***Revised 4.1.05***

***2004-2005 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program***

*U.S. Department of Education*

# Cover Sheet

Type of School: _X_ Elementary __ Middle __ High __ K-12

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

Official School Name Mt. Eccles Elementary
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 200 Adams Street P.O. Box 140
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Cordova, AK 99574-0140
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County N/A School Code Number* 120020

Telephone ( 907 ) 424-3236 Fax ( 907 ) 424-3117

Website/URL http:/cordova.schoolaccess.net/mteccles E-mail fwicks@cordova.schoolaccess.net

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

_____ Date_____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Mr. Don Clark
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Cordova School District Tel. ( 907 ) 424-3265

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

_____ Date_____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mrs. Martha Nichols
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, 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.*

# PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2004-2005 school years.

3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.

4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1999 and has not received the 2003 or 2004 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award.*

5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

6. The 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 the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

# PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

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

1. Number of schools in the district:

| | |
|---|---|
| _1___ | Elementary schools |
| _____ | Middle schools |
| _____ | Junior high schools |
| _1___ | Junior / Senior High schools |
| _____ | Other |
| _2___ | TOTAL |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: ____$6859.00_____

   Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: ____$4576.00_____

**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. ___1___Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

   ___5___If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

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

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PreK** | 12 | 5 | **17** | **7** | | | |
| **K** | 18 | 18 | **36** | **8** | | | |
| **1** | 16 | 11 | **27** | **9** | | | |
| **2** | 18 | 14 | **32** | **10** | | | |
| **3** | 15 | 13 | **28** | **11** | | | |
| **4** | 14 | 19 | **33** | **12** | | | |
| **5** | 20 | 16 | **36** | **Other** | | | |
| **6** | 22 | 23 | 45 | | | | |
| | | | **TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →** | | | | 254 |

*[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]*

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:

67 % White
1 % Black or African American
2 % Hispanic or Latino
17 % Asian/Pacific Islander
13 % American Indian/Alaskan Native
**100% Total**

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

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 21 %

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **(1)** | Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 36 |
| **(2)** | Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 17 |
| **(3)** | Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 53 |
| **(4)** | Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 254 |
| **(5)** | Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4) | .21 |
| **(6)** | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 21 |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 12 %
30 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 4
Specify languages: Tigalog, Illagona, Manderian, and Spanish

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

Total number students who qualify: 91

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: ____17__%
____43__Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

| | |
|---|---|
| __2_Autism | ____Orthopedic Impairment |
| ____Deafness | _4__Other Health Impaired |
| ____Deaf-Blindness | _9__Specific Learning Disability |
| __1_Emotional Disturbance | _25_Speech or Language Impairment |
| __2_Hearing Impairment | ____Traumatic Brain Injury |
| __1_Mental Retardation | ____Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| ____Multiple Disabilities | |

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 teacher's | ___14___ | ___1____ |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | ___2____ | ____0____ |
| Paraprofessionals | ___7____ | ____2____ |
| Support staff | ___6____ | ____5____ |
| Total number | ___30___ | ___8___ |

12. Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio: ___17____

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

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily student attendance | 93.8% | 94.2% | 93.8% | 93.1% | % |
| Daily teacher attendance | 96.9% | 94.6% | 96% | 94% | % |
| Teacher turnover rate | ^12% | *11% | *12% | 0% | *6% |
| Student dropout rate (middle/high) | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Student drop-off rate (high school) | N/A% | N/A% | N/A% | N/A% | N/A% |

* A teacher retired. ^ 2 positions eliminated.

14. **(*High Schools Only*)** Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2004 are doing as of September 2004.

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

# PART III - SUMMARY

**Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 600 words). Include at least a summary of the school's mission or vision in the statement**.

Mt. Eccles Elementary School is located in the seaside community of Cordova, Alaska. Landlocked and remotely located in Prince William Sound, Cordova has a winter population of approximately 2500 people. The main economic base is supported by the fishing industry. Our population ranges from families that have been residents for generations, to government and military families who are stationed for several years, to the families involved in the seasonal work of fishing. Our school's population is a reflection of our town's diversity, and our school's success is an indication of our community's commitment to the education and success of our youth.

Mt. Eccles is a pre-kindergarten through sixth grade elementary school, providing a quality program for 254 students. We use the expertise of thirteen classroom teachers, two special education teachers, a physical education teacher, a music teacher, and a part time art instructor as well as paraprofessionals in the areas of limited English proficient student assistance, technology, and individualized instruction. Our staff, along with community volunteers, parents and school board members, work together to ensure that Cordova's youth experience success and are responsible citizens. Our school is characterized by a safe learning environment; the highest quality staff; a full array of academic and extracurricular offerings; challenging curricula for each student and a continued pursuit of excellence.

"The mission of Cordova School District, a premier education community integrated with and enhanced by the unique realities of our surroundings, is to ensure Cordova's youth experience success and are responsible citizens, through a system characterized by: a safe learning environment; highest quality staff; a full array of academic, elective and extra-curricular offerings, challenging curricula for each student; continued pursuit of excellence; and an active involvement of parents and community."

Our vision statement includes the following: "The Cordova School District is committed to providing opportunities to challenge students to discover, set and pursue their goals. Students shall possess the academic and communication skills, character, personal discipline, and cultural awareness to contribute as responsible citizens. Furthermore, the district seeks to foster a continued desire for learning beyond the classroom and graduation."

Mt. Eccles has strengths that are rarely found and often sought in any quality school. The continuity of our staff shows a long term commitment to, and an investment in, the students and community of Cordova. Five of Mt. Eccles' thirteen classroom teachers are alumni of Cordova School District. This number embodies the community's investment and the result of the investment in our youth.

Our staff is a team in which collaboration and support of each person's talents, expertise and enthusiasm is the standard. This staff has stayed abreast of past and current changes in education, and has strategically selected innovations to enrich the curriculum without discarding the basic foundation of a sound elementary education.

Our academic program includes: technology, physical education, music, art, and band. Additional activities include: Hunter Safety, Geography Bee, Future Problem Solvers, Battle of the Books and the State Spelling Bee. We also collaborate with the community to continue our commitment to education and the youth of Cordova through several enrichment programs. Mt. Eccles works with the Native Village of Eyak to provide an introduction to the Alutiiq language, the native language of Prince William Sound. We work in unison with the City of Cordova which provides staff not only with the school building, but also the use of the city library, museum, pool and other facilities. Mt. Eccles has a partnership with the Prince William Sound Science Center and the U.S. Forest Service who provide the school with monthly hands-on science experiences and field trips. The staff also collaborates with health professionals, law enforcement, and the local family resource center to develop life and safety skills.

Students, staff, and faculty of Mt. Eccles are continually challenging each other, and themselves, to not accept our current level of success, but to always raise the bar of excellence.

# PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Describe in one page the meaning of the school's assessment results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics in such a way that someone not intimately familiar with the tests can easily understand them. Explain disparities among subgroups. If the school participates in the state assessment system, briefly explain the state performance levels and the performance level that demonstrates meeting the standard. Provide the website where information on the state assessment system may be found.**

Mt. Eccles Elementary has not adopted a specific standardized school assessment form. However, our staff uses a variety of informal and formal assessment tools, depending on grade level, to assess and subsequently guide instruction. In addition, Special Education referrals are made as students are identified in need of additional services. Student progress is summarized in report cards, which each grade level completes on a quarterly basis. We also conduct bi-annual parent-teacher conferences to discuss student achievement.

The kindergarten report card is a skill based report card that is arranged as a checklist with a 1-4 developmental scale, one being needs to make a greater effort, two being needs more time to develop skill, three being satisfactory use of skill and four being outstanding use of skill. The first, second and third grade report cards are categorized by subject that are sub-divided by specific skills. These primary report cards are marked with a proficiency scale denoted by the symbols -, S-, S, S+, and +. Students that score in the S, S+, and + range are considered proficient. The fourth, fifth and sixth grade report cards are marked with letter grades on the standard A-F scale. Additional indicators for proficiency include classroom and state assessments.

In general, we have noticed that the bi-lingual sub-group of students has the most challenges in meeting expectations within our classrooms and the district. However, on the 2002-03 State Assessments this sub-group performed well and met Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) as determined by the State of Alaska, in both math and reading.

On average, over 80% of our students have scored consistently in the proficient or above range in reading and math in the past five years. The school reviews the test results of each student and makes adjustments in curriculum to meet each child's needs. Our sub-groups are also performing at the proficient level with the exception of a few students at each grade level who are receiving additional help through individual or small group settings.

Mt. Eccles Elementary administers the Terra Nova standardized achievement tests to Grades Two, Four and Five, and participates in the State of Alaska Benchmark Examinations in Grades Three and Six, as mandated by the State of Alaska. The State of Alaska has identified performance standards that are tracked and reported publicly on the State Department of Education website: www.educ.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/home.html. These performance standards are broken down into an Alaska Performance Index based on an estimate of the number of items a student would respond to correctly if 100 items were given. The State of Alaska has also identified Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) for each subject area as well as Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) for each school to attain on these exams. In 2002-03, Mt. Eccles achieved both AMO and AYP in all subject areas and every subgroup but one. This subgroup was comprised of one student.

Mt. Eccles enjoys high academic success because of the high expectations of our staff. We expect our students to perform well and work hard to ensure that they will succeed. To review assessments go to: http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/results.html point to the year and select the report from the pop up menu. Select district; click on the side arrow and scroll to Cordova City School District, click submit.

**2. Show in one-half page (approximately 300 words) how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.**

Assessment data is synthesized from a variety of sources, including standardized testing, classroom grades, performance and test scores and other specialized evaluations such as special education, and related service evaluations and second language testing. This information is applied to a variety of decisions with an attempt to prevent any single assessment or numerical value from being the sole designator or deciding factor.

When considering which students should be encouraged to attend district provided summer school, assessment data is pulled from standardized testing (scores near or below the 25$^{th}$ percentile on Terra Nova tests and 'below proficient' benchmark scores), classroom grades and performance, teacher recommendations, special education data and discussions with parents. Assessment data is also used by the various grant programs in tracking student progress and focusing services and instruction.

With regard to special education, assessment data is used to qualify (or not qualify) students for services, and, once qualified, the data is included in the overall picture when finding the best placement for students, including services needed to allow students adequate access to their education, and in annual reviews and three-year evaluations.

Evaluations of bilingual students (English Language Learners) are used to assess English language proficiency and thus a student's placement in the general classroom and need for additional assistance and exposure to English.

Teachers consider standardized assessment scores (in addition to classroom evaluations and performance) to place students in the most appropriate instructional environment for math and reading, and in determining whether a child needs referral for special education or 504 consideration. Teachers also use this data to assess the efficacy of classroom programs and overall school curriculum. For example, if data shows a subject area where a large number of students obtain low scores, teachers would re-evaluate and adjust their programs and curriculum accordingly. Several years ago, assessments indicated an overall weakness in our student's writing scores, and over the past few years, teachers at Mt. Eccles have worked to improve writing proficiency among our students.

Not all assessments are standardized. Teachers also use a number of rubrics (for example with regard to the six traits of writing), portfolios, and observational data to indicate and measure academic success.

**3. Describe in one-half page how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.**

Our school communicates students' performance to parents, students, and the community in a variety of ways. One of the traditional methods of communicating with students and parents is through quarterly report cards and periodic progress reports. Along with the quarterly report cards, parent/teacher conferences are held at the end of both first and third quarters. The school district has also implemented Edline, a computer program which allows parents to view their student's progress online. Via Edline, both students and parents have immediate feedback available on the students' efforts. Individual students' standardized test scores are communicated to parents via reports that are sent home. Every student's cumulative record contains an easy to read summary of each year's standardized test score.

The standardized test scores are also used to communicate with the public how the school is doing as a whole. The Cordova School District Report Card is available to anyone who is interested. The report gives information on the district's goals as well as presenting a breakdown of how many students passed each section of the standardized tests.

Many teachers post progress charts in their classrooms that keep a running tally of skills mastery and other achievements. This provides a constant visual reminder and reinforcement of individual progress.

Other types of non-traditional communication methods include monthly news letters generated by the principals and the superintendent. These letters keep parents and students up-to-date of important school information. The school also uses the local newspaper to present school information to the general community. Also, once a year the school hosts an Indian Education Public Hearing where the community is invited to come and hear how students are progressing and achieving.

**4. Describe in one-half page how the school has shared and will continue to share its successes with other schools.**

Geographically, Cordova is in a unique situation. We are not connected by road to any other school district. We do not have the advantage of regular face-to-face meetings with teachers from other elementary schools. Our administrators and special education teachers attend annual statewide conferences in their disciplines, and these conferences provide an informal, yet valuable avenue for sharing

experiences with rural Alaskan schools that face similar challenges. School board members also represent Cordova at statewide conferences and have their own network of communication with other districts. Teachers from Mt. Eccles have attended conferences in a wide array of disciplines from developing math benchmark tests to music education to autism and Asperger's training. Each of these venues has provided Cordova's educators with an opportunity to informally connect with others in the field.

Although most of our sharing takes place in other locations, we are also able to share with and learn from other districts through organizations such as Alaska's Special Education Service Agency (SESA) and the State Mentoring Program. When SESA representatives come to Cordova to provide services and build programs for special needs students, they bring a wealth of experience and information from other districts. In turn, they share the successes we have had with the other districts they serve. The State Mentoring Program operates in a similar fashion. While we do not orchestrate this exchange of information, we benefit from and help others as a result of it.

Another informal exchange involves Pen Pals from other districts in Alaska as well as in the lower 48. The teachers that participate in this student program have found it to be a surprisingly beneficial exchange of both curricular material and teaching techniques as they communicate with educators from across the nation.

Our greatest opportunity for reaching others is, of course, the Internet. Mt. Eccles maintains a website available at http://cordova.ccsd.schoolaccess.net/mteccles/. Items of interest on the site are the principal's monthly newsletter called "In Touch" and our monthly school calendar which highlight many of the programs and activities that occur at the school.

# PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Describe in one page the school's curriculum. Outline in several sentences the core of each curriculum area and show how all students are engaged with significant content based on high standards. Include art and foreign languages in the descriptions (foreign language instruction as a part of the core curriculum is an eligibility requirement in grades seven and higher).**

Reading is the primary focus of the curriculum at Mt. Eccles Elementary. In the primary grades students are taught how to read by using a combination of phonics and literature-based instruction. Teachers apply the Slingerlands multi-sensory approach, literacy centers, and themes to two different reading series. In the upper grades we emphasize comprehension strategies such as drawing inferences, predicting, and identifying important information. These skills are tied in with novels, basal stories, and content area reading and note-taking. Connections with reading are shared in literature circles, parent-led groups, interest groups, and sometimes ability or need-based groups.

We celebrate reading at Mt. Eccles in many ways. Our school participates in the Battle of the Books, where groups of students are challenged to read a selection of several books and compete with each other on their knowledge of those books. Students visit our city library or use the school's expanding leveled library. Many classrooms also have shelves full of fiction and non-fiction books for students to use during daily silent reading time or to take home and read. Students can also purchase books at our semi-annual book fairs. Classes of older students mentor younger readers in a "reading buddy" program. At our weekly assembly, our principal draws names for a free book selection. A culminating celebration is our Spring Book Carnival where all students participate in games and receive free books.

Just as reading is integrated into our curriculum in all areas, so is writing. Students' writing is often posted in the hallways for others to read. Students have journals for informal writing and are evaluated using the seven traits of writing on more formal pieces. Upper elementary students also use Power Point to publish their finished research projects and share them with invited parents and the public.

Math instruction is a mix of facts, basal instruction, hands-on manipulation, writing, problem-solving, and group activities. Many teachers use AIMS activities which integrate Math and Science standards. Math is made to be relevant to the students' lives by having them write and create their own problems. Problem solving is taught at all grade levels. In fact, students at Mt. Eccles have participated at the national level in Future Problem Solvers competition almost every year and last year competed at the international level.

Our science program complements all our disciplines while engaging students in our unique environment. Lessons, projects, and units are mapped out from kindergarten through grade six. Partners from our community such as the Prince William Sound Science Center and the U.S. Forest Service work hand-in-hand with our teachers and students.

Our Social Studies curriculum moves students from learning about their families, to their communities, their country and their world. At the lower levels students have many visitors from the community come to their classrooms to explain their contributions to Cordova. We often have an elder from our Native community come in to teach the 4th graders the Eyak language. Students in the 6th grade participate in a month long project learning about a country of their choice. This project culminates in an International Day celebration with foods prepared by the students from their countries. Local, national and world current events are also discussed in all grades.

We value our P.E. and water safety programs where students get instruction for an hour a week in both areas. Music, both instrumental and vocal, and computer instruction are given weekly as well. Throughout the grades we do many group and individual projects that encourage art and we have an artist in the school who instructs students on hour each month.

We are such a small community here at Mt. Eccles that we truly leave "no child behind." We can meet the needs of students in our small classes with various support services: Migrant Education, ELL, Title Funding, Resource Room, and Special Education Services Agency. We are currently mapping our curriculum so that all lessons are aligned with standards and all teachers know what they need to teach. How to teach those lessons is a decision left to the individual teacher. Because of this, teachers have more ownership in their lessons. Our teachers are extremely committed to keeping the standards high at Mt. Eccles. Several of our teachers are Mt. Eccles graduates or have taught the parents of the students in their classroom. You can see the high academic and behavioral standards set at Mt. Eccles Elementary when you walk in our school.

**2a. (Elementary Schools) Describe in one-half page the school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.**

The reading curriculum at Mt. Eccles is comprised of a variety of methods designed to provide a balanced approach to literacy. For example, in the primary grades we teach reading using a combination of phonics and literature-based instruction, using different methods such as the Slingerlands multi-sensory approach, literacy centers, thematic teaching, a basal series with a strong phonics component and a literature anthology series with supporting activities. In the upper grades we use comprehension strategy instruction to provide students with the necessary skills to make meaningful connections between self, text and world, while engaging with the various texts they read, from trade book to text book. Some of these comprehension strategies include inferring, predicting, summarizing and finding the main idea. These skills are applied to fiction, non-fiction, novels, basal stories, content area reading and note-taking.

Students participate in literature circles, parent-led small reading groups, interest groups, and occasionally ability or needs-based groups.

We chose these methods to ensure that we provide all students with the scaffolding they need while keeping in mind multiple intelligences and learning styles, including visual, auditory, and kinesthetic. By providing varied instruction in many types of curriculums, we are able to provide our students with a balanced literacy program that enables them to become proficient readers.

**2b. (Secondary Schools) Describe in one-half page the school's English language curriculum, including efforts the school makes to improve the reading skills of students who read below grade level.**

N/A

**3. Describe in one-half page one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.**

Science is a vital part of our curriculum program and is integrated with other disciplines. All our teachers have been involved in science curriculum mapping. These instructional guides begin at the kindergarten level and proceed through grade six at Mt. Eccles Elementary. These are living documents. They are continually being updated as new activities and units are changed or implemented. Included in these maps are unit names, essential questions, content, skills assessments, lessons and Alaska Standards.

Students are challenged through grade level science texts, trade books, lab activities, technology, and community partners while keeping in mind multiple intelligences and learning styles, including visual, auditory, and kinesthetic. Our skills include: observe, predict, record, analyze, communicate, compare and contrast, experiment, infer, hypothesize and measure.

Because our science program emphasizes our local surroundings, Mt. Eccles students learn about the environment of Prince William Sound. The Prince William Sound Science Center partners with the U.S. Forest Service to create the "Discovery Room" which students visit once a month. The Discovery Room centers all hands-on activities around an annual theme such as *salmon* or *water* to teach physics, chemistry, earth and life science.

**4. Describe in one-half page the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.**

Mt. Eccles Elementary School uses a variety of instructional methods to teach and improve student learning. Because there is no one "right" method for teaching a particular lesson, our teachers use several criteria to help decide the best method of instruction to meet the needs of all learning styles. Foundational instruction methods in our primary classrooms such as the Slingerland model have proven to assist our students in becoming quality readers. Additional supplemental methods are integrated into our reading program. Literacy programs such as self selected reading, "Reading Counts" centers, leveled books and Reading A to Z provide the framework for quality reading in all disciplines. We also use the four block method, parent group reading, small guided reading groups, and buddy reading. Our math instruction emphasis is on presenting lessons that make sense. We want our students to understand each concept not just memorize it. Students are regularly assessed as they progress through the school year.

Our subjects are not a set of isolated topics but rather an integrated whole. Our teachers use direct teaching, cooperative learning, lecture with discussion, brainstorming, small group interaction, role playing, and student led assignments throughout the course of a school week. In upper grades, one of our goals is to continue to move from a teacher-directed instructional method to a student-directed model.

Mt. Eccles Elementary is a quality school because our teachers use a broad scope of instructional methods and are continually researching and implementing new best practices that have proven successful in student learning.

**5. Describe in one-half page the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.**

The staff development plan for the Cordova School District, which includes Mt. Eccles Elementary School, is proactive and collegial in nature. We are currently moving towards having all our staff highly qualified through several ways, including courses available at our local community college.

Additionally, the staff is completing work on developing curriculum maps in the content area of science. They will begin work on developing curriculum maps in the content area of math this spring followed by Language Arts and social studies in subsequent years.

Our staff has also been involved in numerous training in-services and workshops to help them convert from pencil and paper methods of taking attendance and processing student grade reports to computerized methods. In addition to this training the staff has also received extensive training in using Edline, an information software program designed to help improve communication between staff, students and parents.

Lastly, we are updating our District's strategic plan. The staff, students and community are actively involved in building systems under the following strategies to improve student achievement:

#1: We will provide rich, continuous curricula and programs that meet individual needs and maintain our standard of excellence.
#2: We will provide each student with the safest possible learning environment.
#3: We will offer each student a system of support that promotes individual success.
#4: We will have the most effective staff to accomplish our mission and objectives.
#5: We will ensure a culture of goal setting and achieving.
#6: We will ensure the community is integral to our success.
#7: We will actively integrate student leadership, teamwork and citizenship throughout the educational experience.

The Strategic Plan will be completed in April of 2005. Then over the next three to five years we will work to implement each of the items into our School District.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject__Reading____ Grade__3___ Test___Benchmark Exams_____

Edition/Publication Year_1997__ Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below/Not Proficient | 10.3 | 10- | 20- | 17.5 | 14.3 |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 89.7 | 90+ | 80+ | 82.5 | 85.7 |
| % At Advanced | 10.3 | 32.3 | 30. | 15 | 25.7 |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 31 | 32 | 44 | 40 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93.8 | 90.9 | 87.5 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advance / Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % At or Above Basic | | | | | |
| % At or Above Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 26.2 | 26.1 | 25.4 | 28.8 | 27.5 |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 73.8 | 73.9 | 74.6 | 71.2 | 72.5 |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject____MATH__ Grade__3_ Test_Benchmark_Exams_____

Edition/Publication Year_1997__ Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 17.2 | 10- | 20- | 15 | 17.1 |
| % Advance / Proficient | 82.8 | 90+ | 80+ | 85 | 82.9 |
| % At Advanced | 34.5 | 64.5 | 36.7 | 45 | 45.7 |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 31 | 32 | 44 | 40 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93.8 | 90.9 | 87.5 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % At or Above Basic | | | | | |
| % At or Above Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 27.8 | 28.2 | 29.2 | 33.7 | 35 |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 72.2 | 71.8 | 70.8 | 66.3 | 65 |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject__Writing___ Grade__3___ Test_____Benchmark Exams_____

Edition/Publication Year_1997__ Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 20.7 | 10- | 23.3 | 38.5 | 25.7 |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 79.3 | 90+ | 76.7 | 61.5 | 74.3 |
| % At Advanced | 3.4 | 12.9 | 6.7 | 5.1 | 8.6 |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 31 | 32 | 44 | 40 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93.8 | 88.6 | 87.5 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % At or Above Basic | | | | | |
| % At or Above Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 41.2 | 40.2 | 42 | 46.5 | 51.2 |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 58.8 | 59.8 | 58 | 53.5 | 48.8 |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject____Reading____ Grade___4_ Test____Cat_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 10- | 10- | 12.2 | 6.1 | 24.4 |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 90+ | 90+ | 87.8 | 93.9 | 75.6 |
| % At Advanced | 51.4 | 37.1 | 34.1 | 60.6 | 48.8 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 36 | 43 | 65 | 45 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 97.2 | 95 | 94 | 91 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 29.2 | 28.7 | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 70.8 | 71.3 | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject___Writing_ Grade___4__ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 10- | 10- | 7.3 | 0 | 17.1 |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 90+ | 90+ | 92.7 | 100 | 82.9 |
| % At Advanced | 62.9 | 45.7 | 43.9 | 56.3 | 34.1 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 36 | 43 | 35 | 45 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 97.22 | 95 | 91 | 91 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 23.1 | 23.2 | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 76.9 | 76.8 | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject____Math_____ Grade__4__ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 10- | 10- | 4.9 | 6.1 | 17.1 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 90+ | 90+ | 95.1 | 93.9 | 82.9 |
| % At Advanced | 60 | 51.4 | 48.8 | 63.6 | 43.9 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 36 | 43 | 35 | 45 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 97.22 | 95 | 91 | 91 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % At or Above Basic | | | | | |
| % At or Above Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % At or Above Basic | | | | | |
| % At or Above Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 34.6 | 35.2 | | | |
| %Advanced/Proficient | 65.4 | 64.8 | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject____Reading_____ Grade_5___ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 10- | 10- | 3.7 | | 11.8 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 90+ | 90+ | 96.3 | | 88.2 |
| % At Advanced | 50 | 42.6 | 55.6 | | 44.1 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 47 | 29 | 42 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93 | 95 | 94 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 29. | 29.8 | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 71.0 | 70.2 | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject___Writing__ Grade__5__ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 10- | 10- | 7.4 | | 8.8 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 90+ | 90+ | 92.6 | | 91.2 |
| % At Advanced | 38.9 | 23.4 | 55.6 | | 41.2 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 47 | 29 | 42 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93 | 95 | 94 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 22.9 | 23.8 | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 77.1 | 76.2 | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject___Math_____ Grade__5__ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 13.9 | 21.3 | 3.7 | | 5.9 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 86.1 | 78.7 | 96.3 | | 94.1 |
| % At Advanced | 55.6 | 53.2 | 40.7 | | 47.1 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 47 | 29 | 42 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93 | 95 | 94 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 35.4 | 36.4 | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 64.6 | 63.6 | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject___Reading_____ Grade_6__ Test___Benchmark Exams_____

Edition/Publication Year_1997__ Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 17.4 | 10- | 25 | 27.5 | 9.5 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 82.6 | 90+ | 75 | 72.5 | 90.5 |
| % At Advanced | 54.3 | 65.5 | 50 | 50 | 70.7 |
| Number of students tested | 46 | 29 | 45 | 41 | 43 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 97.8 | 97.6 | 95.3 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 29.8 | 30.2 | 30.2 | 30.6 | 30.1 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 70.2 | 69.8 | 69.8 | 69.4 | 69.9 |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject___Writing____ Grade__6__ Test_____Benchmark Exams_____

Edition/Publication Year_1997__ Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 23.9 | 10- | 20.5 | 22.5 | 12.2 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 76.1 | 90+ | 79.5 | 77.5 | 87.8 |
| % At Advanced | 15.2 | 41.4 | 29.5 | 27.5 | 35.0 |
| Number of students tested | 46 | 29 | 45 | 41 | 43 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 97.8 | 97.6 | 95.3 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 23.8 | 25.0 | 24.5 | 27.0 | 27.8 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 76.2 | 75.0 | 75.5 | 73.0 | 72.2 |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

Subject____Math_____ Grade__6__ Test_____Benchmark Exams_____

Edition/Publication Year_1997__ Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 21.7 | 10.3 | 15.9 | 22.5 | 19.5 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 78.3 | 89.7 | 84.1 | 77.5 | 80.5 |
| % At Advanced | 39.1 | 51.7 | 36.4 | 35 | 50 |
| Number of students tested | 46 | 29 | 45 | 41 | 43 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 97.8 | 976 | 95.3 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1._____ (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2._____(specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | | | | | |
| % Advanced/Proficient | | | | | |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **STATE SCORES** | | | | | |
| % Below / Not Proficient | 35.4 | 35.7 | 36.1 | 37.1 | 37.8 |
| % Advanced/Proficient | 64.6 | 64.3 | 63.9 | 62.9 | 62.2 |
| % At Advanced | | | | | |

## DISPLAYING ASSESSMENTS
## REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

[ *Data Display Table for Reading (language arts or English) and Mathematics*]

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

Subject___Reading___ Grade_4__ Test___CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores _X__ Percentiles____

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Total Score | 75 | 70 | 70 | 84 | 67 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 36 | 43 | 35 | 45 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 97.2 | 95 | 94 | 91 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1.Alaska Native (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| 2.Asian Pacific Islander (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 3 |
| 3.White (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 23 | 26 | 27 | 21 | 28 |
| 4. Other (Black/Hispanic) (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

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

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NATIONAL MEAN SCORE** | 74 | 66 | 66 | 82 | 68 |
| **NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Subject____Writing_ Grade__4_ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores _X__ Percentiles____

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Total Score | 75 | 70 | 70 | 84 | 67 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 36 | 43 | 35 | 45 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 97.2 | 95 | 91 | 91 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1.Alaska Native (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| 2.Asian Pacific Islander (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 3 |
| 3.White (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 23 | 26 | 27 | 21 | 28 |
| 4. Other (Black/Hispanic) (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

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

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NATIONAL MEAN SCORE** | 73 | 63 | 67 | 83 | 58 |
| **NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Subject____MATH_ Grade__4_ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores _X__ Percentiles____

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Total Score | 75 | 70 | 70 | 84 | 67 |
| Number of students tested | 35 | 36 | 43 | 35 | 45 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 97.2 | 95 | 91 | 91 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1.Alaska Native (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| 2.Asian Pacific Islander (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 6 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 3 |
| 3.White (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 23 | 26 | 27 | 21 | 28 |
| 4. Other (Black/Hispanic) (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

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

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NATIONAL MEAN SCORE** | 77 | 75 | 70 | 88 | 70 |
| **NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Subject__Reading_____ Grade__5__ Test___CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores _X_ Percentiles____

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Total Score (Total Battery) | 78 | 66.7 | 79.3 | 73 | 72 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 47 | 29 | 42 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93 | 95 | 94 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1.Alaska Native (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 7 |
| 2.Asian Pacific Islander (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| 3.White (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 26 | 30 | 18 | 25 | 24 |
| 4. Other (Black/Hispanic) (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

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

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NATIONAL MEAN SCORE** | 79 | 65 | 79 | 69.5 | 68 |
| **NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Subject____Writing__ Grade__5__ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores __X Percentiles____

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Total Score (Total Battery) | 78 | 66.7 | 78 | 73 | 72 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 47 | 29 | 42 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93 | 95 | 94 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1.Alaska Native (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 7 |
| 2.Asian Pacific Islander (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| 3.White (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 26 | 30 | 18 | 25 | 24 |
| 4. Other (Black/Hispanic) (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

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

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NATIONAL MEAN SCORE** | 77 | 68.5 | 77 | 64.5 | 67 |
| **NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Subject____Math__ Grade__5__ Test_____CAT_____

Edition/Publication Year 1992, 2000, and 2001__Publisher CTB / McGraw – Hill Inc.

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores __X Percentiles____

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing month | Feb | Mar | Mar | Mar | Apr |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Total Score (Total Battery) | 78 | 66.7 | 78 | 73 | 72 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 47 | 29 | 42 | 36 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 93 | 95 | 94 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1.Alaska Native (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 7 |
| 2.Asian Pacific Islander (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| 3.White (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 26 | 30 | 18 | 25 | 24 |
| 4. Other (Black/Hispanic) (specify subgroup) | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

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

| | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **NATIONAL MEAN SCORE** | 73 | 65.3 | 73 | 79.5 | 75 |
| **NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |