Unified School District's math program forward while providing a solid transition to high school math programs.

In the past year, Lincoln teachers have collaborated to form math intervention groups to meet the needs of lower-performing and gifted students. Data from state assessments, Measures of Academic Progress assessments, and grade level assessments helped teachers to identify power standards at each grade level. From there, instruction is delivered with a laser-like focus. In addition, parent nights have been held at Lincoln Elementary to teach parents how to help their children in math.

4. Instructional Methods:

Differentiation is the key to the success of many of our students, but especially for our Special Education students and English Language Learners. Because Lincoln Elementary uses guided reading practices in language arts, reading is differentiated for all students at all times. Students are taught at the zone of proximal development to ensure maximum learning is taking place. Spelling is differentiated as well through modified spelling lists that are built around high frequency words and assessments in writing workshop. Staff development at Lincoln in 2008-2009 which focused on vocabulary instruction has taught the staff how to collaborate with the reading specialists and ELL tutors to ensure students are internalizing Tier 2 vocabulary words (based on Marzano's research.) Writing workshop instruction is tailored to the unique needs of each and every student through individual conferencing. Choice in reading and writing topics further motivates students and allows teachers to further individualize instruction.

Math instruction is delivered much in the same way as language arts. Teaching assistants and ELL tutors are strategically placed in classrooms to allow for differentiation. Small group instruction, math intervention groups, and gifted/talented assistance provide the opportunity for staff to differentiate according to needs. The Measures of Academic Progress assessment provides data for each math strand. From there, teachers and assistants can provide targeted instruction to meet the needs of students.

Grouping is dynamic and focused around very specific academic needs demonstrated by on-going assessment. Other modifications made are reducing the number of practice problems, adjusting the length of assignments, accessing the schema of each student, and using multi-modal teaching techniques.

Assistive technology provides additional support to special education, ELL, and those with occupational therapy needs by allowing them to access text they would normally not be able to read.

5. Professional Development:

A guaranteed, viable curriculum is essential to the high achievement of all students. Formative and summative assessments, and the collaborative conversations around those assessments, are the key to ensuring Lincoln Elementary's (and the BDUSD's) viable curriculum. A multi-tiered program of interventions (learned by the Lincoln staff during staff development time) help to ensure that students' instructional needs are being met and that confusions are not being habituated. Seamless transitions among grade levels are achieved through vertical and horizontal articulation of curriculum done during our monthly building meetings, in-service days, and our four late start staff development seminars. In addition, teachers have common plan time within and outside of the school day.

Building Consultation Team meetings allow teachers to work with specialists on best practices as well. During our Building Consultation Team meetings, building literacy teams and school-wide assessment walls prevent failure by creating a snapshot of the performance levels in reading of all Lincoln students.

Being a Professional Learning Community has created an atmosphere of collaboration and on-going conversations about language arts, math, and best practices. Team norms and protocols have been developed, common assessments are in place, and conversations among staff have become more reflective and anecdotal. As a learning team the Lincoln staff regularly collaborates to analyze student writing. This information combined with the state standards and district benchmarks allows the Lincoln team to make instructional decisions, especially when planning future units of instruction. Ten Lincoln teachers were able to attend the Wisconsin State Reading Association's writing institute in February. Title I monies were also used for staff to attend math and reading workshops that directly tied to school initiatives. Those teachers then implemented what was learned. They taught fellow teachers the new instructional strategies through the fore-mentioned staff development practices. Consulting with administration and lead teachers also helps to make the implementation of programs and strategies successful.

6. **School Leadership:**

Because Lincoln Elementary is striving to be a Professional Learning Community, the role of the principal is to advocate, nurture, and sustain a school culture conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. We try to remove barriers to student and staff learning through a number of practices. First, leadership is modeled according to school expectations. Being a reading specialist and literacy coach, the principal works collaboratively with the teachers on instructional techniques. Specialists regularly plan and teach units with teachers which guides future staff development, helps teachers try new techniques, and allows all adults to know the students as learners. Credibility is an essential trait for a leader.

Second, each school year begins with a shared vision. The leadership team develops and communicates that vision with all staff (including support staff) throughout the year. We breathe life into that vision by using the budget and building resources to work towards that vision. All our actions—from playground supervision, parent communication, staff development, and curriculum purchases—point to that vision.

Next, the Lincoln staff is encouraged to challenge the status quo and think outside the box. Several of our math and reading interventions started as the ideas of our teachers who took the impossible and made it happen. The role of principal is to remove the barrier of schedules, money, and time to make that vision happen. Data guides our decisions. Therefore, decisions and changes are not made randomly. However, risk taking is encouraged. By doing this, teachers are enabled to act and think on their own. Because Lincoln's culture is one of trust and collaboration, teachers are capable, committed, and have ownership in the success of our students.

Lincoln's academic successes (and needs) are a group effort. Our data wall lets us look at our students as a whole. When a group of students exhibit an academic need, we look to the resources in our building as a whole to improve achievement.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: WKCE-CRT

Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Publisher: McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Nov | Nov | Nov | Nov | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 79 | 82 | 97 | 69 | |
| % Advanced | 47 | 52 | 50 | 46 | |
| Number of students tested | 34 | 27 | 36 | 35 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 53 | 72 | 94 | 57 | |
| % Advanced | 38 | 43 | 63 | 38 | |
| Number of students tested | 13 | 14 | 16 | 21 | |
| 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:

The WKCE-CRT was not administered to 3rd grade students in Wisconsin until the fall of 2005. Prior to 2005, no state math assessment was given.

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Grade: 3 Test: WKCE-CRT
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Nov | Nov | Nov | Nov | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 79 | 93 | 91 | 75 | |
| % Advanced | 53 | 41 | 47 | 46 | |
| Number of students tested | 34 | 27 | 36 | 35 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 61 | 86 | 87 | 62 | |
| % Advanced | 38 | 29 | 56 | 38 | |
| Number of students tested | 13 | 14 | 16 | 21 | |
| 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:

The WKCE-CRT was not given in Wisconsin to 3rd grade students until the fall of 2005. Prior to 2005, the Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test was administered in the spring to 3rd grade students across the state.

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Grade: 4 Test: WKCE-CRT
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 86 | 94 | 72 | 90 | 65 |
| % Advanced | 36 | 43 | 49 | 24 | 43 |
| Number of students tested | 28 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 23 |
| 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 | 91 | 60 | 93 | |
| % Advanced | 25 | 55 | 40 | 14 | |
| Number of students tested | 16 | 11 | 20 | 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:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Grade: 4 Test: WKCE-CRT
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Nov | Nov | Nov | Nov | Nov |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 86 | 91 | 75 | 93 | 65 |
| % Advanced | 50 | 40 | 29 | 48 | 26 |
| Number of students tested | 28 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 23 |
| 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 | 76 | 81 | 60 | 93 | |
| % Advanced | 38 | 36 | 20 | 50 | |
| Number of students tested | 16 | 11 | 20 | 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 | | | 10 | | |
| % Advanced | | | 0 | | |
| Number of students tested | | | 10 | | |
| 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:

Subject: Mathematics
Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Grade: 5 Test: WKCE-CRT
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 97 | 74 | 88 | 72 | |
| % Advanced | 53 | 42 | 38 | 28 | |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 38 | 34 | 25 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 69 | 88 | | |
| % Advanced | 64 | 30 | 41 | | |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 23 | 17 | | |
| 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 | | 10 | | | |
| % Advanced | | 0 | | | |
| Number of students tested | | 10 | | | |
| 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:

The WKCE-CRT was not administered to 5th grade students in Wisconsin until the fall of 2005. #6 subgroup is Asian/Pacific Islander.

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Grade: 5 Test: WKCE-CRT
Publisher: McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 91 | 78 | 88 | 64 | |
| % Advanced | 33 | 39 | 29 | 28 | |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 38 | 34 | 25 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 90 | 74 | 83 | | |
| % Advanced | 45 | 35 | 18 | | |
| Number of students tested | 11 | 23 | 17 | | |
| 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 | | 20 | | | |
| % Advanced | | 0 | | | |
| Number of students tested | | 10 | | | |
| 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:

The WKCE-CRT was not administered to 5th grade students in Wisconsin until the fall of 2005. #6 subgroup is Asian/Pacific Islander.