Annual Report to the Public
Miami-Yoder School District JT-60
For the 2008-09 School Year

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Colorado State Law and Federal Law, under the No Child Left Behind legislation, requires each school district to submit, to its patrons, a report that includes data on student testing, student growth, adequate yearly progress of each school, and a host of other topics that may be found in the Table of Contents of this document.

It is the intent of the Miami-Yoder School District to present the data in the format that was created by the Colorado Department of Education. Many of the reports that you will read came directly from the Colorado Department of Education's website. In completing this report, the district has followed the format or rubric provide as a guide by the Colorado Department of Education. This is the simplest way we have to allow you to examine the district's performance for the 2007-08 school year. Additionally, much of the data allows the reader to review previous years performance and compare that performance with the 2007-08 school year data.

This information is being supplied to patrons in two separate formats; the district's website, www.miamiyoder.org or it may be requested in paper format from the district's administration office by calling 719-478-2206 or by requesting a copy in writing by mail: Miami-Yoder School District JT-60, 420 South Rush Road, Rush, CO 80833.

We hope that you find the information informative and should you have questions regarding the report please feel free to contact any school district administrator by phone, mail, or email.

Elementary Principal- Mrs. Sharon Webb- 719-478-2186, extension 612, 420 South Rush Road, Rush, CO 80833 or swebb@miamiyoder.org

Secondary Principal- Mr. Sean Shields- 719-478-2186, extension 611, 420 South Rush Road, Rush, CO 80833 or sshields@miamiyoder.org

Superintendent of Schools- Mr. Richard C. Walter, Sr.- 719-478-2206, extension 624, 420 South Rush Road, Rush, CO 80833 or rwalter@miamiyoder.org

Sincerely,

Richard C. Walter, Sr.
Superintendent of Schools
Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Table of Contents

District Improvement Plan Progress Report	**Pages 3-22**
Assessment Data	**Pages 23–52**
Accountability Data	**Page 53-61**
Teacher Data	**Pages 63-65**

Miami-Yoder School District #60 JT
School Improvement Plan

District Mission Statement

Miami-Yoder School District 60-JT is a partnership of professionals, parents and community members dedicated to providing a rigorous and challenging curriculum in a positive, safe environment, providing opportunities which foster and encourage individuals to become successful, productive citizens.

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 1.1: The district has established clear goals that support improving student achievement. (Reading)
Achievement Goal: A- The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Reading** will increase from: **70.2%** to **75%** in grade levels **3-5.** **B-** The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Reading** will increase from: **60%** to **75%** in grade levels **6-8.** **C-** The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Reading** will increase from: **71.8%** to **75%** in grade levels **9-10.**
Growth Goal: A- The median growth percentile in **Reading** will increase from: **44 percentile** to **52 percentile** at the elementary level. **B-** The median growth percentile in **Reading** will increase from: **43 percentile** to **52 percentile** at the middle school level. **C-** The median growth percentile in **Reading** will increase from: **57.5 percentile** to **62 percentile** at the high school level.
Gaps Goals: A- The median growth percentile in **Reading** for elementary minority students is **60.4** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **50.0.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **5 percentile** points with an increase in white population by **10%** and minority populations by **5%**. (The minority population currently scores higher than the white population in the elementary school, thus we have a reverse achievement gap.) The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Reading** will increase from: **69.2 % to 79.2 %** for elementary minority students. **B-** The median growth percentile in **Reading** for middle school minority students is **32** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **42.0.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **5 percentile** points with an increase in minority populations by **10%** and white populations by **5%**. The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Reading** will increase from: **50.0 % to 60.0%** for middle school minority students. **C-** The median growth percentile in **Reading** for high school minority students is **xxx** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **43.5.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **51.75 percentile** points with an increase in minority populations by **10%** and white populations by **5%**. The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Reading** will increase from: **55.6 % to 65 %** for high school minority students.
ARRA Fund Use and Buff Time: Students scoring partially proficient or unsatisfactory are required to use a ½ hour period of time during Middle School and High School lunch periods for remediation in reading. **ARRA funds have been used to contract a Literacy and Math Coach to assist teachers and students during buff time and regular class time. ARRA funds have been used to contract another Special Education Teacher to work with both middle and high school students, exclusively. After school tutoring provided on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons, with school transportation for all at-risk or underperforming students in grades 3-12.**

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 1.2: The district has established clear goals that support improving student achievement. (Writing)
Achievement Goal: A- The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Writing** will increase from: **52.2%** to **62%** in grade levels **3-5.** **B-** The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Writing** will increase from: **60%** to **70%** in grade levels **6-8.** **C-** The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Writing** will increase from: **71.8%** to **75%** in grade levels **9-10.**
Growth Goal: A- The median growth percentile in **Writing** will increase from: **49 percentile** to **59 percentile** at the elementary level. **B-** The median growth percentile in **Writing** will increase from: **30 percentile** to **50 percentile** at the middle school level. **C-** The median growth percentile in **Writing** will increase from: **41 percentile** to **50 percentile** at the high school level.
Gaps Goals: A- The median growth percentile in **Writing** for elementary minority students is **32.8** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **57.0.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **5 percentile** points with an increase in minority populations by **10%** and white populations by **5%**. The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Writing** will increase from: **41.6 % to 52 %** for elementary minority students. **B-** The median growth percentile in **Writing** for middle school minority students is **42.5** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **28.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **5 percentile** points with an increase in white populations by **10%** and the minority populations by **5%**. (The minority population currently scores higher than the white population in the middle school, thus we have a reverse achievement gap.) The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Writing** will increase from: **42.9 % to 52.0%** for middle school minority students. **C-** The median growth percentile in **Writing** for high school minority students is **57.5** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **41.0.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **5 percentile** points with an increase in white population by **10%** and the minority populations by **5%.** (The minority population currently scores higher than the white population in the high school, thus we have a reverse achievement gap.) The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Writing** will increase from: **22.2 % to 45 %** for high school minority students.
ARRA Fund Use and Buff Time: Students scoring partially proficient or unsatisfactory are required to use a ½ hour period of time during Middle School and High School lunch periods for remediation in writing. **ARRA funds have been used to contract a Literacy and Math Coach to assist teachers and students during buff time and regular class time. ARRA funds have been used to contract another Special Education Teacher to work with both middle and high school students, exclusively. After school tutoring provided on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons, with school transportation for all at-risk or underperforming students in grades 3-12.**

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 1.3: The district has established clear goals that support improving student achievement. (Mathematics)

Achievement Goal: A- The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Math** will increase from: **67.4 %** to **75%** in grade levels **3-5.**
B- The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Math** will increase from: **44.1%** to **54%** in grade levels **6-8.**
C- The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Math** will increase from: **18%** to **28%** in grade levels **9-10.**

Growth Goal: A- The median growth percentile in **Math** will increase from: **52 percentile** to **62 percentile** at the elementary level.
B- The median growth percentile in **Math** will increase from: **44.1 percentile** to **54 percentile** at the middle school level.
C- The median growth percentile in **Math** will increase from: **46 percentile** to **56 percentile** at the high school level.

Gaps Goals: A- The median growth percentile in **Math** for elementary minority students is **22** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **55.0.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **10 percentile** points with an increase in minority populations by **20%** and white populations by **10%**. The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Math** will increase from: **50 % to 60 %** for elementary minority students.
B- The median growth percentile in **Math** for middle school minority students is **42.5** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **28.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **10 percentile** points with an increase in white populations by **20%** and the minority populations by **10%.** (The minority population currently scores higher than the white population in the middle school, thus we have a reverse achievement gap.) The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Math** will increase from: **28.6% to 40 %** for middle school minority students.
C- The median growth percentile in **Math** for high school minority students is **39.4** growth percentile. The median growth percentile for white students is **47.** The gap between the two subgroups will decrease by **5 percentile** points with an increase in minority populations by **10%** and white populations by **5%**. The percentage of students scoring proficient and higher in **Math** will increase from: **0 % to 34 %** for high school minority students.

ARRA Fund Use and Buff Time: Students scoring partially proficient or unsatisfactory are required to use a ½ hour period of time during Middle School and High School lunch periods for remediation in math. **ARRA funds have been used to contract a Literacy and Math Coach to assist teachers and students during buff time and regular class time. ARRA funds have been used to contract another Special Education Teacher to work with both middle and high school students, exclusively. After school tutoring provided on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons, with school transportation for all at-risk or underperforming students in grades 3-12.**

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 1:1 The district has established clear goals that support improving student achievement. (Reading)

	Indicator	Existing Practice	Action Steps for 2009-2010	Timeline	Resources	Person(s) Responsible	Evaluation
Vision	The plan includes the district's compelling vision and mission that are referenced and drive improvement efforts and are owned by all stakeholders.	Weekly staff meetings by both secondary and elementary staff, examining data and planning for instruction, interventions, and remediation. After school tutoring programs, twice weekly using Expelled and At-Risk Grant funds, including afternoon transportation for students. Elementary team meetings during prep periods each week. Secondary RTI meetings as required.	Weekly staff meetings by both secondary and elementary staff, examining data and planning for instruction, interventions, and remediation. After school tutoring programs, twice weekly using Expelled and At-Risk Grant funds, including afternoon transportation for students. . Elementary team meetings during prep periods each week. Secondary RTI meetings as required. Use of Alpine Achievement Templates to complete ILP's for grades 6-10. Training Dec 7, 2009. ALP development on November 24 using Co-Gat data for G& T students.	In-place for the 2009-2010 school year. DIBELS- Bi-Monthly review and monitoring. AIMS WEB- Quarterly review and monitoring. NWEA- Testing and review in September 2009, January 2010, and May 2010 Quarterly writing prompts at levels 3-10 and reviews by staff. Dec 7, 2009- Alpine ILP training for secondary staff. ALP development on November 24 using Co-Gat data for G& T students.	DIBELS, AIMS WEB, NWEA, AND BEAR software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program. Alpine Achievement System. Co-Gat testing for Gifted and Talented identification.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Progress monitoring will occur in the elementary school using DIBELS, BEAR, AIMS WEB, and NWEA. Elementary use of McMillan/McGraw Hill Placement Tests. In the secondary school, progress monitoring will occur using AIMS WEB, NWEA, TOWRE, TOSCRF from SRLP.
Data	The district plan articulates a systematic process for conducting an analysis of longitudinal data that identifies strengths and gaps for all students and subgroups and guides professional development.	Data days have been built into the school district calendar with elementary and secondary staff conducting reviews and intervention strategy meetings during these dates.	Movement of Professional Development Days for Data Monitoring to Sep 28, 2009, Oct 9, 2009, Dec 7, 2009, and Jan 25, 2010	See action steps	DIBELS, AIMS WEB, NWEA, AND BEAR software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	BAC and DAC reviews, report to Board of Education, August 2010.

					development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program. Alpine Achievement System. Co-Gat testing for Gifted and Talented identification.		
Goals	The district plan includes SMART goals for status and growth of all students (including subgroups), and closing achievement gaps for indentified populations based on data analysis.	See Goals for Reading: 1.1	Monitoring of student progress using district assessment programs listed in resources.	Bi-weekly, Quarterly, on Professional Development days included on District Calendar, and as required by RTI committee.	DIBELS, AIMS WEB, NWEA, AND BEAR software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program. Alpine Achievement System. Co-Gat testing for Gifted and Talented identification.	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	CSAP, End of Year DIBELS Test reports, AIMS WEB end of year tests, NWEA end of year results. ACT results, June 2010.
Monitoring	The district plan has been developed on data analysis. Progress is monitored frequently and the plan is adjusted, as needed.	Building level committee creates and reviews plan, presents to Build Accountability Committee and then to the District Accountability Committee (DAC). DAC reports to board of education.	**Quarterly reports from BAC to DAC to Board of Education.**	Monthly meetings of BAC and DAC, with monthly reports to the Board of Education by the Board DAC representative.	DIBELS, AIMS WEB, NWEA, AND BEAR software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program. Alpine Achievement System.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	BAC, DAC, Board of Education reviews and reports, Quarterly, End of Year results, and CSAP data. Alpine Achievement Software Program reports.

					Co-Gat testing for Gifted and Talented identification.		

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 1:2 The district has established clear goals that support improving student achievement. (Writing)

	Indicator	Existing Practice	Action Steps for 2009-2010	Timeline	Resources	Person(s) Responsible	Evaluation
Vision	The plan includes the district's compelling vision and mission that are referenced and drive improvement efforts and are owned by all stakeholders.	Weekly staff meetings by both secondary and elementary staff, examining data and planning for instruction, interventions, and remediation. After school tutoring programs, twice weekly using Expelled and At-Risk Grant funds, including afternoon transportation for students. Elementary team meetings during prep periods each week. Secondary RTI meetings as required.	Weekly staff meetings by both secondary and elementary staff, examining data and planning for instruction, interventions, and remediation. After school tutoring programs, twice weekly using Expelled and At-Risk Grant funds, including afternoon transportation for students. . Elementary team meetings during prep periods each week. Secondary RTI meetings as required. ALP development on November 24 using Co-Gat data for G& T students.	In-place for the 2009-2010 school year. Bi-Monthly review and monitoring. AIMS WEB- Quarterly review and monitoring. NWEA- Testing and review in September 2009, January 2010, and May 2010 Quarterly writing prompts at levels 3-10 and reviews by staff. Dec 7, 2009- Alpine ILP training for secondary staff. ALP development on November 24 using Co-Gat data for G& T students.	AIMS WEB, NWEA, AND software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program. Alpine Achievement System. Co-Gat testing for Gifted and Talented identification.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Progress monitoring will occur in the elementary school using AIMS WEB, and NWEA. In the secondary school, progress monitoring will occur using AIMS WEB, NWEA, TOWRE, TOSCRF from SRLP.
Data	The district plan articulates a systematic process for conducting an analysis of longitudinal data that identifies strengths and gaps for all students and subgroups and guides professional development.	Data days have been built into the school district calendar with elementary and secondary staff conducting reviews and intervention strategy meetings during these dates.	Movement of Professional Development Days for Data Monitoring to Sep 28, 2009, Oct 9, 2009, Dec 7, 2009, and Jan 25, 2010	See action steps	AIMS WEB, NWEA, software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program.	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	BAC and DAC reviews, report to Board of Education, August 2010.
Goals	The district plan includes SMART goals for status and growth of all	See Goals for Reading: 1.2	Monitoring of student progress using district assessment	Bi-weekly, Quarterly, on Professional Development	AIMS WEB, NWEA, software subscription	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School	CSAP, End of Year, AIMS WEB tests, NWEA end of

	students (including subgroups), and closing achievement gaps for identified populations based on data analysis.		programs listed in resources.	days included on District Calendar, and as required by RTI committee.	services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program.	Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	year results. ACT results, June 2010.
Monitoring	The district plan has been developed on data analysis. Progress is monitored frequently and the plan is adjusted, as needed.	Building level committee creates and reviews plan, presents to Build Accountability Committee and then to the District Accountability Committee (DAC). DAC reports to board of education.	**Quarterly reports from BAC to DAC to Board of Education.**	Monthly meetings of BAC and DAC, with monthly reports to the Board of Education by the Board DAC representative.	AIMS WEB, NWEA, software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	BAC, DAC, Board of Education reviews and reports, Quarterly, End of Year results, and CSAP data. Alpine Achievement Software Program reports.

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 1:3 The district has established clear goals that support improving student achievement. (Math)

	Indicator	Existing Practice	Action Steps for 2009-2010	Timeline	Resources	Person(s) Responsible	Evaluation
Vision	The plan includes the district's compelling vision and mission that are referenced and drive improvement efforts and are owned by all stakeholders.	Weekly staff meetings by both secondary and elementary staff, examining data and planning for instruction, interventions, and remediation. After school tutoring programs, twice weekly using Expelled and At-Risk Grant funds, including afternoon transportation for students. Elementary team meetings during prep periods each week. Secondary RTI meetings as required.	Weekly staff meetings by both secondary and elementary staff, examining data and planning for instruction, interventions, and remediation. After school tutoring programs, twice weekly using Expelled and At-Risk Grant funds, including afternoon transportation for students. . Elementary team meetings during prep periods each week. Secondary RTI meetings as required. ALP development on November 24 using Co-Gat data for G& T students.	In-place for the 2009-2010 school year. Bi-Monthly review and monitoring. AIMS WEB- Quarterly review and monitoring. NWEA- Testing and review in September 2009, January 2010, and May 2010 Quarterly writing prompts at levels 3-10 and reviews by staff. Dec 7, 2009- Alpine ILP training for secondary staff. ALP development on November 24 using Co-Gat data for G& T students.	AIMS WEB, NWEA, AND software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program. Alpine Achievement System. Co-Gat testing for Gifted and Talented identification.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Progress monitoring will occur in the elementary school using AIMS WEB, and NWEA. In the secondary school, progress monitoring will occur using AIMS WEB, and NWEA.
Data	The district plan articulates a systematic process for conducting an analysis of longitudinal data that identifies strengths and gaps for all students and subgroups and guides professional development.	Data days have been built into the school district calendar with elementary and secondary staff conducting reviews and intervention strategy meetings during these dates.	Movement of Professional Development Days for Data Monitoring to Sep 28, 2009, Oct 9, 2009, Dec 7, 2009, and Jan 25, 2010	See action steps	AIMS WEB, NWEA, software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program.	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	BAC and DAC reviews, report to Board of Education, August 2010.
Goals	The district plan includes SMART goals for status and growth of all	See Goals for Reading: 1.3	Monitoring of student progress using district assessment	Bi-weekly, Quarterly, on Professional Development	AIMS WEB, NWEA, software subscription	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School	CSAP, End of Year, AIMS WEB tests, NWEA end of

	students (including subgroups), and closing achievement gaps for indentified populations based on data analysis.		programs listed in resources.	days included on District Calendar, and as required by RTI committee.	services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program.	Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	year results. ACT results, June 2010.
Monitoring	The district plan has been developed on data analysis. Progress is monitored frequently and the plan is adjusted, as needed.	Building level committee creates and reviews plan, presents to Build Accountability Committee and then to the District Accountability Committee (DAC). DAC reports to board of education.	**Quarterly reports from BAC to DAC to Board of Education.**	Monthly meetings of BAC and DAC, with monthly reports to the Board of Education by the Board DAC representative.	AIMS WEB, NWEA, software subscription services. Professional development funds from Title I, ARRA, and General Fund to support testing procedures and data interpretation training. Professional development training with the Secondary Rural Literacy Program.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	BAC, DAC, Board of Education reviews and reports, Quarterly, End of Year results, and CSAP data. Alpine Achievement Software Program reports.

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 2: The district has established and maintains a standards-based and aligned curriculum

	Indicator	Existing Practice	Action Steps for 2009-2010	Timeline	Resources	Person Responsible	Evaluation
Standards	The plan documents that the curriculum is research-based and clearly aligned to adopted standards and assessment frameworks.	MYSD adopted and teaches current state standards available to school district from the Colorado Department of Education and when not available, uses national standards developed for content areas. Textbooks and curriculum materials are selected by staff, reviewed by DAC, and approved by the Board of Education to provide scientifically-research based curriculum that aligns with state and national standards. Former practices for secondary graduation requirements lacked scope and sequencing, allowed substitution of non-core classes for core area requirements, weakening attempts to provide students with necessary content to do well on CSAP and ACT. Staff and administration using CSAP assessment frameworks and CEDAR radar graphs to assess coverage of state standards	MYES uses curriculum programs aligned with Reading First and Title I requirements. Literacy: Step Up to Writing, Six-Traits + 1, McGraw/Hill "Treasurers Reading Program, SRA-Corrective Reading Program, Language ! point, DIBELS- "Now What!", Scott/Foresman Intervention Program, McGraw/Hill- "Triumph Intervention Program. Math: McGraw/Hill Math Connects Programs- aligns with new state and national math standards, SRA-Corrective Math. Secondary programs review textbooks and curriculum materials to encompass state and national standards and grade level expectations. Miami-Yoder Middle and Senior High School are adapting and modifying Cheyenne Mountain Curriculum Maps, while developing course description manuals and course syllabi.	Curriculum alignment and mapping occurring during 1st semester of 2009. (Cheyenne Mountain assisting with mapping programs.) Course description manuals due to central office for review on December 15. Due to board for approval on January 10, 2010. Graduation requirements revised to provide rigor and adherence to state standards and national standards requirements. Policy adoption in January 2010 for all freshman and sophomore students. **Looking @ Student Work-Workshop-1/25/2010.**	Professional development funding and district calendar time requirements provide by previous planning. Funding from ARRA, Title I, and secondary professional development lines used to review, copy, and implement curriculum maps and alignment processes. Step Up to Writing, Six-Traits + 1, McGraw/Hill "Treasurers Reading Program, SRA-Corrective Reading Program, Language ! point, DIBELS- "Now What!", Scott/Foresman Intervention Program, McGraw/Hill- "Triumph Intervention Program. Math: McGraw/Hill Math Connects Programs- aligns with new state and national math standards, SRA-Corrective Math.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff.	Principal's and BAC review recommendations for approval and status to DAC. DAC report to Board of Education regarding review process, alignment, course description manuals, syllabi, and graduation requirements. Principal and Superintendent Performance Evaluations.

		assessed by the previous year's CSAP tests.	Secondary reading and literacy programs align with state standards. The secondary school is completing its third year of participation in the states Secondary Rural Literacy Program to provide literacy intervention and remediation. MYHS is reviewing course scope and sequencing to insure that students are taking prerequisite, aligned courses necessary to perform well on CSAP and ACT. Added rigor and student achievement focus.				
Review	The plan includes a timeline for systematic review and revision of curriculum. The review and revision process is clearly tied to student achievement data.	Review by staff and school administration.	Review by staff and administration, District Assessment Coordinator. Planning coordinated between teaching staff, parents, BAC, DAC, Administration team**.** Quarterly progress review by building principals and quarterly reports to DAC and Board of Education.	See Standards line	Professional development funding and district calendar time requirements provide by previous planning. Funding from ARRA, Title I, and secondary professional development lines used to review, copy, and implement curriculum maps and alignment processes.	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Principal's and BAC review recommendations for approval and status to DAC. DAC report to Board of Education regarding review process, alignment, course description manuals, syllabi, and graduation requirements. Principal and Superintendent Performance Evaluations.
Resources	The plan documents consistent practices for offering adequate time, materials and support for instruction. Resource allocations are based on student achievement data.	Review by staff and school administration.	Adaptation of district calendar for 2009-2010 to provide additional time to teachers, during critical planning and implementation periods, earlier in the school year.	See Standards line	Professional development funding and district calendar time requirements provide by previous planning. Funding from	Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Planning conducted by administration, coordinated with DAC Budget committee, and approved by BOE.

					ARRA, Title I, and secondary professional development lines used to review, copy, and implement curriculum maps and alignment processes.		
Monitoring	The plan describes how the district consistently monitors fidelity of curriculum implementation, provides support and holds schools accountable.	Review by staff and school administration.	Weekly review by teaching staff during team meetings. Bi-Monthly reviews by teaching staff and administration during staff meetings. Month review of curriculum needs through reports from BAC to DAC. Quarterly reports to the DAC and the BOE.	See Standards line	Professional development funding and district calendar time requirements provide by previous planning. Funding from ARRA, Title I, and secondary professional development lines used to review, copy, and implement curriculum maps and alignment processes.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Weekly review by teaching staff during team meetings. Bi-Monthly reviews by teaching staff and administration during staff meetings. Month review of curriculum needs through reports from BAC to DAC. Quarterly reports to the DAC and the BOE.

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 3: The district has developed a program of instruction that meets the needs of all students.

	Indicator	Existing Practice	Action Steps for 2009-2010	Timeline	Resources	Person Responsible	Evaluation
Instruction and Assessment	The district plan has systematic, research-based comprehensive assessment program to monitor effectiveness of instructional program.	**Use of Love and Logic at the elementary school. Switching from Love and Logic at secondary level to PBS. Use of DIBELS, BEAR, NWEA, Co-GAT (G&T), AIMS WEB, Quarterly writing prompts, Semester Exams** **Poor and Ineffective Evaluations of staff at MS and HS level. Poor feedback on staff evaluations.**	**Implement PBS in secondary system.** **Textbook adoption, review and selection process implementation.** **Vertical alignment of curriculum.** **Induction program for provisional teaching staff- Monthly, professional development days and data days.** **Increased walk-through observations for secondary classrooms.** **Observations, pre- and post conference meetings, summative and formative evaluations.** **Implementation of the McGrath SUCCEED personnel management system.**	**August 2009- May 15, 2010- PBS.** **Formal observations for probationary staff completed NLT December 2009 and April 2010.** **Summative evaluations completed NLT April 10, 2010.** **Walk-through observations- Continuous.** **Induction- Monthly**	**McGrath SUCCEED template- Training classes for SUCCEED** **District Adopted Staff and Teacher Evaluation forms.** **Walk-through forms.**	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	**Teacher retention and dismissal percentages at end of year. BAC, DAC Reports. Teacher review of Instructional Programs at end of year.**
Training	The district requires staff to participate in quality job-embedded, ongoing professional development based on identified needs. Professional development is tied to district mission, vision, and goals.	**McGraw/Hill representative- Training for Elementary Staff at beginning of year. Focus on fidelity to reading and math programs**	**Vertical alignment of curriculum. Development of District Professional Development plan to include district needs and individual staff needs.**	**McGraw/Hill- August 2009. Vertical Alignment- NLT May 15, 2010. Professional Development plan for District- NLT May 15, 2010**	**Professional Development funds from General Fund, ARRA, and Title I**	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	**Teacher retention and dismissal percentages at end of year. BAC, DAC Reports. Teacher review of Instructional Programs at end of year.**
Interventions	The district plan specifies a process for aligning	**Developing RTI process.** **Using**	**Using Title Coaches, ARRA funds, CO-Gat testing, and Alpine**	**RTI- Review by BOE on Dec 10, 2009. IN –place by May 15,**	**PPBOCES G&T Coordinator, ARRA funds,**	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals,	**DAC, School Administration, BOE, May 10, 2009**

	interventions with the individual needs of under performing and gifted students.	**PPBOCES G& T plan and Director of G&T**	**Achievement to enhance intervention strategies, RTI, and G & T instructional needs.**	**2009. Alpine-Achievement Software- In-place**	**and Title Funds. General Education Funds, Secondary Rural Literacy Program.**	School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	
Monitoring	The district plan details how the district will consistently monitor and support schools to ensure assessments drive instructional changes on an ongoing basis. The plan describes how the district, school, and staff members are held accountable.	**Elementary: Walk-through observations, use of assessment data, data days.** **Secondary ineffective use of NWEA, CSAP, Assessment Frameworks, Radar Graphs and other sources of data.**	**Increased walk-throughs at secondary level.** **Emphasis on RTI, interventions, use of Data for instructional planning/use of frameworks/Radar graphs/curriculum mapping and alignment at all grade levels.**	**Quarterly assessments by Administration of all school programs and data. Quarterly reports to DAC and BOE by administration and Title I coaches.**	**Title I coaches- assessment tools- District Evaluation Forms, Alpine Achievement Software.**	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	**Reports to BAC, DAC, and BOE$**

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 4: The district promotes postsecondary readiness.
Advanced Coursework: The number of students taking postsecondary/advanced courses will increase from 9 in 2008-09 to 11 in 2009-2010.
ACT Goal: (1) District's ACT composite score will increase from 17 in 2008-09 to 20 in 2009-2010. (2).
Graduation Goal: The district will maintain or (increase the graduation rate) of 81.2% in 2008-2009 for 2009-2010.

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 4: The district promotes postsecondary readiness.

	Indicator	Existing Practice	Action Steps for 2009-2010	Timeline	Resources	Person Responsible	Evaluation
Post-Secondary	The district plan has SMART goals, strategies and resources that promote student participation in post-secondary/advanced courses. Data is used to ensure that all students (including subgroups) are represented.	The district partners with PPCC and UCCS to provide post-secondary options for qualified high school juniors and seniors. Students are transported to PPCC each day for morning sessions, five days per week.	(1). To decrease transportation costs, the district is working to bring concurrent/dual credit courses to our campus using our own qualified instructors. (2). To increase number of students taking and pacing the ACCUPLACER Test. (3). Guidance Counselor providing career information and monitoring credit requirements. (4). Insure continued access and preparation to increase minority student and FRL population students. (4). Insure use and implementation of high school four year course and career plan	Planning and Scheduling of future PSEO courses to be taught on campus, to be completed by April 2010. ACCUPLACER testing of all Juniors, by March 2010 and all Sophomores by April 2010.	General Fund PSEO accounts for tuition, books, and transportation costs. Qualified, licensed guidance counselor employed for 2009-2010 school year from General Fund.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Work with PPCC to assess current success and preparation of college attendees and evaluation of current English 121 course being taught on our campus. Examine ACCUPLACER test results to examine remediation needs to include more students in PSEO classes. Evaluation of current attendee's ethnicity and financial status.
ACT	The plan documents SMART goals, strategies and resources to improve ACT performance.	High School began ACT preparation training in 2008-09. RTI meetings began in September 2009, facilitated by new employee hired with ARRA funds. Training and implementation of required RTI process underway.	(1). Align course schedules and graduation requirements to ensure students are taking requisite courses needed to perform well on ACT testing. (2) Planning surrounding career exploration and course needs in 9th grade, Freshmen Seminar class implemented in 2009-2010 schedule. Junior Seminar class for 2010-2011 in	Course Description Manuals completed by December 2009. Course syllabi completed by December 2009. Revision of graduation requirements, February 2010 for all 9th and 10th grade students. Adherence to CCHE and CDE requirements for courses required for graduation and attendance to post-secondary	General Fund appropriations for testing, career guidance, college exploration and communications with parents/guardians/and students. ARRA funds being used to provide RTI interventions to assist students with meeting instructional needs.	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	ACT test scores from testing conducted in April and May 2010. ACT test preparation software results, shared with students and parents, emphasizing areas of strengths and needed remediation. Test taking skills assessments to increase test taking skills prior to ACT

			planning stages.	institutions- Now! Review of transcript information and corrections- Now!			testing conducted by Guidance Counselor and Building Principal.
Graduation	The district plan has SMART goals to improve graduation and attendance rates for students. There is a clear and ongoing process for identifying students early that are at risk of not graduating based on attendance, behavior, course completion and other data. Meaningful supports are documented.	Practices prior to 2009-2010 school year indicate poor supervision and communication by registrar, guidance counselor and administration. Graduation requirements may or may not have been met.	Review of all student transcripts. Requirements established for all students to meet minimum standards of required classes for graduation. Review of four year plan with students/parents at the beginning of each year by guidance counselor. Annual reviews of student progress and program requirements. Career counseling and guidance counseling regarding graduation requirements, college or trade school entrance requirements, financial aid assistance, and other requirements including scholarship applications and ACT/SAT requirements.	Course Description Manuals completed by December 2009. Course syllabi completed by December 2009. Revision of graduation requirements, February 2010 for all 9th and 10th grade students. Adherence to CCHE and CDE requirements for courses required for graduation and attendance to post-secondary institutions- Now! Review of transcript information and corrections- Now! On-line and summer school credit recovery programs provided.	Guidance counselor line items. At-Risk and Expulsion Prevention grant funds and matching funds from district.	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Monitoring of four year plan development, financial aid forums, scholarship application forums, and audits of transcripts performed by guidance counselor, principal, superintendent, and selected members of the DAC. Report to BOE in April establishing proof of eligibility to graduate.
Monitoring	The plan details how the district monitors progress annually on goals, provides support and holds schools accountable.	Practices prior to 2009-2010 school year indicate poor supervision and communication by registrar, guidance counselor and administration. Graduation requirements may or may not have been met.	Review of all student transcripts. Requirements established for all students to meet minimum standards of required classes for graduation. Review of four year plan with students/parents at the beginning of each year by guidance counselor. Annual reviews of student progress and program	Course Description Manuals completed by December 2009. Course syllabi completed by December 2009. Revision of graduation requirements, February 2010 for all 9th and 10th grade students. Adherence to CCHE and CDE requirements for courses required for graduation and attendance	Guidance counselor line items. At-Risk and Expulsion Prevention grant funds and matching funds from district.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	See graduation line- under evaluation.

			requirements. Career counseling and guidance counseling regarding graduation requirements, college or trade school entrance requirements, financial aid assistance, and other requirements including scholarship applications and ACT/SAT requirements.	to post-secondary institutions- Now! Review of transcript information and corrections- Now! On-line and summer school credit recovery programs provided			

Miami-Yoder School District JT-60

Standard 5: The district maintains positive student, family and community support.
(1). Using Global Connect, the district intends to maintain elementary P/T conference participation at 98% and increase secondary P/T participation from 28% to 50% no later than April 8, 2010. **(2). Establish baseline participation rates with first meetings (September 17, 2009) and assemblies and observe increases in attendance and participation, including volunteer assistance by parents with DAC and BAC.** **(3). Increase student participation in post-secondary education opportunities from current levels and gauge support for home grown PSEO courses and vocational programs, by 50%, during 2009-2010 school year.**

	Indicator	Existing Practice	Action Steps for 2009-2010	Timeline	Resources	Person Responsible	Evaluation
Communications	The plan provides details on how the district supports two-way, meaningful communication about school activities and its performance consistently, in home languages and through a variety of sources.	MYSD uses Infinite Campus as a primary means for parents/guardians to monitor student grades, attendance, and behavior. In addition, the MYSD website lists current events of upcoming school events. MYSD uses Global Connect software to notify parents of upcoming events or important activities occurring at school. The elementary school uses a weekly newsletter. Elementary teachers use individual websites to communicate with parents/guardians and all staff members have published email and phone extensions for public contact.	Increased use of Global Connect software to notify parents/guardians of events. Increased emphasis on parent use of Infinite Campus software management systems to provide feedback to parents/guardians/students. Increase in number of parent/teacher conferences from twice a year to each quarter. Increased use of local media sources, including the Ranchland Newspaper with student interest articles. Coordinated elementary and secondary parent/teacher conferences. Use Secondary Principal's skills in Spanish Language to draft and provide Spanish language directions for program requirements and student requirements. Increase use of websites for MS and HS parents.	August 2009 to May 15, 2009. P/T conferences on: 9/17/2009 11/19/2009 2/18/2010 4/8/2010 ILP meetings and reviews: 9/18/2009 4/6, 2010 Title I parent information meetings-January 2010.	New Gymnasium for Secondary P/T conferences. General fund revenue. Global Connect telephonic communications system.	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Using Global Connect, the district intends to maintain elementary P/T conference participation at 98% and increase secondary P/T participation from 28% to 50% no later than April 8, 2010.
Family Activities	The plan provides details about the district actively engaging families through numerous activities and	Back to school night, open house, Title I parent/teacher nights, parent/teacher conferences, school concerts,	Back to school night in August, Title I parent information meetings, Senior Luncheon sponsored by NHS for elderly. Veteran's Day celebration with invited guest veterans. Sports and	Per school district monthly calendar and district annual calendar of events and	Title I funds ARRA funds General fund academic and athletic lines. District funds for hamburgers,	Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators,	Establish baseline participation rates with first meetings and assemblies and observe

	providing ways for families to partner in students' learning.	NHS activities, athletic events, volunteer classroom workers in the elementary school, involvement in IEP, ILP, and RTI meetings.	Academic Awards banquets.	attendance.	chips, drinks Title I funds for Parent Involvement Activities.	Teaching Staff	increases in attendance and participation, including volunteer assistance by parents with DAC and BAC.
Partnerships	The plan provides details about the district having multiple partnerships, including district and school accountability committees, within and beyond the district, to enrich student opportunities. The plan describes how stakeholders have multiple ways to influence policy and accountability.	Partnerships with PPCC and UCCS to provide vocational and post-secondary educational opportunities. Participation with PPBOCES and partner school districts to provide career education and college visit days. Partnership with local community members in DAC and BAC settings to review policies, create and implement plans related to budget, curriculum, and textbook adoption. Numbers of businesses in the area preclude partnerships with these entities to facilitate programs. MYSD does work with 4H and the local fire protection district to provide student training and monitor safety. Partner with Peak Vista to provide local, indigent health and dental care.	Continue current partnerships with post-secondary providers, local school districts, PPBOCES, 4 H, Tri-County Fire Protection District, and with the El Paso County Sheriff. Partnerships with local Rush Youth League officials to provide athletic facilities for summer programs. Partner with Peak Vista to provide local, indigent health and dental care.	August 2009- May 15 for post-secondary partners, Aug 2009 through July 2010 with DAC, BAC. Yearly participation in PPBOCES activities. Spring participation with Rush Youth League and Peak Vista.	General Education fund line items for tuition, transportation, and fees, including text books. Provide irrigation and electricity for youth athletic programs**.**	Board of Education, District Accountability Committee, Building Accountability Committee, Superintendent of Schools, Building Principals, School Counselors, Title I Coordinators, Teaching Staff	Increase student participation in post-secondary education opportunities and gauge support for home grown vocational programs.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Colorado's state assessment system includes three different types of assessments to measure student achievement. The main assessment used in the state is the Colorado Student Assessment Program test (CSAP), which assesses students in reading, writing and math standards in grades 3 through 10 and science for grades 5, 8, and 10. The second assessment given is for students in third grade and fourth grade who are receiving instruction in Spanish. The Lectura is the Spanish reading version of the CSAP and the Escritura is the Spanish writing version of the CSAP. All assessments are scored with the following ratings: Unsatisfactory (student is not demonstrating knowledge of content standards), Partially Proficient (student is beginning to demonstrate knowledge on the standards), Proficient (student is meeting the standards), Advanced (student is above and beyond the standards), and No Score (the student was unable to complete the test). The third assessment, the CSAP Alternative (CSAPA), is available for use with students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. It is used to assess reading, writing, math, and science content knowledge. Only about 1% of students in Colorado take the CSAPA.

The following show our district and schools' results from the various assessments:

NA= Insufficient student population to report without violating individual student privacy. (If fewer that 16 students test in a given area, the ability of the public to identify the individual student is compromised, especially in small populations. Example: If only one student had a severe learning disability and that student took the CSAPA, individuals with knowledge that his student was the only one in the population would allow them to identify the student by name

3rd Grade CSAP Results: Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	8.73%	18.30%	65.65%	6.94%	0.37%
	2008	10.88%	18.38%	63.82%	6.51%	0.41%
District Average	2009	11.11%	22.22%	59.26%	7.41%	0.00%
	2008	7.14%	28.57%	64.29%	0.00%	0.00%
White	2009	10.53%	21.05%	63.16%	5.26%	0.00%
	2008	4.00%	24.00%	72.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

4th Grade CSAP Results: Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	12.68%	21.82%	58.59%	6.44%	0.47%
	2008	10.25%	23.53%	61.70%	4.17%	0.36%
District Average	2009	13.04%	13.04%	73.91%	0.00%	O.00%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
White	2009	10.00%	15.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

5th Grade CSAP Results: Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	12.15%	18.80%	59.72%	8.94%	0.40%
	2008	11.49%	17.91%	60.73%	9.48%	0.38%
District Average	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	13.04%	34.78%	47.83%	4.35%	0.00%
White	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6th Grade CSAP Results: Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	9.23%	18.51%	59.68%	12.10%	0.49%
	2008	9.10%	19.20%	59.06%	12.08%	0.56%
District Average	2009	15.38%	26.92%	57.69%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	9.09%	9.09%	54.55%	27.27%	0.00%
White	2009	11.11%	33.3%	55.56%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	10.53%	0.00%	63.16%	26.32%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

7th Grade CSAP Results: Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	11.84%	20.38%	58.57%	8.58%	.062%
	2008	11.86%	22.00%	56.16%	9.29%	0.69%
District Average	2009	4.76%	14.29%	57.14%	14.29%	9.52%
	2008	14.29%	25.00%	60.71%	0.00%	0.00%
White	2009	5.56%	16.67%	55.56%	11.11%	11.11%
	2008	9.09%	22.73%	68.18%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	23.53%	11.76%	64.71%	0.00%	0.00%
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

8th Grade CSAP Results: Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	10.95%	23.75%	57.42%	7.05%	0.83%
	2008	10.89%	21.02%	57.43%	9.64%	1.02%
District Average	2009	20.00%	36.67%	36.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	16.67%	33.33%	44.44%	0.00%	5.56%
White	2009	16.00%	36.00%	40.00%	0.00%	8.00%
	2008	17.65%	29.41%	47.06%	0.00%	5.88%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	26.32%	26.32%	36.84%	0.00%	10.53%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

9th Grade CSAP Results: Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	7.31%	23.63%	63.63%	3.29%	2.15%
	2008	8.65%	22.88%	59.96%	6.14%	2.37%
District Average	2009	5.26%	21.05%	73.68%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	3.03%	27.27%	63.64%	0.00%	6.06%
White	2009	5.56%	16.67%	77.78%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	3.85%	23.08%	65.38%	0.00%	7.69%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	5.88%	35.29%	52.94%	0.00%	5.88%
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	0.00%	18.75%	75.00%	0.00%	6.25%
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

10th Grade CSAP Results: Reading

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	6.88%	20.64%	59.95%	9.51%	3.02%
	2008	9.86%	20.85%	55.22%	10.85%	3.22%
District Average	2009	2.86%	22.86%	65.71%	2.86%	5.71%
	2008	4.35%	21.74%	65.22%	8.70%	0.00%
White	2009	3.70%	18.52%	66.67%	3.70%	7.41%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	5.26%	21.05%	63.16%	5.26%	5.26%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

3rd Grade CSAP Results: Writing

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	5.76%	40.37%	44.47%	9.16%	0.24%
	2008	6.68%	42.93%	39.73%	10.39%	0.27%
District Average	2009	7.41%	51.85%	33.33%	7.41%	0.00%
	2008	7.14%	46.43%	35.71%	10.71%	0.00%
White	2009	10.00%	50.00%	35.00%	5.00%	0.00%
	2008	8.00%	40.00%	40.00%	12.00%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

4th Grade CSAP Results: Writing

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	8.13%	40.84%	41.85%	8.67%	0.51%
	2008	6.72%	41.05%	42.51%	9.25%	0.47%
District Average	2009	0.00%	30.43%	52.17%	17.38%	0.00%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
White	2009	0.00%	25.00%	55.00%	20.00%	0.00%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

5th Grade CSAP Results: Writing

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	4.86%	36.75%	48.08%	9.93%	0.38%
	2008	5.50%	34.84%	47.49%	11.79%	0.38%
District Average	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	0.00%	47.83%	47.83%	4.35%	0.00%
White	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6th Grade CSAP Results: Writing

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	4.14%	34.18%	50.48%	10.32%	0.89%
	2008	5.02%	34.90%	49.19%	10.39%	0.50%
District Average	2009	3.85%	53.85%	42.31%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	4.35%	34.78%	56.52%	4.35%	0.00%
White	2009	5.56%	50.00%	44.44%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	5.00%	30.00%	60.00%	5.00%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

7th Grade CSAP Results: Writing

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	2.83%	34.67%	47.44%	14.43%	0.62%
	2008	4.65%	36.87%	45.64%	12.18%	0.66%
District Average	2009	4.76%	33.33%	23.81%	28.57%	9.52%
	2008	0.00%	50.00%	46.43%	3.57%	0.00%
White	2009	5.56%	38.89%	27.78%	16.67%	11.11%
	2008	0.00%	50.00%	45.45%	4.55%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009					
	2008	0.00%	64.71%	35.29%	0.00%	0.00%
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

8th Grade CSAP Results: Writing

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	3.10%	43.32%	44.27%	8.48%	0.83%
	2008	4.95%	41.20%	42.42%	10.48%	0.95%
District Average	2009	10.00%	53.33%	26.67%	3.33%	6.67%
	2008	11.11%	44.44%	44.44%	0.00%	0.00%
White	2009	12.00%	48.00%	28.00%	4.00%	8.00%
	2008	11.76%	41.18%	47.06%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	10.53%	47.37%	31.58%	0.00%	10.53%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

9th Grade CSAP Results: Writing

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	4.31%	42.16%	43.60%	7.79%	2.15%
	2008	5.44%	43.44%	41.85%	7.02%	2.25%
District Average	2009	5.26%	42.11%	52.63%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	0.00%	54.55%	39.39%	3.03%	3.03%
White	2009	5.56%	38.89%	55.56%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	0.00%	57.69%	34.62%	3.85%	3.85%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	0.00%	70.59%	29.41%	0.00%	0.00%
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	0.00%	37.50%	50.00%	6.25%	6.25%
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

10th Grade CSAP Results: Writing

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	6.69%	41.17%	41.44%	7.81%	2.88%
	2008	9.71%	39.84%	39.35%	7.87%	3.22%
District Average	2009	2.86%	54.29%	37.14%	0.00%	5.71%
	2008	13.04%	56.52%	30.43%	0.00%	0.00%
White	2009	3.70%	48.15%	40.74%	0.00%	7.41%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	5.26%	63.16%	26.32%	0.00%	5.26%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	0.00%	43.75%	50.00%	0.00%	6.25%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

3rd Grade CSAP Results: Math

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	7.26%	23.43%	42.67%	26.41%	0.24%
	2008	7.99%	22.04%	39.84%	29.81%	0.32%
District Average	2009	14.81%	22.22%	55.56%	7.41%	0.00%
	2008	7.41%	33.33%	29.63%	29.63%	0.00%
White	2009	20.00%	15.00%	60.00%	5.00%	0.00%
	2008	8.33%	29.17%	29.17%	33.33%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

4th Grade CSAP Results: Math

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	8.69%	20.67%	42.63%	27.68%	0.33%
	2008	8.83%	22.50%	42.29%	26.06%	0.32%
District Average	2009	4.35%	26.09%	30.43%	39.13%	0.00%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
White	2009	5.00%	20.00%	30.00%	45.00%	0.00%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

5th Grade CSAP Results: Math

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	11.31%	25.19%	35.18%	28.02%	0.30%
	2008	8.38%	26.16%	37.23%	27.96%	0.27%
District Average	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	12.50%	45.83%	20.83%	20.83%	0.00%
White	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	12.50%	37.50%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

6th Grade CSAP Results: Math

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	12.34%	24.75%	35.51%	27.04%	0.36%
	2008	12.78%	25.81%	36.61%	24.42%	0.38%
District Average	2009	23.08%	38.46%	23.08%	15.38%	0.00%
	2008	8.33%	29.17%	29.17%	33.33%	0.00%
White	2009	15.79%	36.84%	26.32%	21.05%	0.00%
	2008	4.76%	28.57%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

7th Grade CSAP Results: Math

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	13.46%	31.69%	30.59%	23.62%	0.63%
	2008	18.29%	35.00%	27.82%	18.37%	0.52%
District Average	2009	5.00%	25.00%	35.00%	30.00%	5.00%
	2008	21.43%	32.14%	32.14%	14.29%	0.00%
White	2009	5.56%	27.78%	33.33%	27.78%	5.56%
	2008	18.18%	27.27%	40.91%	13.64%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	23.53%	29.41%	35.29%	11.76%	0.00%
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

8th Grade CSAP Results: Math

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	18.56%	30.77%	31.07%	18.86%	0.74%
	2008	22.76%	29.50%	26.52%	20.41%	0.81%
District Average	2009	20.00%	46.67%	26.67%	0.00%	6.67%
	2008	33.33%	44.44%	16.67%	5.56%	0.00%
White	2009	20.00%	44.00%	28.00%	0.00%	8.00%
	2008	35.29%	41.18%	17.65%	5.88%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	15.79%	42.11%	31.58%	0.00%	10.53%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

9th Grade CSAP Results: Math

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	34.59%	28.52%	23.21%	11.73%	1.94%
	2008	30.44%	29.83%	24.48%	13.32%	1.92%
District Average	2009	42.11%	42.11%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	44.12%	29.41%	17.65%	5.88%	2.94%
White	2009	38.89%	44.44%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	2008	42.31%	30.77%	15.38%	7.69%	3.85%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	35.29%	29.41%	23.53%	11.76%	0.00%
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	52.94%	29.41%	11.76%	0.00%	5.88%
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

10th Grade CSAP Results: Math

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	32.15%	34.72%	24.98%	5.46%	2.69%
	2008	31.99%	34.88%	25.39%	4.98%	2.75%
District Average	2009	42.86%	37.14%	14.29%	0.00%	5.71%
	2008	39.13%	39.13%	21.74%	0.00%	0.00%
White	2009	40.74%	33.33%	18.52%	0.00%	7.41%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	42.11%	31.58%	21.05%	0.00%	5.26%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	43.75%	43.75%	6.25%	0.00%	6.25%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

5th Grade CSAP Results: Science

Please note: in 2007 the Colorado State Board of Education adopted new model content standards for science. The 2008 CSAP Science results are not comparable to earlier results because they test new standards.

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	14.73%	40.17%	32.00%	12.75%	0.34%
	2008	15.44%	40.67%	32.97%	10.63%	0.30%
District Average	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	33.33%	33.33%	29.17%	4.17%	0.00%
White	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	37.50%	18.75%	37.50%	6.25%	0.00%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

8th Grade CSAP Results: Science

Please note: in 2007 the Colorado State Board of Education adopted new model content standards for science. The 2008 CSAP Science results are not comparable to earlier results because they test new standards.

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	23.15%	27.14%	40.60%	8.28%	0.82%
	2008	24.92%	27.77%	39.34%	7.13%	0.84%
District Average	2009	36.67%	40.00%	16.67%	0.00%	6.67%
	2008	35.00%	35.00%	20.00%	0.00%	10.00%
White	2009	32.00%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	8.00%
	2008	33.33%	38.89%	22.22%	0.00%	5.56%
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	26.32%	36,84%	26.32%	0.00%	10.53%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

10th Grade CSAP Results: Science

Please note: in 2007 the Colorado State Board of Education adopted new model content standards for science. The 2008 CSAP Science results are not comparable to earlier results because they test new standards.

Disaggregated Groups	Year	% Unsatisfactory	% Partially Proficient	% Proficient	% Advanced	% No Score
State Average	2009	25.80%	21.64%	42.98%	6.78%	2.80%
	2008	26.80%	23.10%	41.40%	5.89%	2.81%
District Average	2009	34.29%	17.14%	42.86%	0.00%	5.71%
	2008	21.74%	30.43%	43.48%	0.00%	4.35%
White	2009	33.33%	11.11%	48.15%	0.00%	7.41%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hispanic	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Black	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Male	2009	36.84%	5.26%	52.63%	0.00%	5.26%
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
English Language Learners	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gifted and Talented	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant	2009	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	2008	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

CSAPA Results- Student populations of less than 16 are not displayed for public viewing. Miami-Yoder School District JT-60 had less than 16 students taking CSAPA in any grade level or content area.

CSAP Lectura and CSAP Escritura- Student populations for both 3rd and 4th grades were less than 16 and are not displayed for public viewing. Miami-Yoder School District JT-60 had less than 16 students taking the Spanish versions of CSAP in any grade level or content area.

ACCOUNTABILITY DATA

The *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) of 2001, requires Colorado school districts to make a determination of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for every school in their district. The districts calculates AYP for each school with a formula set by the Colorado Department of Education, which measures participation rates, math and reading performance, and graduation rate targets for the elementary, middle and high school levels. Additionally, schools are responsible for all subgroups of students (race/ethnicity, English Language Learners, Economically Disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities) if there are thirty or more students in the subgroup at a specific grade level. The following data shows school AYP results in comparison to the district and state results.

MIAMI-YODER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Student group	Reading/Language Arts					
	Percent Tested Goal: 95%			Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced * Goal: 88.46%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	100.00	100.00	99.28	95.27	95.37	88.55
African American	NA	NA	99.22	NA	NA	81.03
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	99.52	NA	NA	83.79
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	99.34	NA	NA	92.96
Hispanic	NA	NA	98.69	NA	NA	79.42
White	100.00	100.00	99.58	97.13	97.20	93.97
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	98.18	NA	NA	56.83
English Language Learners	NA	NA	98.04	NA	NA	74.13
Economically Disadvantaged	100.00	100.00	98.88	NA	NA	79.84

Student group	Mathematics					
	Percent Tested Goal: 95%			Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced * Goal: 89.09%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	100.00	100.00	99.63	96.49	96.57	90.79
African American	NA	NA	99.51	NA	NA	80.26
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	99.57	NA	NA	85.39
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	99.34	NA	NA	95.47
Hispanic	NA	NA	99.65	NA	NA	84.21
White	100.00	100.00	99.65	95.59	95.71	95.21
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	98.57	NA	NA	65.78
English Language Learners	NA	NA	99.55	NA	NA	81.66
Economically Disadvantaged	100.00	100.00	99.57	NA	NA	83.72

Student group	Other Indicator					
	Advanced Performance Reading * Goal: 1.21%			Advanced Performance Mathematics * Goal: 1.21%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	14.53	14.25	7.60	36.27	35.57	27.61
African American	NA	NA	2.99	NA	NA	13.84
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	4.30	NA	NA	17.74
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	11.84	NA	NA	44.33
Hispanic	NA	NA	2.34	NA	NA	13.02
White	14.17	13.82	10.67	41.07	40.12	35.79

Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	1.41	NA	NA	7.35
English Language Learners	NA	NA	1.82	NA	NA	11.68
Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	2.32	NA	NA	13.19

**Confidence Intervals Used*

	Legend
	Not Applicable
	Made AYP Goal
	AYP Goal Not Made
	Made Safe Harbor
	Made Matched Safe Harbor

MIAMI-YODER MIDDLE SCHOOL

Student group	Reading/Language Arts					
	Percent Tested Goal: 95%			Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced * Goal: 86.81%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	94.81	94.81	99.30	91.90	91.90	89.03
African American	NA	NA	99.06	NA	NA	80.95
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	98.65	NA	NA	86.62
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	99.53	NA	NA	92.63
Hispanic	NA	NA	99.23	NA	NA	79.05
White	95.83	95.83	99.35	95.37	95.37	94.31
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	97.64	NA	NA	55.54
English Language Learners	NA	NA	99.30	NA	NA	72.99
Economically Disadvantaged	95.24	95.24	99.09	NA	NA	79.34

Student group	Mathematics					
	Percent Tested Goal: 95%			Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced * Goal: 79.75%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	96.05	96.05	99.35	90.52	90.52	84.97
African American	NA	NA	98.99	NA	NA	71.77
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	98.99	NA	NA	78.17

Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	99.50	NA	NA	93.47
Hispanic	NA	NA	99.29	NA	NA	73.94
White	95.16	95.16	99.41	94.14	94.14	91.03
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	97.95	NA	NA	48.60
English Language Learners	NA	NA	99.38	NA	NA	71.25
Economically Disadvantaged	96.77	96.77	99.13	NA	NA	73.52

Student group	**Other Indicator**					
	Advanced Performance Reading * Goal: 1.21%			**Advanced Performance Mathematics * Goal: 1.21%**		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
All Students	11.36	11.36	9.42	26.52	26.52	23.46
African American	NA	NA	3.36	NA	NA	9.65
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	5.49	NA	NA	15.79
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	16.43	NA	NA	42.09
Hispanic	NA	NA	2.43	NA	NA	9.40
White	14.25	14.25	12.93	31.94	31.94	30.32
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	1.00	NA	NA	4.11
English Language Learners	NA	NA	1.66	NA	NA	9.53
Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	2.38	NA	NA	9.32

**Confidence Intervals Used*

Legend	
	Not Applicable
	Made AYP Goal

AYP Goal Not Made

Made Safe Harbor

Made Matched Safe Harbor

MIAMI-YODER HIGH SCHOOL

Student group	Reading/Language Arts					
	Percent Tested Goal: 95%			Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced * Goal: 89.83%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	96.30	96.30	97.39	98.58	98.58	92.42
African American	NA	NA	95.56	NA	NA	87.42
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	95.67	NA	NA	90.78
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	98.58	NA	NA	93.62
Hispanic	NA	NA	96.86	NA	NA	85.43
White	95.56	95.56	97.77	98.27	98.27	96.01
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	94.54	NA	NA	64.95
English Language Learners	NA	NA	97.31	NA	NA	79.81
Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	96.48	NA	NA	85.15

Student group	Mathematics					
	Percent Tested Goal: 95%			Percent Part. Proficient, Proficient, & Advanced * Goal: 73.50%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	96.30	96.30	97.61	68.43	68.43	65.78
African American	NA	NA	96.14	NA	NA	45.06
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	96.13	NA	NA	53.13

Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	98.45	NA	NA	80.16
Hispanic	NA	NA	97.02	NA	NA	44.25
White	95.56	95.56	98.00	69.13	69.13	76.62
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	95.27	NA	NA	24.95
English Language Learners	NA	NA	97.40	NA	NA	40.97
Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	96.79	NA	NA	44.70

Student group	Other Indicator		
	Graduation Rate Goal: 59.50%		
	School	District	State
All Students	81.20	81.20	73.90
African American	NA	NA	64.10
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	NA	NA	57.50
Asian/Pacific Islander	NA	NA	82.80
Hispanic	NA	NA	55.60
White	NA	NA	81.60
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	63.00
English Language Learners	NA	NA	52.00
Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	59.30

**Confidence Intervals Used*

Legend	
	Not Applicable
	Made AYP Goal

AYP Goal Not Made

Made Safe Harbor

Made Matched Safe Harbor

Status of School Improvement in the District

If Title I schools do not make AYP for two consecutive years, in the same content area, they are placed on School Improvement.

Improvement Levels	Schools	Percent of schools in district
Not on Improvement	Miami-Yoder Elementary Miami-Yoder Middle School Miami-Yoder High School	100%
School Improvement- Year-1	None	0%
School Improvement- Year 2	None	0%
Corrective Action	None	0%
Restructuring-Planning	None	0%
Restructuring-Implementation	None	0%

Teacher Data:

MIAMI-YODER ELEMENTARY

Teachers Highly Qualified in the School						
School Year	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
Percentage Not Highly Qualified	-	0.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Percentage Highly Qualified	0.00%	100.00%	83.33%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	33.00%	66.50%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Classrooms in the School Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers						
School Year	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
Percentage Not Highly Qualified	-	0.00%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Percentage Highly Qualified	0.00%	100.00%	90.91%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	33.00%	66.50%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

Professional Qualifications of Teachers	
Professional Qualification	**Percent of Teachers**
Bachelors Degree	50.00%
Masters Degree	50.00%
PhD	0.00%

Teacher Licenses	
License	**Percent of Teachers**
Initial	16.67%
Emergency	0

MIAMI-YODER MIDDLE SCHOOL

Teachers Highly Qualified in the School						
School Year	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
Percentage Not Highly Qualified	-	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%
Percentage Highly Qualified	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	NA	NA	YES	NO	YES

Classrooms in the School Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers						
School Year	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
Percentage Not Highly Qualified	-	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%
Percentage Highly Qualified	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	96.30%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	NA	NA	YES	NO	YES

Professional Qualifications of Teachers	
Professional Qualification	**Percent of Teachers**
Bachelors Degree	63.64%
Masters Degree	36.36%
PhD	0.00%

Teacher Licenses	
License	**Percent of Teachers**
Initial	9.09%
Emergency	0

MIAMI-YODER HIGH SCHOOL

Teachers Highly Qualified in the School						
School Year	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
Percentage Not Highly Qualified	-	28.57%	37.50%	9.09%	9.09%	11.11%
Percentage Highly Qualified	62.50%	71.43%	62.50%	90.91%	90.91%	88.89%
Target Percentage	-	74.88%	87.44%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Classrooms in the School Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers						
School Year	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**
Percentage Not Highly Qualified	-	19.71%	22.73%	2.94%	10.26%	0.00%
Percentage Highly Qualified	76.39%	80.29%	77.27%	97.06%	89.74%	100.00%
Target Percentage	-	84.18%	92.09%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target Made	-	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES

Professional Qualifications of Teachers	
Professional Qualification	**Percent of Teachers**
Bachelors Degree	64.29%
Masters Degree	28.57%
PhD	0.00%

Teacher Licenses	
License	**Percent of Teachers**
Initial	14.29%
Emergency	0