

## APPENDIX E

### INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT AND CHARTER SCHOOL DATA: SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS AND RESULTS

The tables that follow, for each participating district and charter school, have two main parts: self-reported data and state English Language Arts Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) data.

Part 1 of each table specifies the self-reported goals, assessments, and results submitted to the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) in fall 2006 Annual Reading Proficiency Reports.

- Column 1 indicates grade level.
- Column 2 specifies the Year 2 proficiency goal that was set for each grade level. Year 1 goals are not included in these tables.<sup>1</sup>
- Column 3 lists the assessment measure used to evaluate whether the participant's Year 2 goal was met.
- Columns 4, 5, and 7 depict student performance on the specified measure in SY2003/04, SY2004/05, and SY2005/06.
- Columns 6 and 8 indicate whether the district or charter school reported meeting its specified grade-level goals in Year 1 (SY2004/05) and Year 2 (SY2005/06). Note that a *Yes* or *No* in Column 6 indicates whether the participant met its Year 1 goal, which is not listed in the table. So if the district or charter changed its proficiency goal from Year 1 to Year 2, the determination in Column 6 may not align with the goal listed in Column 2.

Part 2 of each data table (the three right columns) indicates the district's or charter school's proficiency rates (the percentages of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4) on the English Language Arts CRT administered in the spring of 2004, 2005, and 2006.<sup>2</sup> When reviewing CRT figures in this context, certain key statistical considerations should be kept in mind.

First, these results depict three different grade-level cohorts of varying sizes and compositions; they do not represent the performance of a single group of students over three years. Second, among charter schools and smaller school districts, even a single student can have a disproportionate statistical impact on the overall grade-level proficiency rate.

Assessment measures:

- *English Language Arts CRT*.
- *Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM)*.
- *Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)*.
- *Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)*.
- *Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI)*.
- *Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI)*.

#### Notes

1. Year 1 goals set by participating districts and charter schools are available in WestEd (2005), accessible online at [www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf).
2. Data exclude home-schooled students, those spending less than a full academic year at their school, and students in private schools. The inclusion rules for these calculations were based on "Blank," "Attempted," "Accommodated," and "UT Alternate Assessment" Participation Codes as well as a "V" (Valid) Record Status Code. These rules were established in October 2005 through phone discussions with Jerry Winkler, USOE Information Technology Manager, and were subsequently verified by Aaron Brough, USOE Data Specialist, in September 2006. Additional technical detail, including the SPSS syntax used to produce the 2006 results, is available upon request. (The 2004 and 2005 results were retrieved from WestEd, 2005.)

**Alpine School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Reduce percentage of students not passing DRA level 3 to below 25%	DRA oral reading	28% not passing	24%	Yes	20%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Decrease the percentage of students at CRT levels 1 and 2 by 1%	CRT	L1: 7% L2: 13% Tot: 20%	L1: 6% L2: 13% Tot: 19%	Yes	18%	Yes	82.3%	81.8%	83.0%
2	Reduce individual achievement gap by 1% on district value-added Gr. 2 core test as compared to Gr. 1 core test for students below CRT scaled score (155)	CRT	150	155 (3.3%)	Yes	1%	Yes	80.8%	83.7%	82.7%
3	Reduce individual achievement gap by 1% on district value-added Gr. 3 core test as compared to Gr. 2 core test for students below CRT scaled score (155)	CRT	149	153 (2.6%)	Yes	1%	Yes	80.8%	80.0%	82.4%

**Beaver County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS LNF DIBELS PSF	10% 48%	97% 92%	Yes Yes	97% 93%	Yes Yes	–	–	–
1	80% proficient	DRA	37%	72%	Yes	88%	Yes	75.6%	79.7%	87.8%
2	80% proficient	DRA	62%	93%	Yes	90%	Yes	88.1%	92.9%	90.4%
3	80% proficient	DRA	71%	91%	Yes	93%	Yes	76.7%	79.5%	87.8%

**Box Elder School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	68% at benchmark	DIBELS LNF/PSF	35%	61%	Yes	68%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Increase percentage proficient from 78% (2005) to 80% (2006)	CRT	73.9%	77.8%	Yes	78.5%	No	73.9%	77.8%	78.5%
2	Increase percentage proficient from 73% (2005) to 75% (2006)	CRT	77.9%	73.5%	No	80.2%	Yes	77.9%	73.5%	80.2%
3	Increase percentage proficient from 78% (2005) to 80% (2006)	CRT	80.0%	78.1%	No	73.9%	No	80.0%	78.1%	73.9%

**Cache County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	90% proficient	DIBELS PSF	78%	86%	Yes	93%	Yes	–	–	–
1	90% proficient	CRT	91.9%	90.8%	Yes	94.0%	Yes	91.9%	90.8%	94.0%
2	90% proficient	CRT	90.4%	93.5%	Yes	93.3%	Yes	90.4%	93.5%	93.3%
3	90% proficient	CRT	90.6%	92.0%	Yes	92.0%	Yes	90.6%	92.0%	92.0%

**Carbon School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	65% proficient	DIBELS LNF	55%	70%	Yes	66%	Yes	–	–	–
1	77% proficient on CRT; DIBELS improvement	CRT	84.4%	80.3%	No	84.6%	Yes	84.4%	80.3%	84.6%
		DIBELS PSF	60%	80%	Yes	93%	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF	59%	71%	Yes	72%	Yes			
2	77% proficient on CRT; DIBELS improvement	CRT	81.9%	81.4%	No	85.0%	Yes	81.9%	81.4%	85.0%
		DIBELS ORF	40%	43%	Yes	54%	Yes			
3	77% proficient on CRT; DIBELS improvement	CRT	81.5%	80.9%	No	79.9%	Yes	81.5%	80.9%	79.9%
		DIBELS ORF	42%	45%	Yes	46%	Yes			

**Daggett School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	75% scoring Some Risk or better on DIBELS	DIBELS LNF	33%	20%	Yes	25%	Yes	–	–	–
		DIBELS PSF	At Risk	At Risk	Yes	At Risk	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF	11%	0%	Yes	25%	Yes			
			At Risk	At Risk		At Risk				
			22%	20%		13%				
			At Risk	At Risk		At Risk				
1	75% proficient	CRT	87.5%	100.0%	Yes	87.5%	Yes	87.5%	100%	87.5%
2	75% proficient	CRT	100.0%	63.6%	No	90.0%	Yes	100%	63.6%	90.0%
3	75% proficient	CRT	100.0%	73.3%	Yes	81.8%	Yes	100%	73.3%	81.8%

**Davis School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Increased pre/post mean scores	USOE K assessment	76% to 90%	Yes	77% to 91%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Reading level gains for Tier 1 students	CRT	169 to 169 (median scale scores)	Yes	79.2 to 80.3	Yes	78.2%	77.9%	77.3%
	Reading level gains for Tier 2 students	QRI	1 year, 2 month gain	Yes	1.0				
2	Reading level gains for Tier 1 students	CRT	168 to 169 (median scale scores)	Yes	83.2 to 83.3	Yes	82.4%	82.3%	81.8%
		SDRT	NA	NA	Scale score gain = 26.0				
	Reading level gains for Tier 2 students	QRI	2 year, 3 month gain	Yes	1.9				
3	Reading level gains for Tier 1 students	CRT	168 to 169 (median scale scores)	Yes	82.4 to 83.0	Yes	80.7%	80.5%	80.9%
		SDRT	NA	NA	Scale score gain = 30.0				
	Reading level gains for Tier 2 students	QRI	1 year, 7 month gain	Yes	1.6				

**Duchesne County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	2% more reaching benchmark on DIBELS	DIBELS PSF	64% Low Risk 19% Some Risk 18% At Risk	81% Established 15% Emerging 4% Deficit	Yes	85.5% 12.2% 2.4%	Yes	-	-	-
1	2% higher proficiency	CRT	82.7%	79.5%	No	81.5%	Yes	82.7%	79.5%	81.5%
2	2% higher proficiency	CRT	78.0%	78.4%	No	77.3%	No	78.0%	78.4%	77.3%
3	2% higher proficiency	CRT	77.1%	77.2%	No	76.8%	No	77.1%	77.2%	76.8%

**Emery County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Lower percentage At Risk (Fall vs. Spring)	DIBELS LNF DIBELS PSF	30% to 25% At Risk 18% to 8% At Risk	Yes Yes	39% to 23% At Risk 33% to 10% At Risk	Yes Yes	-	-	-
1	Higher percentage of cohort proficiency (K to Gr. 1)	CRT	NA to 78.7	NA	NA to 81.3	NA	89.9%	78.7%	81.3%
2	Higher percentage of cohort proficiency (Gr. 1 to Gr. 2)	CRT	89.9 to 85.1	No	78.7 to 82.0	Yes	79.1%	85.1%	82.0%
3	Higher percentage of cohort proficiency (Gr. 2 to Gr. 3)	CRT	79.1 to 90.0	Yes	85.1 to 89.6	Yes	81.8%	90.0%	89.6%

**Garfield County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	All students will show progress each year	DIBELS	NA	11% Deficit 23% Emerging 67% Established	Yes	10% Deficit 17% Emerging 73% Established	Yes	-	-	-
1	All students will show progress each year	CRT	89.7%	93.0%	Yes	93.2%	Yes	89.7%	93.0%	93.2%
2	All students will show progress each year	CRT	82.1%	83.1%	Yes	93.2%	Yes	82.1%	83.1%	93.2%
3	All students will show progress each year	CRT	68.7%	72.6%	Yes	84.1%	Yes	68.7%	72.6%	84.1%

**Grand County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	70% at benchmark	Letter recognition	70%	94%	Yes	95%	Yes	-	-	-
		Letter/sounds	51%	86%	Yes	89%	Yes			
		Sound segments	51%	71%	Yes	80%	Yes			
		Elementary spelling	64%	87%	Yes	88.5%	Yes			
		HFW Reading	40%	71%	Yes	76%	Yes			
		HFW Written	62%	82%	Yes	80%	Yes			
K	60% at benchmark	DIBELS PSF	NA	50%	No	78%	Yes			
		DIBELS LNF	NA	48%	No	68%	Yes			
1	80% proficient	CRT	83.5%	87.4%	Yes	80.5%	Yes	83.5%	87.4%	80.5%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	NA	55%	No	65%	No			
		DIBELS NWF	NA	55%	No	75%	Yes			
	64% at Level I	Guided Reading	58%	60%	No	72%	Yes			
2	64% at Level 6	Elementary spelling	64%	82%	Yes	78%	Yes			
2	78% proficient	CRT	75.7%	79.2%	Yes	80.4%	Yes	75.7%	79.2%	80.4%
	60% at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	NA	NA	NA	47%	No			
	64% at Level M	Guided Reading	58%	84%	Yes	77%	Yes			
3	78% proficient	CRT	87.8%	80.7%	Yes	79.8%	Yes	87.8%	80.7%	79.8%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	NA	NA	NA	56%	No			
	66% at Level P	Guided Reading	75%	68%	Yes	64%	No			

**Granite School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Measurable performance gains	USOE Pre/Post K assessment	NA	NA	Yes	63% to 88%	Yes	-	-	-
1	Measurable performance gains	CRT	69.3%	69.5%	Yes	67.8%	No	69.3%	69.5%	67.8%
		Yearly Progress Pro	NA	3% (Fall)	-	46%	Yes			
2	Measurable performance gains	CRT	68.4%	70.8%	Yes	70.0%	No	68.4%	70.8%	70.0%
		Yearly Progress Pro	NA	36% (Fall)	-	63%	Yes			
3	Measurable performance gains	CRT	66.4%	67.6%	Yes	69.7%	Yes	66.4%	67.6%	69.7%
		Yearly Progress Pro	NA	38% (Fall)	-	57%	Yes			

**Iron County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	3% gain on DIBELS	DIBELS LNF	NA	28% gain	Yes	37% gain	Yes	-	-	-
1	3% higher proficiency than 2004 baseline	CRT	80.3%	82.4%	No	83.5%	Yes	80.3%	82.4%	83.5%
	3% gain on DIBELS	DIBELS	NA	23% gain	Yes	2% gain	No			
2	3% higher proficiency than 2004 baseline	CRT	82.9%	85.0%	No	82.2%	No	82.9%	85.0%	82.2%
	3% gain on DIBELS	DIBELS	NA	7% gain	Yes	7% gain	Yes			
3	3% higher proficiency than 2004 baseline	CRT	84.7%	87.1%	No	84.8%	No	84.7%	87.1%	84.8%
	3% gain on DIBELS	DIBELS	NA	3% gain	Yes	4% gain	Yes			

**Jordan School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficiency	USOE K assessments	NA	87%	Yes	96%	Yes	-	-	-
	1% more on grade level	Guided Reading	NA	NA	Yes	+32%	Yes			
1	70% proficient	CRT	80.1%	77.5%	No	77.4%	Yes	80.1%	77.5%	77.4%
	1% more on grade level	Guided Reading	NA	NA	Yes	+26%	Yes			
2	70% proficient	CRT	81.6%	80.4%	Yes	80.6%	Yes	81.6%	80.4%	80.6%
	1% more on grade level	Guided Reading	NA	NA	Yes	+19%	Yes			
3	70% proficient	CRT	79.4%	77.9%	Yes	78.7%	Yes	79.4%	77.9%	78.7%
	1% more on grade level	Guided Reading	NA	NA	Yes	+13%	Yes			

**Juab School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	85% proficient	DIBELS	NA	93% on gr. level	Yes	94% on gr. level	Yes	-	-	-
1	85% proficient	CRT	88.8%	95.4%	Yes	88.2%	Yes	88.8%	95.4%	88.2%
2	85% proficient	CRT	92.9%	95.0%	Yes	92.5%	Yes	92.9%	95.0%	92.5%
3	85% proficient	CRT	89.8%	86.4%	Yes	86.9%	Yes	89.8%	86.4%	86.9%

**Kane County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	2% increase in % meeting DIBELS benchmark	DIBELS PSF	64% Low Risk	85% Established	Yes	82% Established	Yes	-	-	-
		DIBELS NWF	63% Low Risk	79% Low Risk	Yes	85% Low Risk	Yes			
1	73% proficient	CRT	86%	82%	Yes	84%	Yes	85.9%	82.3%	83.9%
	84% Established	DIBELS NWF	37% Low Risk	82% Established	Yes	84% Established	Yes			
	76% Low Risk	DIBELS ORF	59% Low Risk	77% Low Risk	Yes	76% Low Risk	Yes			
2	73% proficient	CRT	84%	92%	Yes	93%	Yes	84.4%	92.2%	92.6%
	72% Low Risk	DIBELS ORF	51% Low Risk	59% Low Risk	Yes	72% Low Risk	Yes			
3	73% proficient	CRT	87%	81%	No	77%	Yes	87.0%	80.5%	76.5%
	57% Low Risk	DIBELS ORF	45% Low Risk	47% Low Risk	Yes	57% Low Risk	Yes			
	National Percentile Rank	Iowa Reading Iowa Language	67% 54%	73% 55%	NA	73% 55%	NA			

**Logan City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	90% proficiency	DIBELS	LNF 51%	LNF 99% PSF 55%	Yes	PSF 99%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Lower percentage below grade level	CRT	12.0%	14.5%	No	12.7%	Yes	88.0%	85.5%	87.3%
	90% proficiency	DIBELS	NWF 67%	NWF 99% PSF 74%	Yes	PSF 99%	Yes			
2	Lower percentage below grade level	CRT	11.3%	9.5%	Yes	13.8%	No	88.7%	90.5%	86.2%
	90% proficiency	DIBELS	ORF 60%	ORF 100% ORF 65%	Yes	ORF 99%	Yes			
3	Lower percentage below grade level	CRT	14.3%	10.9%	Yes	12.8%	No	85.7%	89.1%	87.2%
	90% proficiency	DIBELS	ORF 65%	ORF 99% ORF 66%	Yes	ORF 98%	Yes			

**Millard County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	55% scoring 40+	DIBELS LNF	NA	46%	Yes	78%	Yes	–	–	–
	55% scoring 35+	DIBELS PSF	NA	45%		64%				
1	72% proficient	CRT	77.9%	79.9%	Yes	75.4%	Yes	77.9%	79.9%	75.4%
2	72% proficient	CRT	78.7%	82.3%	Yes	86.6%	Yes	78.7%	82.3%	86.6%
3	72% proficient	CRT	78.2%	74.2%	Yes	76.2%	Yes	78.2%	74.2%	76.2%

**Morgan County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	85–95% proficient	DIBELS ISF	88%	87%	No	94%	Yes	–	–	–
		DIBELS LNF	91%	83%		94%				
1	85–95% proficient	CRT	95.9%	91.7%	No	98.0%	Yes	95.9%	91.7%	98.0%
2	85–95% proficient	CRT	88.7%	88.0%	Yes	91.6%	Yes	88.7%	88.0%	91.6%
3	85–95% proficient	CRT	84.5%	87.4%	Yes	88.5%	Yes	84.5%	87.4%	88.5%

**Murray City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	10% decrease in Intensive students	DIBELS LNF	22% At Risk	23% At Risk	No	96 to 64 (33%)	Yes	-	-	-
		DIBELS PSF	19% Deficient	6% Deficient	Yes					
1	80% proficient	CRT	76.6%	76.4%	No	83.4%	Yes	76.6%	76.4%	83.4%
2	82% proficient	CRT	84.4%	83.6%	Yes	82.2%	Yes	84.4%	83.6%	82.2%
3	82% proficient	CRT	78.5%	80.7%	Yes	82.2%	Yes	78.5%	80.7%	82.2%

**Nebo School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K		District K assessment	NA	NA	NA	95	Yes	-	-	-
1	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	83.8	82.9	Yes	87.2	Yes	84.5%	83.8%	87.2%
		Benchmark	80.4	83.5	Yes	85.5	Yes			
2	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	82.3	82.2	Yes	84.5	Yes	84.0%	82.9%	84.5%
		Benchmark	83.3	80.2	Yes	80.6	Yes			
3	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	82.3	81.8	Yes	83.9	Yes	83.7%	82.9%	83.9%
		Benchmark	76.5	76.6	Yes	77.3	Yes			

**North Sanpete School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% scoring 35+ by 2007	DIBELS PSF	70% Established	90% Established	Yes	94.4% Established	Yes	-	-	-
1	74% proficient	CRT	71.5%	78.7%	Yes	88.0%	Yes	71.5%	78.7%	88.0%
2	74% proficient	CRT	75.0%	85.6%	Yes	77.9%	Yes	75.0%	85.6%	77.9%
3	74% proficient	CRT	77.5%	64.3%	No	84.4%	Yes	77.5%	64.3%	84.4%

**North Summit School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	83% at benchmark	DIBELS	NA	82%	NA	92%	Yes	-	-	-
1	80% proficient	CRT	84.8%	75.7%	No	85.9%	Yes	84.8%	75.7%	85.9%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS	NA	68%	No	78%	Yes			
2	80% proficient	CRT	95.0%	88.9%	No	91.8%	Yes	95.0%	88.9%	91.8%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS	NA	69%	No	71%	Yes			
3	80% proficient	CRT	77.9%	84.6%	Yes	88.9%	Yes	77.9%	84.6%	88.9%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS	NA	59%	Yes	71%	Yes			

**Ogden City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ISF, PSF	54%	74%	Yes	78%	Yes	-	-	-
1	10% fewer students not proficient	CRT	61.7%	64.0%	No	68.1%	No	61.7%	64.0%	68.1%
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS PSF, NWF, ORF	43%	52%	Yes	58%	Yes			
	10% cohort growth (K to Gr. 1)	DIBELS	NA	74% (K)	NA	58% (Gr1)	No			
2	10% fewer students not proficient	CRT	65.2%	68.9%	No	70.9%	No	65.2%	68.9%	70.9%
	10% cohort growth (Gr. 1 to Gr. 2)	CRT	NA	64% (Gr1)	NA	70.9% (Gr2)	Yes			
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	37%	47%	Yes	45%	No			
	10% cohort growth (Gr. 1 to Gr. 2)	DIBELS ORF	NA	52% (Gr1)	NA	45% (Gr2)	No			
3	10% fewer students not proficient	CRT	61.6%	67.1%	No	70.5%	Yes	61.6%	67.1%	70.5%
	10% cohort growth (Gr. 2 to Gr. 3)	CRT	61.7% (Gr1)	68.9% (Gr2)	NA	70.5% (Gr3)	No			
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	34%	43%	Yes	42%	No			
	10% cohort growth (Gr. 2 to Gr. 3)	DIBELS ORF	43% (Gr1)	47% (Gr2)	NA	42% (Gr3)	No			

**Park City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Not provided	DIBELS PSF	63% Established	76% Established	Yes	NA	NA	-	-	-
1	Higher percentage proficient	CRT	76.8%	74.2%	No	82.2%	Yes	76.8%	74.2%	82.2%
2	Higher % proficient	CRT	81.9%	80.6%	No	83.1%	Yes	81.9%	80.6%	83.1%
3	Higher % proficient	CRT	82.9%	82.1%	No	85.9%	Yes	82.9%	82.1%	85.9%

**Piute School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Average of K-3 passing rates > 75%	USOE PreK assessment	76%	76%	Yes	76%	Yes	-	-	-
1		CRT	73.3%	85.7%	Yes	72.7%	Yes	73.3%	85.7%	72.7%
2		CRT	75.0%	70.0%	Yes	100%	Yes	75.0%	70.0%	100%
3		CRT	42.1%	69.2%	Yes	66.7%	Yes	42.1%	69.2%	66.7%

**Provo City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Increased yearly gain until 80% reached	District K assessment	69%	69%	No	75%	Yes	-	-	-
1	2% proficiency gain	CRT	83.7%	82.4%	No	78.3%	No	83.7%	82.4%	78.3%
	Proficiency gain	DRA	71%	65%	No	64%	No			
2	2% proficiency gain	CRT	76.0%	79.4%	Yes	81.4%	No	76.0%	79.4%	81.4%
	Proficiency gain	DRA	72%	74%	Yes	74%	No			
3	2% proficiency gain	CRT	78.5%	77.9%	No	80.8%	Yes	78.5%	77.9%	80.8%
	Proficiency gain	DRP	61%	77%	Yes	72%	No			

## Rich School District

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	<u>General:</u> Student growth from Fall to Spring <u>Long term:</u> 80% proficient on CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, Utah Core tests	Classroom (skills)	25% to 95%	Yes	29% to 96%	Yes	-	-	-
		CBM LSF (letters)	13 to 41	Yes	2 to 51	Yes			
		CBM LNF (letters)	41 to 72	Yes	19 to 53	Yes			
1	<u>General:</u> Student growth from Fall to Spring <u>Long term:</u> 80% proficient on CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, Utah Core tests	Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading (grade level)	1.0 to 2.3	Yes	0.6 to 1.8	Yes	84.2%	86.2%	92.6%
		CBM R-CBM (words/minute)	19 to 87	Yes	6 to 82	Yes			
		CBM Maze (multiple choice)	5 to 16	Yes	1 to 14	Yes			
		CBM Spelling (letter sequence)	24 to 29	Yes	26 to 45	Yes			
2	<u>General:</u> Student growth from Fall to Spring <u>Long term:</u> 80% proficient on CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, Utah Core tests	Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading (grade level)	1.1 to 3.0	Yes	2.2 to 3.1	Yes	100%	88.6%	77.8%
		CBM R-CBM (words/minute)	73 to 120	Yes	71 to 120	Yes			
		CBM Maze (multiple choice)	7 to 21	Yes	4 to 20	Yes			
		CBM Spelling (letter sequence)	43 to 61	Yes	48 to 58	Yes			
3	<u>General:</u> Student growth from Fall to Spring <u>Long term:</u> 80% proficient on CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, Utah Core tests	Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading (grade level)	3.5 to 4.5	Yes	3.0 to 3.9	Yes	96.0%	92.6%	89.7%
		CBM R-CBM (words/minute)	79 to 138	Yes	89 to 167	Yes			
		CBM Maze (multiple choice)	10 to 26	Yes	15 to 21	Yes			
		CBM Spelling (letter sequence)	65 to 81	Yes	60 to 98	Yes			

**Salt Lake City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Increased percentage reading at grade level	District K test	54% to 77% (full day) 62% to 77% (half day)	Yes	77% to 76% (full day) 77% to 80% (half day)	Yes	–	–	–
1	Increased proficiency	CRT	67.8 to 62.9	No	62.9 to 66.8	Yes	67.8%	62.9%	66.8%
	Increased percentage reading at grade level	DRA	66 to 61	No	61 to 65	Yes			
2	Increased proficiency	CRT	66.7 to 68.6	Yes	68.6 to 66.4	No	66.7%	68.6%	66.4%
	Increased percentage reading at grade level	DRA	64 to 66	Yes	66 to 64	No			
3	Increased proficiency	CRT	66.6 to 69.2	Yes	69.2 to 71.2	Yes	66.6%	69.2%	71.2%
	Increased percentage reading at grade level	DRA	64 to 67	Yes	67 to 72	Yes			

**San Juan School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	5% improvement over previous year	DIBELS NWF	71%	82%	Yes	92%	Yes	–	–	–
1	5% improvement over previous year	DIBELS ORF	54%	56%	No	71%	Yes	62.5%	62.7%	70.3%
2	5% improvement over previous year	DIBELS ORF	45%	46%	No	64%	Yes	58.5%	75.9%	69.6%
3	5% improvement over previous year	DIBELS ORF	45%	50%	Yes	57%	Yes	59.3%	60.1%	62.9%

**Sevier School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	85% with correct response	USOE PA subtest	85%	85%	Yes	88%	Yes	–	–	–
	91% with correct response	USOE Compr subtest	91%	89%	No	92%	Yes			
1	71% proficient	CRT	84.7%	83.8%	Yes	80.3%	Yes	84.7%	83.8%	80.3%
2	71% proficient	CRT	85.1%	84.7%	Yes	84.7%	Yes	85.1%	84.7%	84.7%
3	77% proficient	CRT	89.6%	87.5%	No	84.8%	Yes	89.6%	87.5%	84.8%

**South Sanpete School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% "sufficient" or above	DIBELS	77%	78%	No	84%	Yes	-	-	-
1	80% "sufficient" or above	CRT	90.5%	84.1%	Yes	91.1%	Yes	90.5%	84.1%	91.1%
		DIBELS	83%	83%		86.5%				
2	80% "sufficient" or above	CRT	85.6%	87.0%	No	88.9%	Yes	85.6%	87.0%	88.9%
		DIBELS	73%	73%		81%				
3	80% "sufficient" or above	CRT	86.4%	85.7%	Yes	90.1%	Yes	86.4%	85.7%	90.1%
		DIBELS	73%	81%		86%				

**South Summit School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS PSF	30%	8%	Yes	98%	Yes	-	-	-
		DIBELS NWF	At Risk	Deficit		ORF				
		DIBELS LNF	39%	23%						
			At Risk	At Risk						
1	3% proficiency increase	CRT	86.9%	88.4%	Yes	84.0%	No	86.9%	88.4%	84.0%
	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	11% At Risk	11% At Risk		0% At Risk	Yes			
2	3% proficiency increase	CRT	85.6%	83.8%	No	87.0%	Yes	85.6%	83.8%	87.0%
	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	27% At Risk	33% At Risk		0% At Risk	Yes			
3	3% proficiency increase	CRT	77.9%	85.3%	Yes	76.9%	No	77.9%	85.3%	76.9%
	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	24% At Risk	17% At Risk		0% At Risk	Yes			

**Tintic School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	10% reduction in students not proficient	USOE K assessment	36%	94%	Yes	96%	Yes	-	-	-
		Teacher CRT	NA	100%	Yes	96%	No			
1	10% reduction in students not proficient	CRT	93.3%	77.8%	No	83.3%	Yes	93.3%	77.8%	83.3%
	10% fewer not making one year's growth	QRI 3	31%	100%	Yes	85%	No			
2	10% reduction in students not proficient	CRT	100%	93.8%	Yes	80.0%	No	100%	93.8%	80.0%
	10% fewer not making one year's growth	QRI 3	60%	88%	Yes	95%	Yes			
3	10% reduction in students not proficient	CRT	88.2%	100%	Yes	89.5%	No	88.2%	100%	89.5%
	10% fewer not making one year's growth	QRI 3	91%	100%	Yes	89%	No			

**Tooele County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS PSF	NA	Training	NA	89%	Yes	-	-	-
1	77% proficient	CRT	81.3%	79.7%	No	77.5%	Yes	81.3%	79.7%	77.5%
2	80% proficient	CRT	81.1%	81.4%	Yes	85.2%	Yes	81.1%	81.4%	85.2%
3	80% proficient	CRT	82.5%	81.1%	No	83.9%	Yes	82.5%	81.1%	83.9%

**Uintah County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	No official proficiency goal set by USOE	USOE K assessment	68%	89%	Yes	85% ≥80%	Yes	-	-	-
1	71% proficient	CRT	83.3%	79.8%	Yes	80.0%	Yes	83.3%	79.8%	80.0%
2	71% proficient	CRT	81.6%	84.3%	Yes	81.8%	Yes	81.6%	84.3%	81.8%
3	71% proficient	CRT	78.4%	83.5%	Yes	83.1%	Yes	78.4%	83.5%	83.1%

**Wasatch County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	94.40% proficient	USOE K assessment	93%	95%	Yes	95%	Yes	–	–	–
1	71.62% proficient	CRT	70.2%	78.7%	Yes	78.1%	Yes	70.2%	78.7%	78.1%
2	81.64% proficient	CRT	81.0%	77.6%	No	81.5%	No	81.0%	77.6%	81.5%
3	76.85% proficient	CRT	79.0%	74.3%	Yes	75.5%	No	79.0%	74.3%	75.5%

**Washington County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	10% increase (or 80%) at proficiency	USOE K assessment	87%	96%	Yes	NA	NA	–	–	–
1	10% increase (or 80%) at proficiency	CRT	76.7%	75.6%	No	75.2%	No	76.7%	75.6%	75.2%
		DRA	75%	78%	Yes	75%	No			
2	10% increase (or 80%) at proficiency	CRT	76.7%	79.0%	Yes	77.4%	No	76.7%	79.0%	77.4%
		DRA	83%	85%	Yes	82%	Yes			
3	10% increase (or 80%) at proficiency	CRT	76.3%	74.1%	No	77.0%	No	76.3%	74.1%	77.0%
		DRA	87%	81%	Yes	85%	Yes			

**Wayne County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% scoring $\geq$ 74%	K TPRI	69%	100%	Yes	97%	Yes	–	–	–
1	77% proficient	CRT	83.8%	82.1%	Yes	93.8%	Yes	83.8%	82.1%	93.8%
2	77% proficient	CRT	83.8%	88.2%	Yes	77.5%	Yes	83.8%	88.2%	77.5%
3	77% proficient	CRT	78.8%	82.5%	Yes	90.9%	Yes	78.8%	82.5%	90.9%

**Weber School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Fewer students At Risk	DIBELS PSF	386 to 120	Yes	281 to 89	Yes	-	-	-
1	Fewer students At Risk	DIBELS PSF	386 to 7	Yes	193 to 19	Yes	79.5%	80.1%	80.1%
		DIBELS NWF	659 to 112	Yes	409 to 98	Yes			
2	Fewer students At Risk	DIBELS ORF	499 to 489	Yes	493 to 372	Yes	82.5%	82.1%	81.8%
3	Fewer students At Risk	DIBELS ORF	491 to 347	Yes	524 to 336	Yes	77.4%	78.5%	78.1%

**PARTICIPATING CHARTER SCHOOLS (YEAR 2)**

**American Leadership Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS	-	-	-	NA	NA	-	-	-
1	80% proficient	CRT	-	-	-	55.7%	No	NA	NA	55.7%
		DIBELS	-	-	-	NA				
2	80% proficient	CRT	-	-	-	78.1%	No	NA	NA	78.1%
		DIBELS	-	-	-	NA				
3	80% proficient	CRT	-	-	-	80.8%	Yes	NA	NA	80.8%
		DIBELS	-	-	-	NA				

**American Preparatory Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS PSF	NA	NA	NA	81%	Yes	-	-	-
		DIBELS NWF				85%	Yes			
1	80% proficient	CRT	88.9%	79.2%	No	78.3%	No	88.9%	79.2%	78.3%
		DIBELS PSF	NA	NA	NA	97%	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF				79%	No			
		DIBELS ORF				77%	No			
2	80% proficient	CRT	80.0%	83.3%	Yes	86.5%	Yes	80.0%	83.3%	86.5%
		DIBELS ORF	NA	NA	NA	77%	No			
3	80% proficient	CRT	87.2%	74.1%	No	94.3%	Yes	87.2%	74.1%	94.3%
		DIBELS ORF	NA	NA	NA	69%	No			

**Freedom Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Measurable gains	Spalding assessment	30%	75%	Yes	75%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Measurable gains	CRT	54.5%	76.5%	Yes	83.8%	Yes	54.5%	76.5%	83.8%
2	Measurable gains	CRT	78.3%	88.3%	Yes	81.8%	No	78.3%	88.3%	81.8%
3	Measurable gains	CRT	82.9%	81.0%	No	80.8%	No	82.9%	81.0%	80.8%

**John Hancock Charter School**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	75% "sufficient" or "substantial"	SAT9	60% ≥50%	90%	Yes	80%	Yes	–	–	–
1	75% "sufficient" or "substantial"	CRT	95.0%	100%	Yes	95.0%	Yes	95.0%	100%	95.0%
2	75% "sufficient" or "substantial"	CRT	64.7%	85.0%	Yes	100%	Yes	64.7%	85.0%	100%
3	75% "sufficient" or "substantial"	CRT	65.0%	84.2%	Yes	85.0%	Yes	65.0%	84.2%	85.0%

**Moab Community School**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	–	–	–
1	All students proficient	CRT	NA	3 of 5	No	0 of 2	No	NA	60.0%	0.0%
2	All students proficient	CRT	NA	3 of 4	No	1 of 5	No	NA	75.0%	20.0%
3	All students proficient	CRT	NA	0 of 2	No	1 of 3	No	NA	0.0%	33.3%

**Navigator Pointe Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Reading mastery	Internal assessments	-	-	-	Not provided	Yes	-	-	-
1	Reading mastery	Internal assessments	-	-	-	Not provided	Yes	NA	NA	74.0%
2	Reading mastery	Internal assessments	-	-	-	Not provided	Yes	NA	NA	88.0%
3	Reading mastery	Internal assessments	-	-	-	Not provided	Yes	NA	NA	77.1%

**North Davis Preparatory Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Cohort growth	DIBELS	NA	NA	88 to 74 (grade level)	No	-	-	-
1	Cohort growth	CRT	NA	NA	88 to 68.8	No	NA	85.3%	68.8%
2	Cohort growth	CRT	NA	NA	85.3 to 71.1	No	NA	80.3%	71.1%
3	Cohort growth	CRT	NA	NA	80.3 to 91.0	Yes	NA	90.2%	91.0%

**North Star Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	90% proficient	School's K assessment	-	-	NA	98%	Yes	-	-	-
1	90% proficient	CRT	-	-	NA	89.8%	No	NA	NA	89.8%
2	90% proficient	CRT	-	-	NA	91.7%	Yes	NA	NA	91.7%
3	90% proficient	CRT	-	-	NA	93.9%	Yes	NA	NA	93.9%

**Ogden Preparatory Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	-	-
1	5% improvement	CRT	NA to 52.4 (K to Gr.1)	NA	NA to 81.8 (K to Gr.1)	NA	52.4%	81.8%	73.3%
2	5% improvement	CRT	52.4 to 55.3 (Gr.1 to Gr.2)	No	81.8 to 73.9 (Gr.1 to Gr.2)	No	70.6%	55.3%	73.9%
3	5% improvement	CRT	70.6 to 83.3 (Gr.2 to Gr.3)	Yes	55.3 to 70.5 (Gr.2 to Gr.3)	Yes	73.9%	83.3%	70.5%

**Pinnacle Canyon Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Not provided	USOE K assessment	71%	89%	Yes	NA	NA	–	–	–
1	Not provided	CRT	87.2%	63.9%	No	65.6%	Yes	87.2%	63.9%	65.6%
		Iowa reading level	1.6	NA		NA				
2	Not provided	CRT	82.9%	59.5%	No	51.2%	Yes	82.9%	59.5%	51.2%
		Iowa reading level	NA	2.1		NA				
3	Not provided	CRT	75.6%	80.8%	No	56.8%	No	75.6%	80.8%	56.8%
		Iowa reading level	3.4	3.1		NA				

**Soldier Hollow School**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	75% proficient	DIBELS PSF	NA	NA	NA	NA	Yes	–	–	–
1	75% proficient	CRT	NA	NA	NA	80.0%	Yes	100%	100%	80.0%
2	75% proficient	CRT	NA	NA	NA	62.5%	No	88.9%	87.5%	62.5%
3	75% proficient	CRT	NA	NA	NA	85.7%	Yes	100%	100%	85.7%

**Summit Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	–	–	–
1	80% proficient	CRT	NA	93.2%	Yes	91.8%	Yes	NA	93.2%	91.8%
2	80% proficient	CRT	NA	89.6%	Yes	95.7%	Yes	NA	89.6%	95.7%
3	80% proficient	CRT	NA	94.4%	Yes	91.7%	Yes	NA	94.4%	91.7%

**Thomas Edison Charter School North Campus**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	At least 1 year's growth	Morrison McCall	NA	2.23	Yes	81.1	Yes	-	-	-
		Phonogram testing	NA	80%	Yes	88.2%	Yes			
1	90% proficient	CRT	83.7%	81.8%	No	82.9%	No	83.7%	81.8%	82.9%
	At least 1 year's growth	Morrison McCall	1.97 GRE	3.62 GRE	Yes	3.13 GRE	Yes			
2	90% proficient	CRT	68.0%	85.5%	No	89.5%	No	68.0%	85.5%	89.5%
	At least 1 year's growth	Morrison McCall	2.84 GRE	3.25 GRE	Yes	4.47 GRE	Yes			
3	90% proficient	CRT	77.3%	79.4%	No	80.0%	No	77.3%	79.4%	80.0%
	At least 1 year's growth	Morrison McCall	3.31 GRE	3.93 GRE	Yes	5.24 GRE	Yes			

**Thomas Edison Charter School South Campus**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Phonograms 80%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	90%	Yes	–	–	–
	Spelling 1.3	Morrison McCall	–	–	NA	1.8	Yes			
	Sentence dictation 80%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	85%	Yes			
	Poetry recitation 80%	Teacher guide	–	–	NA	100%	Yes			
1	Phonograms 80%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	82%	Yes	NA	NA	80.0%
	Spelling 2.3	Morrison McCall	–	–	NA	3.1	Yes			
	UPASS 80%	CRT	–	–	NA	80%	Yes			
	Reading skills 80%	Reading skills tests	–	–	NA	87%	Yes			
	Language skills 80%	Language skills tests	–	–	NA	87%	Yes			
2	Phonograms 85%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	91%	Yes	NA	NA	70.0%
	Spelling 3.3	Morrison McCall	–	–	NA	3.85	Yes			
	Reading comprehension 3.3	McCall Crabbs	–	–	NA	4.25	Yes			
	UPASS 80%	CRT	–	–	NA	70%	No			
	Reading skills 80%	Reading skills tests	–	–	NA	86%	Yes			
	Language skills 80%	Language skills tests	–	–	NA	90%	Yes			
3	Phonograms 85%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	93%	Yes	NA	NA	65.6%
	Spelling 4.3	Morrison McCall	–	–	NA	5.0	Yes			
	Reading comprehension 4.3	McCall Crabbs	–	–	NA	4.9	Yes			
	UPASS 80%	CRT	–	–	NA	65.6%	No			
	Reading skills 80%	Reading skills tests	–	–	NA	75%	No			
	Lang skills 80%	Language skills tests	–	–	NA	79%	No			

**Timpanogos Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	90% proficient	Spalding – phonograms 1-26	10% (Sept)	98% (May)	Yes	96% (May)	Yes	–	–	–
1	75% proficient	CRT	85.4%	81.3%	No	86.0%	Yes	85.4%	81.3%	86.0%
2	75% proficient	CRT	83.1%	85.4%	No	84.0%	Yes	83.1%	85.4%	84.0%
3	75% proficient	CRT	81.6%	80.8%	No	79.6%	Yes	81.6%	80.8%	79.6%

**Wasatch Peak Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Annual improvement	ECRI IRI	-	-	NA	Indiv. student comparisons	NA	-	-	-
1	Annual improvement	CRT	-	-	NA	71.1%	baseline	NA	NA	71.1%
		ECRI IRI	-	-	NA	Indiv. student comparisons				
		ECRI Mastery Tests	-	-	NA					
2	Annual improvement	CRT	-	-	NA	85.7%	baseline	NA	NA	85.7%
		ECRI IRI	-	-	NA	Indiv. student comparisons				
		ECRI Mastery Tests	-	-	NA					
3	Annual improvement	CRT	-	-	NA	91.7%	baseline	NA	NA	91.7%
		ECRI IRI	-	-	NA	Indiv. student comparisons				
		ECRI Mastery Tests	-	-	NA					
		Iowa	-	-	NA	80				

---

**REFERENCES**

- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1998). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002, April). *Guidance for the Reading First program*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/guidance.pdf>.
- Utah State Office of Education. (2005a, March). Literacy assessments supporting the Utah literacy framework and the Utah elementary core curriculum. Retrieved from [http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/core/ASSESSMENTS.pdf](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/core/ASSESSMENTS.pdf).
- Utah State Office of Education. (2005b). Utah K–3 literacy framework for successful instruction and intervention. Retrieved from <http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/sars/readingta/literacyframework.pdf>.
- Utah State Office of Education. (2006). Utah charter schools directory. Retrieved November 29, 2006, from <http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/charterschools/directory.htm>.
- WestEd. (2005). *WestEd analysis of Utah's K–3 Reading Improvement Program*. Retrieved from [http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf).