

2005-2006 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Cover Sheet Type of School: (Check all that apply) Elementary Middle High K-12 Charter

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

Official School Name North Georgetown Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 664 North Bedford Street
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Georgetown Delaware 19947-2162
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Sussex State School Code Number* 36-0692

Telephone (302) 855-2430 Fax (302) 855-2439

Website/URL www.k12.de.us/indianriver E-mail jHUDSON@IRSD.K12.DE.US

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

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent* Mrs. Lois M. Hobbs
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Indian River School District Tel. (302) 436-1000

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mr. Charles M. Bireley
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

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

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

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2005-2006 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2000 and has not received the 2003, 2004, or 2005 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

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

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>42</u> | % White |
| <u>17</u> | % Black or African American |
| <u>40</u> | % Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>1</u> | % Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>0</u> | % American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% | Total |

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

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 11 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	33
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	29
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	62
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	576
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.108
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	10.8

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 19 %
105 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: 1
 Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 56 %
 Total number students who qualify: 315

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

10. Students receiving special education services: $\frac{26}{147}$ %
 Total Number of Students Served

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

<u>1</u> Autism	<u>3</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u> </u> Deafness	<u>8</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>52</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>81</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>1</u> Hearing Impairment	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u> </u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u> </u> Multiple Disabilities	

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

Number of Staff

	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u> </u>
Classroom teachers	<u>34</u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>9</u>	<u> </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>7</u>	<u> </u>
Support staff	<u>4</u>	<u> </u>
Total number	<u>56</u>	<u> </u>

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers: 17:1

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

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Daily student attendance	95%	96%	96%	96%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	94%	93%	94%	94%	94%
Teacher turnover rate	5 %	5%	5%	5%	5%
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	%	%	%	%	%
Student drop-off rate (high school)	%	%	%	%	%

PART III - SUMMARY

North Georgetown Elementary School is located in the town of Georgetown, Delaware. It is one of seven elementary schools in the Indian River School District. The school has a total student population of 563 students in grades 1–5. The racial composition of the diverse student body includes 42% Caucasian, 17% African American, 40% Hispanic, and 1% Asian Pacific. Fifty-six percent of our students here at North Georgetown receive free or reduced-priced meals. North Georgetown’s special education services include an Intensive Learning Center along with inclusion and pullout classrooms. All students are instructed in the district’s regular education standards-based curricula.

North Georgetown Elementary is a community school where parents, teachers, support staff and community members collaborate for the benefit of all students. The staff consists of 2 administrators, 2 secretaries, 4 custodians, 8 cafeteria workers, 7 paraprofessionals, 1 nurse, 1 counselor, 1 reading specialist, 2 reading teachers, 9 specialists, 3 English Language Learner teachers, and 31 regular classroom teachers. Our active Parent Teacher Organization provides a vehicle for parents to support the school’s programs. Parents and community members partner with the school through our mentoring program and through opportunities to serve as classroom volunteers. Students are challenged academically, and they are encouraged to demonstrate model behavior. Good citizenship is reinforced through our “Caught Being Good” program, where students are honored daily, weekly, and monthly with certificates and other awards for making positive choices and for becoming productive members of our school. Our very active Y.E.L.L. (Youth to Eliminate the Loss of Life) Club provides an opportunity for several of our fifth grade students to develop leadership skills and promote community service. One of the Y.E.L.L. Club activities is to coordinate the North Georgetown Morning Report. This program educates our students about safety topics including fire, bicycle, and motor vehicle issues.

The staff here at North Georgetown is committed to the belief that all students can learn. The staff seeks to provide quality instruction in a learning environment that allows all students to reach their fullest potential. Our teachers focus on student learning within the framework of professional learning communities that foster collaboration in planning, instruction, and assessment. Students are provided additional assistance through before and after-school programs, flexible grouping, tutoring, previewing opportunities, and differentiated instruction. Staff members have written and received grants amounting to well over \$750,000 during the past six years. These monies, coming from organizations like MBNA and the 21st Century Community Learning Center Program, have been used to purchase materials and fund special programs that improve instruction and help address our students’ instructional needs. One of these special programs is called T.A.R.D.E.S. (Tutoring and Reading for the Development of English Skills), which offers after-school help for about 90 Hispanic students two times a week. Approximately 60% of our teachers have master’s degrees; six teachers have obtained their National Board Teaching Certification.

Our school goals include increasing the percentage of students who meet or exceed the state standards in all academic areas, providing professional development for instructional staff, increasing the availability of technology to enhance learning and instruction, creating a professional learning community, maintaining a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning, and increasing parental and community involvement opportunities.

North Georgetown Elementary School has been successful in developing a professional learning community where teachers work closely together both within and across grade levels to promote student learning. Instructional staff members participate in numerous learning-focused professional development activities enabling them to provide our students with instructional strategies that are research-based and produce results. Consequently, North Georgetown Elementary has received a Superior rating from the State of Delaware for the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

The staff of North Georgetown Elementary School uses multiple indicators to track student growth, to measure gains of various student populations, and to gauge the overall academic success of the school. Student progress toward the state standards is monitored using a variety of measures, including performance assessment, portfolio and norm-referenced testing. Although we use multiple measures, the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) serves as our primary indicator of student progress toward the state standards. This test is administered annually and has been expanded to include grades 2 through 10. The data presented for our school will focus on grades 3 and 5, as the more recently adopted assessments at the other grade levels are not yet supported by more than 3 years of data. Information on the state assessment system can be found on the state's website (www.doe.k12.de.us).

DSTP results show the percentage of 3rd grade students at North Georgetown who have met or exceeded the reading standard (reflected at performance levels 3, 4, and 5) has increased from 70% to 88% between 2001 and 2005. During this same time period, third grade students in the State of Delaware went from 74% meeting or exceeding the reading standard to 84%. Likewise, significant improvement is evident in the range of 5th grade students meeting and exceeding the reading standard from 72% in 2001 to 92% in 2005. Delaware's fifth grade students improved from 67% to 85%. Nationally normed data also reflect reading gains for the same five-year period. On the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT 9 / SAT 10), our NCE scores have increased from 57% to 62% in third grade reading and from 57% to 68% in fifth grade reading.

In the mathematics portion of the DSTP, the students are required to demonstrate key concepts by solving "real-life" problems. In 2001, 82% of our 3rd grade students met or exceeded the state standard in mathematics. In 2005, that percentage had increased to 87%. During this same time period, third grade students in the State of Delaware went from 71% meeting or exceeding the math standard to 79%. In 2001, only 65% of the 5th grade students at North Georgetown were meeting or exceeding the state standard, as compared to 85% in 2005. All of Delaware's fifth grade students improved from 62% to 77%. Our school scaled score increased from 432 to 442 for third grade math and from 460 to 479 for fifth grade math.

Looking at the disaggregated data, North Georgetown's students are making significant gains. In reading, our third grade low-income students steadily rose from 62% meeting or exceeding the standard in 2001 to 90% meeting or exceeding the standard in 2005. Our African American third grade students rose from 53% meeting or exceeding the standard in 2001 to 71% meeting or exceeding the reading standard in 2005. North Georgetown's third grade Hispanic students went from 72% in 2001 to 95% in 2005. In reading, our fifth grade low-income students rose from 64% in 2001 to 90% in 2005. North Georgetown's fifth grade African American students went from 63% meeting or exceeding the standard in 2001 to 92% meeting or exceeding the standard in 2005. Our fifth grade Hispanic students went from 50% in 2001 to 92% in 2005.

North Georgetown Elementary math students made similar gains. In third grade, our low-income students grew from 73% meeting or exceeding the math standard in 2001 to 89% in 2005. In fifth grade, our low-income students drastically improved from 48% meeting or exceeding the standard to 82% in 2005. Our African American fifth grade students have made progress moving from 50% meeting or exceeding the standard in 2001 to 73% meeting or exceeding the standard in 2005. North Georgetown's fifth grade Hispanic students went from 45% to 83% meeting or exceeding standards over that same five- year period.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Assessment data is the catalyst for problem solving and decision-making at North Georgetown Elementary School. “Data Day” is a school-wide in-service event, which compels our staff to examine the evidence of student progress. In June, the staff spends a whole day analyzing the DSTP data. These results are compared to teacher assessments and report card grades. Professional reflection focuses on the following: Are the students learning and making progress? What are the strengths and weaknesses of our students? What are the instructional needs for individual students and groups of students? What does the disaggregated data tell us? Are we meeting the instructional needs of all student populations? Are the teacher assessments and report card grades aligned with the DSTP data and state standards? The purpose of “data day” is to identify school-wide goals that focus on reading, writing, and math instruction as well as to align assessments and grading practices with the content standards. Grade levels articulate expectations regarding student learning and performance in reading, writing, and math. Goals are generated for staff development to enhance instruction. Needs that have been identified include text-based writing, extended responses in math and reading, and guided reading. In-service opportunities have been offered to address these concerns. Plans have been developed to expand grade level and school-wide reading opportunities. A school-wide program, called Scholastic Reading Counts, provides extra reading support for all students. After-school reading and math programs focus on identified weaknesses and provide additional instruction. Data collection and analysis are continued more informally at regular Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings as teachers examine students’ daily progress. Theme tests, math unit assessments, and writing assessments are benchmarks to determine the direction of instruction. This data is shared at PLC meetings and quarterly Promotion and Review meetings. Other more formal measures of student progress are used to look for trends and to determine the degree to which students are meeting or exceeding the standards. These assessments include Star Reading, Computer Curriculum Corporation tutorials, and the LAS (ELL students). Data is disaggregated and analyzed with consideration of needs for students, curriculum, instructional strategies, teacher support, and instructional time.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

North Georgetown Elementary communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community in a variety of ways. Student progress is shared through progress reports, report cards, and parent-teacher conferences. The Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) state, district, and school results are published in several newspapers. Student performance data is presented during public sessions of both the state and local school boards of education. DSTP results are shared with both parents and students through letters and formal reports. Parents are encouraged to contact school personnel with questions. Additionally, the school presents achievement data to parents at open houses, Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings, family math and literacy nights, and during parent-teacher-student conferences. School staff shares results at community meetings. The North Georgetown School Profile is annually distributed to parents and is available to the community. The district’s monthly newsletter provides testing results and performance information, as does the district’s website. The North Georgetown Elementary School Improvement Committee, which is comprised of parents, community members, and staff, uses data as it plans how to allocate funds for the succeeding year. Classroom teachers keep parents informed of progress through nightly homework and communication folders, weekly progress sheets with teacher comments, phone calls, and conferences. Formal communications involve progress reports and report cards. Teachers communicate with students through individual student conferences and through the use of scoring rubrics that detail the students’ strengths and weaknesses. In addition, the principal and assistant principal schedule conferences with students to share information about their academic progress.

4. Sharing Success:

North Georgetown Elementary shares its successes with other Indian River schools through the networking system that currently exists within the district. Principals, assistant principals, and reading specialists meet

with their peers on a regular basis. Frequent agenda topics include “best practice” instruction, student performance results, and achievement gap data. In essence, student performance and strategies for its enhancement are at the heart of Indian River School District’s (IRSD) primary goal, which is “All students will meet or exceed the state standards.” Additionally, staff members are willing to conduct professional development sessions in our district schools and at schools around the state. This is current practice as our teachers conduct presentations on such topics as math and social studies instruction, Dimensions of Learning, and Learning-Focused Strategies for closing the achievement gap. We will continue our practice of providing in-service training to share the strategies that we have found to be successful with our students. Our monthly faculty meetings are devoted to the sharing of lessons that promote student learning through best instructional practices. Teachers meet weekly to work on the development of lessons and the common assessments to measure student progress. They share what works and what does not work. This collaboration encourages a team approach to student learning. Additionally, teachers are given the opportunity for long-range planning by having a half a day once a month for curriculum mapping.

One of our major success stories has been the reorganization of our school. From 1996 through 2004, North Georgetown Elementary consisted of grades three, four, and five. Kindergarten, first grade, and second grade students attended another elementary school in our community. This configuration caused the two schools to have large numbers of students at each grade level. During the 2004-2005 school year, the Indian River School District implemented a three-year reorganization plan for our school. We began by adding second grade. During the 2005-2006 school year we have added first grade. Kindergarten will be added during the 2006-2007 school year. The number of students at each grade level is now being spread out between the two “community” schools. Traditionally, there have been approximately 150 students at each grade level. The benefits of this reorganization were presented at faculty meetings, community gatherings, and at the district school board meetings to generate support for this plan prior to its implementation. Those benefits included the following:

- Georgetown would have two K-5 “community” schools.
- Students would attend one school for six years, similar to other elementary schools in the district.
- There would be better communication and planning among grade level teachers.
- Students and parents would no longer have to “start over” at a new school in third grade.
- The principal and staff would have a better opportunity to know the students and parents.
- Older students would be able to work as mentors in the lower grades.

These benefits have had a major influence on the success of our students. Collaborative planning has become a much more manageable task and has led to a team approach to student learning. It is now much easier to identify individual students’ needs.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum

North Georgetown Elementary’s curriculum has been designed to reflect Delaware’s rigorous content area standards. At its core is a balanced literacy program published by Houghton Mifflin (HM). Students experience worldwide adventures via the authentic literary selections while strengthening their comprehension skills, practicing decoding and textural analysis strategies, expanding vocabulary, and increasing fluency. Since reading and writing are naturally integrated, students hone their text-based writing skills in relation to the narrative, informational, or technical texts included in their anthologies. Additionally, the students respond to “stand alone” writing prompts related to numerous topics and concepts. In order to enrich their students’ learning experiences, North Georgetown’s staff members have improved their instructional skills through participation in the Delaware Reading Project, Delaware Social Studies Project, and the implementation of 6+1 Writing Traits. To ensure that all students are meeting the standards in reading, supplemental reading programs such as Soar to Success, Early Success, Earobics, Scholastic Reading Counts, and Horizons are available.

Furthermore, the National Science Foundation (NSF)-researched Math Trailblazers program (Kendall Hunt) has been implemented in all first through fifth grade classrooms. Emphasizing conceptual-learning rather than the memorization of algorithms or the mastery of computational skills, the Math Trailblazers curriculum has dramatically changed math instruction at North Georgetown Elementary. To better meet students' math needs as well as to transition to more interactive, experiential methods of teaching, the staff has participated in Math Club professional development sessions, where grade level peers prepare for upcoming units, discuss strategies for student success, and explore effective assessments of what students know and are able to do mathematically. Math lead teachers also provide demonstration lessons for their peers. Assessments are closely aligned with the state content standards, and the math curriculum requires students to reflect and analyze data and explain their answers as they must do on the state assessment.

Indian River partners with other districts in the state's Science Coalition. All of the district teachers have been trained to use Smithsonian Project science kits, which enable students to experience hands-on science so that they can meet the state's science standards. Included in their science curriculum is the opportunity to explore nature in the district's Outdoor Education Center at Ingram Pond. Again, since Delaware's science standards stress conceptual knowledge rather than isolated fact memorization, North Georgetown's students learn science by doing, discussing, drawing conclusions, and writing about their observations, experiences, and analyses.

District staff use Houghton Mifflin's We the People textbook as the foundation for the social studies curriculum, which is supplemented with various materials and activities. Since Delaware's high stakes accountability focuses on students' reading achievement, teachers use the opportunity to integrate the geography, civics, history, and economics standards through their reading materials. The district has invested in social studies-linked "trade books" for students' instructional and recreational reading. A North Georgetown Elementary team is currently working with district peers and University of Delaware personnel to design thematic units and standards-based performance assessments as a part of the Delaware Social Studies Project. The interwoven features underlining all curricular activities and materials are the emphasis on conceptual understanding, problem solving, justification of answers, evaluative thinking, multiple perspectives, and generalization to new situations.

In addition to regular instruction in the standards-linked core content areas, the students at North Georgetown engage in physical education, art, vocal and instrumental music, computer-assisted instruction, writing, library, and guidance on a weekly basis. Students who need additional learning opportunities are served by Title I reading teachers, a Title I reading specialist, Title I paraprofessionals, a computer teacher for individualized CCC math and reading instruction, and special education teachers and paraprofessionals.

2. Reading:

Using Delaware English Language Arts (ELA) content standards, Houghton Mifflin's "Invitations to Literacy" was adopted as the foundation of our district's reading program. This reading program uses a systematic and spiraling approach that integrates the ELA standards of reading, writing, viewing, speaking, and listening. North Georgetown students experience a balanced reading approach incorporating whole class and small flexible group instruction. On-going assessment through the use of fluency checks, sight word recognition surveys, and comprehension measures allow staff to adjust and differentiate instruction and materials to meet each child's needs. The purchase of Houghton Mifflin guided readers has enabled the students to become strategic readers while being engaged with material on their own instructional levels. Supplemental programs such as Horizons, Early Success and Soar to Success are provided for students needing additional support. Houghton Mifflin theme tests are aligned directly with the Delaware Reading Standards. Rubrics have been written to reflect Delaware's expectations. In an effort to facilitate experiences with literary, informative, and technical genre, North Georgetown's staff provides many different types of material across content areas. These include informative trade books, newspapers, and research documents, which correlate to the ELA standards. Grants have provided classroom libraries to

allow for a rich, varied assortment of books. Reading incentive programs encourage personal reading. Other students, non-teaching staff, and community leaders are invited to read aloud to encourage the enjoyment of reading for all of our students.

3. Mathematics, Science, Art, Etc.:

The staff at North Georgetown strives to provide opportunities for all students to reach their full potential. One area of concern is the ability to consistently monitor individual student progress and to accommodate individual students with specifically needed instruction in the required content areas. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) were introduced to address this concern. The identification of what individual students need to learn and how to best facilitate that learning are the focus of the PLC. Teachers are able to meet every week to compare results of student assessments and revise instruction. Each PLC consists of all teachers within a specific grade level. Through the use of team leaders, each grade level is able to facilitate action plans for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Within the PLC, teachers are able to collaboratively measure individual student achievement, revise assessment measures to align with state standards, and reorganize students' instructional grouping, thus allowing for individual differences in acquisition of knowledge. The PLC is able to discuss teaching strategies resulting in adaptation of those methods that increase student achievement. Instructional strategies are shared with the entire staff allowing other grades to benefit from the shared knowledge that impacts all students. A cross-grade level PLC meets monthly to review overall student achievement and recommend needed in-services. North Georgetown has an after-school reading/math intervention program to further assist those students who need additional instruction. A mentoring program is available to students requiring alternative support. Bridges, our extended year program, provides students an additional 20 days of instruction in the summer. The collaborative efforts of our staff to consistently monitor assessment, modify instruction, and provide appropriate flexible grouping have resulted in continued improvement in demonstrated academic ability.

4. Instructional Methods:

The Indian River School District, through a grant from the University of Delaware, created a leadership cluster that has provided professional development for building administrators to become more effective instructional leaders. This grant has enabled us to be exposed to best practices through the presentations of instructional leaders such as Max Thompson, Robert Marzano, Larry Lazotte, Rick and Becky DuFour, and John Brown. Lead teachers have also participated in this training, allowing them to become catalysts for the development of Professional Learning Communities focused on student learning and achievement.

North Georgetown's teachers have infused the principles of Dimensions of Learning and Learning-Focused Strategies in their daily interactions with students. These principles are the basis for exemplary schools and serve as the framework for teachers. Knowing how children become strategic learners guides their educational plan. Classroom instruction utilizes critical thinking strategies such as compare/contrast, cause/effect, classify/categorize, analogies/metaphors, and summarizing. Teachers promote independence through the use of reciprocal teaching allowing the student to emulate and model techniques of predicting, clarifying, self-questioning, and summarizing. Content instruction encompasses these strategies that most impact student achievement. The acronym RARE (**R**ephrase the question, **A**nswer the question, **R**easons for answer, **E**xplanation for the answer) is used to refine student's ability to answer questions effectively by using supporting information from the text and by providing explanations to incorporate the text information into the answer. Additionally, graphic organizers are utilized to enable students to organize their information. Flexible grouping provides for different levels of instruction and achievement. The learning-focused strategies lesson plan format, EATS (**E**ssential question, **A**ctivating strategies, **T**eaching strategies, **S**ummarizing), is utilized in all classrooms. This format allows teachers to organize information and strategies into lessons by providing focused instruction, guided and independent practice, and assessment. The key questions that guide our classroom instruction are as follows: What is it we expect students to learn? How do we know if they have learned it? How do we respond when they don't learn? How do we respond when they have learned? By analyzing high-performing schools, the Learning-

Focused Strategies framework connects exemplary teaching strategies to teacher planning and instruction. These connections accommodate and enhance the diverse skills, abilities, and cultural backgrounds of all students. The initiatives of the Indian River School District have allowed our teachers to convert research into active learning techniques. Consequently, the focus at North Georgetown has changed from teaching to learning.

5. Professional Development:

Professional development activities are determined by school and district goals. Our staff development plan addresses school, grade level, and personal goals as they apply to student learning. The School Improvement Team considers the school's needs and makes sure that the necessary resources are allocated to achieve them. Professional development activities are planned to ensure that teachers are engaged in improving instructional practices, strengthening curriculum, and broadening content knowledge. We have been focused on meeting individual student needs and closing the achievement gap in our diverse classrooms.

The Dimensions of Learning model has been a focus for the past decade. During the last two years, North Georgetown has focused on Dimension 3, extending and refining knowledge. This Dimension of Learning encourages teachers to design and implement instructional activities and tasks that require more rigorous thinking than what is needed for the initial acquisition and integration of knowledge. Teachers have shared academic learning activities related to Dimension 3 that have included comparing, contrasting, classifying, analyzing, abstracting, constructing support, error analysis, induction, and deduction. Teacher observations and evaluations have focused on these strategies.

The Learning-Focused Strategies framework has been implemented to provide a toolbox of instructional methods to enhance student learning. 'Exemplary practices' are shared during faculty and grade-level meetings. Several teachers have been trained to provide assistance for implementing these strategies.

In an effort to allow for different rates of student achievement, a flexible grouping / guided reading in-service was provided. As a result, flexible groups allow teachers to reteach or extend lessons to small groups of students depending on their demonstrated needs. Model lessons were also presented to support flexible grouping in the classroom. Math Club, Smithsonian science kit training, and district wide in-service through the Delaware Reading and Social Studies Projects continue to be offered to the staff.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Delaware State Testing Program - A Criterion-Referenced Assessment

This overview applies to:	Table 1a	Reading Grade 3	page 15
	Table 1b	Reading Grade 5	page 16
	Table 1c	Math Grade 3	page 17
	Table 1d	Math Grade 5	page 18
	Table 1e	Writing Grade 3	page 19
	Table 1f	Writing Grade 5	page 20

Grade: 3 & 5 (end of standards cluster years)

Test: Delaware State Testing Program

Edition/publication year: 1996

Publisher: Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

What groups were excluded from testing? 0 Why, and how were they assessed? All student populations are assessed at North Georgetown Elementary. Every effort is made to ensure all students take the assessment. Absent students must make up the assessment the following week. Schools automatically receive scores of 0 for students who do not participate in the assessment.

The DSTP Student Performance levels and cut scores were established by Delaware educators and community members from around the state. These cut-scores were approved by the State Board of Education in September 1999.

There are five performance levels in reading, writing, and mathematics. The following describe each level:

DSTP Student Performance Levels		
Level	Category	Description
5	Distinguished	Excellent Performance
4	Exceeds the Standard	Very Good Performance
3	Meets the Standard	Good Performance
2	Below the Standard	Needs Improvement
1	Well Below the Standard	Needs Significant Improvement

The cut scores for the DSTP appear in the tables at the bottom of each content area and grade level chart. The number indicated represents the lowest possible score a student can earn and still be within that particular performance level.

Up until the present school year, the DSTP involved five separate days of assessment. Two days were for reading, two days for math, and one day for writing. For the 2005-2006 school year, DSTP testing will stretch out over six days and include a second day for writing. The test takes approximately two and one-half hours each day.

**North Georgetown Elementary Table 1a
Delaware State Testing Program- Reading -Grade 3**

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March	March
READING SCORES NGES GR 3						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		31%	33%	22%	25%	15%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		88%	87%	72%	80%	70%
% At Below State Standards (1 & 2)		12%	13%	28%	20%	30%
Number of Students Tested		68	147	192	146	170
Percent of total students tested		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1.Low income # in population		38	72	101	75	74
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		24%	21%	13%	12%	4%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		90%	86%	66%	75%	62%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		10%	14%	35%	25%	38%
Low income mean scaled score		447	438	424	426	415
2. Not Low income # in population		30	75	91	71	96
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		40%	45%	32%	38%	24%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		87%	88%	79%	84%	77%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		13%	12%	21%	16%	23%
Not Low Income mean scaled score		453	438	445	453	436
3.African American # in population		14	26	45	50	51
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		7%	27%	9%	12%	6%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		71%	81%	60%	70%	53%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		29%	19%	40%	30%	47%
African American Mean Scaled Score		438	438	421	424	411
4 .Hispanic # in population		20	33	43	18	18
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		25%	24%	18%	22%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		95%	79%	67%	83%	72%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		5%	21%	33%	17%	28%
Hispanic Mean Scaled Score		451	438	427	438	428
5. White # in population		33	85	101	77	99
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		43%	40%	28%	33%	22%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		91%	92%	79%	84%	79%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		9%	8%	21%	16%	21%
White Mean Scaled Score		454	456	443	450	435
STATE SCORES						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		31%	32%	30%	29%	23%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		84%	82%	80%	80%	74%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		16%	18%	21%	21%	26%
State Mean Scaled Score		446	447	442	441	435
School Mean Scaled Score		450	448	434	439	427

Cut Scores- DSTP Reading Grade 3 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
3	387	411	465	482

**North Georgetown Elementary Table 1b
Delaware State Testing Program- Reading -Grade 5**

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March	March
READING SCORES –NGES Gr. 5						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		21%	27%	22%	23%	16%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		92%	97%	90%	80%	72%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		8%	3%	20%	20%	28%
Number of Students Tested		169	93	165	157	139
Percent of total students tested		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1.Low income		86	70	74	83	61
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		15%	16%	8%	13%	13%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		90%	93%	70%	72%	64%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		10%	7%	30%	28%	36%
Low income mean scaled score		485	482	467	468	463
2.Not low income		83	68	91	74	78
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		28%	38%	33%	34%	19%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		94%	100%	87%	88%	79%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		6%	0%	13%	12%	21%
Not low income mean scaled score		491	502	491	490	481
3.African American		36	36	48	51	38
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		9%	14%	11%	11%	16%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		92%	92%	69%	70%	63%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		8%	8%	31%	30%	37%
African American mean scaled score		483	484	467	463	462
4.Hispanic		36	19	27	16	10
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		20%	16%	8%	6%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		92%	100%	90%	81%	50%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		8%	0%	11%	19%	50%
Hispanic mean scaled score		485	485	476	477	441
5.White		96	82	87	90	91
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		27%	35%	31%	32%	19%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		92%	97%	82%	84%	79%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		8%	3%	18%	16%	21%
White mean scaled score		491	497	487	487	481
STATE SCORES						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		24%	23%	23%	22%	18%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		85%	84%	78%	78%	67%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		15%	16%	22%	22%	33%
State Mean Scaled School		485	483	480	478	469
School Mean Scaled Score		488	492	480	478	473

Cut Scores- DSTP Reading Grade 5 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
5	427	451	508	529

**North Georgetown Elementary Table 1c
Delaware State Testing Program- Math Grade 3**

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March	March
MATH SCORES –NGES Gr. 3						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		23%	29%	23%	18%	23%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		87%	84%	74%	78%	82%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		13%	16%	26%	22%	18%
Number of Students Tested		78	168	194	147	170
Percent of total students tested		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Low income		45	90	103	76	74
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		16%	21%	12%	4%	16%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		89%	80%	65%	70%	73%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		11%	20%	35%	30%	27%
Low income mean scaled score		436	436	421	420	421
2. Not Low Income		33	78	91	71	96
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		33%	37%	35%	32%	30%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		85%	87%	82%	86%	90%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		15%	13%	18%	14%	10%
Not low income mean scaled score		450	454	447	443	440
3. African American		16	34	46	51	51
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		6%	21%	6%	2%	12%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		69%	71%	65%	67%	71%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		31%	29%	35%	33%	29%
African American mean scaled score		420	427	415	414	418
4. Hispanic		23	39	44	18	18
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		22%	22%	18%	0%	33%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		83%	81%	61%	89%	94%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		17%	18%	39%	11%	6%
Hispanic mean scaled score		440	440	424	428	441
5. White		38	92	101	77	99
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		29%	34%	32%	33%	28%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		97%	88%	82%	82%	86%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		3%	12%	18%	18%	14%
White mean scaled score		451	452	446	443	437
STATE SCORES						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		29%	30%	25%	26%	22%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		79%	78%	74%	72%	71%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		21%	22%	26%	28%	29%
State Mean Scaled Score		441	439	435	434	430
School Mean Scaled Score		442	444	433	431	432

Cut Scores- DSTP Math Grade 3 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
3	382	407	464	499

**North Georgetown Elementary Table 1d
Delaware State Testing Program- -Math-Grade 5**

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March	March
MATH SCORES- NGES Gr. 5						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		24%	23%	21%	18%	12%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		85%	92%	74%	69%	65%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		15%	8%	26%	31%	35%
Number of Students Tested		192	156	167	159	140
Percent of total students tested		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Low income		104	84	75	85	62
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		15%	14%	15%	8%	6%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		82%	90%	64%	62%	48%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		18%	10%	36%	38%	52%
Low income mean scaled score		473	477	461	453	448
2. Not Low Income		88	72	92	74	78
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		34%	33%	28%	29%	16%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		89%	93%	83%	76%	78%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		11%	7%	17%	24%	22%
Not low income mean scaled score		487	490	481	476	470
3. African American		48	43	48	53	38
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		6%	7%	13%	10%	3%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		73%	81%	65%	55%	50%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		27%	19%	35%	45%	50%
African American mean scaled score		464	471	459	448	444
4. Hispanic		41	20	27	16	11
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		20%	25%	11%	6%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		83%	100%	74%	75%	45%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		17%	0%	26%	25%	55%
Hispanic mean scaled score		476	487	469	461	438
5 White		101	92	89	90	91
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		34%	30%	28%	25%	18%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		91%	95%	79%	76%	74%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		9%	5%	21%	24%	26%
White mean scaled score		488	487	478	474	469
STATE SCORES						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		24%	20%	18%	17%	14%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		77%	75%	71%	67%	62%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		23%	25%	29%	33%	38%
State Mean Scaled Score		476	473	468	466	460
School Mean Scaled Score		479	483	472	464	460

Cut Scores- DSTP Math Grade 5 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
5	424	449	503	525

North Georgetown Elementary Table 1e
Delaware State Testing Program- Writing-Grade 3

Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March	March
WRITING SCORES –NGES Gr. 3						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		0%	2%	0%	0%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		72%	60%	30%	46%	23%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		27%	40%	70%	54%	77%
Number of Students Tested		78	168	193	147	170
Percent of total students tested		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1.Low income		45	90	102	76	74
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		0%	2%	0%	0%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		73%	54%	25%	39%	18%
% At or Below Standard (1 & 2)		27%	46%	75%	61%	82%
Low income mean		7	6	5	6	5
2.Not Low Income		33	78	91	71	96
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		3%	0%	0%	2%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		73%	65%	35%	54%	27%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		27%	35%	65%	46%	73%
Not low income mean scaled score		7	7	6	7	6
3.African American # in population		16	34	46	51	51
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		0%	3%	0%	0%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		63%	50%	26%	37%	18%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		37%	50%	74%	63%	82%
African American mean scaled score		7	6	5	6	5
4.Hispanic # in population		23	39	43	18	18
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		0%	3%	3%	0%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		78%	62%	26%	56%	33%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		22%	38%	74%	44%	67%
Hispanic mean scaled score		7	6	5	7	6
5.White # in population		38	92	101	77	99
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		3%	0%	0%	1%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		74%	62%	34%	49%	23%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		26%	38%	66%	51%	77%
White mean scaled score		7	7	6	7	6
STATE SCORES						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		3%	1%	1%	2%	1%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		70%	52%	39%	46%	33%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		31%	48%	61%	54%	67%
State Mean Scaled Score		7	6	6	6	6
School Mean Scaled Score		7	6	5	6	6

Cut Scores- DSTP Writing Grade 3 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
3	5	7	11	13

North Georgetown Elementary Table 1f
Delaware State Testing Program-Writing -Grade 5
 Criterion-Referenced Testing developed by state with Harcourt Education Measurement Systems

	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	March	March	March	March	March
WRITING SCORES- NGES Gr. 5						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		4%	5%	4%	3%	2%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		55%	62%	64%	36%	48%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		45%	38%	36%	54%	52%
Number of Students Tested		191	156	166	159	74
Percent of total students tested		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students excluded		0	0	0	0	0
Percentage of students excluded		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES						
1. Low income		103	84	75	85	62
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		3%	2%	1%	6%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		54%	57%	53%	38%	40%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		46%	43%	47%	62%	60%
Low income mean scaled score		7	7	7	7	7
2. Not Low Income		88	72	91	74	78
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		4%	8%	6%	21%	5%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		56%	68%	73%	55%	55%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		44%	32%	27%	45%	45%
Not low income mean scaled score		7	8	8	8	8
3. African American		48	43	48	53	38
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		2%	3%	4%	10%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		52%	56%	62%	40%	45%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		48%	44%	38%	60%	55%
African American mean scale score		7	7	7	7	7
4. Hispanic		40	20	27	16	11
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		8%	10%	7%	6%	0%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		63%	90%	59%	50%	45%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		37%	10%	41%	50%	55%
Hispanic mean scaled score		8	8	7	7	7
5. White		101	92	88	90	91
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		2%	6%	2%	17%	5%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		53%	60%	65%	49%	51%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		47%	40%	35%	51%	49%
White mean scaled score		7	8	7	8	7
STATE SCORES						
Total						
% At Exceeds (Perf. Levels 4 & 5)		4%	4%	4%	8%	4%
% At or Above Meets (Perf. Level 3)		56%	60%	60%	49%	51%
% At Below Standard (1 & 2)		44%	40%	40%	51%	49%
State Mean Scaled Score		7	7	7	7	7
School Mean Scaled Score		7	8	7	7	7

Cut Scores- DSTP Writing Grade 5 (lowest scaled score a student can earn and still be within the indicated performance level)				
Grade	Below	Meets	Exceeds	Distinguished
5	6	8	11	13

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

This overview applies to:	Table 2a	Reading Grade 3 NCEs	page 21
	Table 2b	Reading Grade 3 Scaled Scores	page 22
	Table 2c	Reading Grade 3 Percentiles	page 23
	Table 2d	Math Grade 3 NCEs	page 24
	Table 2e	Math Grade 3 Scaled Scores	page 25
	Table 2f	Math Grade 3 Percentiles	page 26

Table 2a

Subject Reading Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores _____ Percentiles _____

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean NCE Score	62	59	60	58	57
Number of students tested	68	147	192	146	170
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	61	54	55	53	53
Number of students tested	38	72	101	75	74
2. Not Low Income	62	64	64	64	60
Number of students tested	30	75	91	71	96
3. African American	57	54	55	53	48
Number of students tested	14	26	45	50	51
4. Hispanic	61	54	55	55	52
Number of Students tested	20	33	43	18	18
5. White	64	63	63	62	63
Number of students tested	33	85	101	77	99
STATE MEAN NCE	62	60	59	59	57

Table 2bSubject Reading Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement TestEdition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement SystemsScores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean Scaled Score	450	448	434	439	427
Number of students tested	68	147	192	146	170
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	447	438	424	426	415
Number of students tested	38	72	101	75	74
2. Not Low Income	453	458	445	453	436
Number of students tested	30	75	91	71	96
3. African American	434	438	421	424	411
Number of students tested	14	26	45	50	51
4. Hispanic	451	438	427	439	428
Number of students tested	20	33	43	18	18
5. White	454	456	443	450	435
Number of students tested	33	85	101	77	99
STATE SCALED SCORE	446	447	442	441	435

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

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	50	50	50	50	50
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	21.06	21.06	21.06	21.06	21.06

Table 2c

Subject Reading Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement Systems

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean Percentile Score	71	66	67	66	64
Number of students tested	68	147	192	146	170
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	70	58	60	55	55
Number of students tested	38	72	101	75	74
2. Not Low Income	72	74	74	74	69
Number of students tested	30	75	91	71	96
3. African American	60	57	59	55	47
Number of students tested	14	26	45	50	51
4. Hispanic	69	57	59	58	53
Number of students tested	20	33	43	18	18
5. White	74	73	74	72	73
Number of students tested	33	85	101	77	99
STATE PERCENTILE SCORE	72	69	67	66	64

Table 2d

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean NCE Score	62	69	67	64	68
Number of students tested	78	168	194	147	170
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	59	66	62	60	66
Number of students tested	45	90	103	76	74
2. Not Low Income	67	73	72	69	69
Number of students tested	33	78	91	71	96
3. African American	53	64	60	59	53
Number of students tested	16	34	46	51	38
4. Hispanic	60	67	61	59	72
Number of students tested	23	39	44	18	18
5. White	67	71	72	69	66
Number of students tested	38	92	101	77	91
STATE MEAN NCE SCORE	62	66	64	63	61

Table 2e

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean Scaled Score	442	444	433	431	432
Number of students tested	78	168	194	147	170
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	436	436	421	420	421
Number of students tested	45	90	103	76	74
2. Not Low Income	450	454	447	443	440
Number of students tested	33	78	91	71	96
3. African American	420	427	415	414	418
Number of students tested	16	34	46	51	53
4. Hispanic	440	440	425	428	441
Number of students tested	23	39	44	18	18
5. White	451	452	446	443	437
Number of students tested	38	92	101	77	91
STATE SCALED SCORE	441	439	435	434	430

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

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	50	50	50	50	50
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	21.06	21.06	21.06	21.06	21.06

Table 2f

Subject Math Grade 3 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs ___ Scaled Scores ___ Percentiles X

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean Percentile Score	72	82	79	75	80
Number of students tested	78	168	194	147	170
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	66	77	71	68	77
Number of students tested	45	90	103	76	74
2. Not Low Income	78	86	85	81	81
Number of students tested	33	78	91	71	96
3. African American	56	75	69	66	70
Number of students tested	16	34	46	51	53
4. Hispanic	68	79	71	66	84
Number of students tested	23	39	44	18	18
5. White	79	84	85	82	83
Number of students tested	38	92	101	77	91
STATE PERCENTILE SCORE	71	77	74	73	70

ASSESSMENTS REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

This overview applies to:	Table 3a	Reading Grade 5 NCEs	page 27
	Table 3b	Reading Grade 5 Scaled Scores	page 28
	Table 3c	Reading Grade 5 Percentiles	page 29
	Table 3d	Math Grade 5 NCEs	page 30
	Table 3e	Math Grade 5 Scaled Scores	page 31
	Table 3f	Math Grade 5 Percentiles	page 32

Table 3a

Subject Reading Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean NCE Score	68	57	54	54	57
Number of students tested	163	127	137	125	118
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	65	51	49	48	54
Number of students tested	86	70	74	83	61
2. Not Low Income	71	63	58	58	59
Number of students tested	83	68	91	74	78
3. African American	62	53	48	47	51
Number of students tested	36	36	48	51	38
4. Hispanic	65	49	51	45	42
Number of students tested	36	19	27	16	10
5. White	71	62	58	58	60
Number of students tested	96	82	87	90	91
STATE MEAN NCE SCORE	65	56	55	55	54

Table 3bSubject Reading Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement TestEdition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)Publisher Harcourt Educational MeasurementScores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean Scaled Score	488	492	480	478	473
Number of students tested	192	156	167	159	140
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	485	482	467	468	463
Number of students tested	86	70	74	83	61
2. Not Low Income	491	502	490	490	481
Number of students tested	83	68	91	74	78
3. African American	483	484	467	463	462
Number of students tested	36	36	48	51	38
4. Hispanic	485	485	476	477	445
Number of students tested	36	19	27	16	10
5. White	491	497	487	487	481
Number of students tested	96	82	87	90	91
STATE SCALED SCORE	485	483	480	478	469

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

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	50	50	50	50	50
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	21.06	21.06	21.06	21.06	21.06

Table 3c

Subject Reading Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean Percentile Score	80	63	58	56	63
Number of students tested	192	156	167	159	140
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	76	52	48	46	57
Number of students tested	86	70	74	83	61
2. Not Low Income	84	74	64	65	67
Number of students tested	83	68	91	74	78
3. African American	72	56	45	44	52
Number of students tested	36	36	48	51	38
4. Hispanic	76	47	52	41	37
Number of students tested	36	19	27	16	10
5. White	84	71	64	65	68
Number of students tested	96	82	87	90	91
STATE PERCENTILE SCORE	71	74	70	68	64

Table 3d

Subject Math Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean NCE Score	62	69	66	63	62
Number of students tested	192	156	167	159	140
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	65	51	49	48	54
Number of students tested	86	70	74	83	61
2. Not Low Income	71	63	58	58	59
Number of students tested	83	68	91	74	78
3. African American	62	53	48	47	51
Number of students tested	36	36	48	51	38
4. Hispanic	65	49	51	45	47
Number of students tested	36	19	27	16	11
5. White	71	62	58	58	60
Number of students tested	96	82	87	90	91
STATE MEAN NCE SCORE	65	56	55	55	54

Table 3eSubject Math Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement TestEdition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)Publisher Harcourt Educational MeasurementScores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled Scores Percentiles

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean Scaled Score	479	483	472	464	460
Number of students tested	192	156	167	159	140
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	473	477	461	453	448
Number of students tested	86	70	74	83	61
2. Not Low Income	487	490	481	476	470
Number of students tested	83	68	91	74	78
3. African American	464	471	459	448	444
Number of students tested	36	36	48	51	38
4. Hispanic	476	487	469	461	437
Number of students tested	36	19	27	16	11
5. White	488	487	478	474	459
Number of students tested	96	82	87	90	91
STATE SCALED SCORE	476	473	468	466	460

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

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE	50	50	50	50	50
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION	21.06	21.06	21.06	21.06	21.06

Table 3f

Subject Math Grade 5 Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year 1996 (SAT-9) / 2003 (SAT- 10)

Publisher Harcourt Educational Measurement

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs Scaled scores Percentiles

	2004-2005	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month	March	March	March	March	March
SCHOOL SCORES					
Mean Percentile Score	72	82	78	73	71
Number of students tested	192	156	167	159	140
Percent of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Low Income	67	78	71	67	60
Number of students tested	86	70	74	83	61
2. Not Low Income	77	85	81	79	79
Number of students tested	83	68	91	74	78
3. African American	63	71	64	63	55
Number of students tested	36	36	48	51	38
4. Hispanic	66	81	76	62	44
Number of students tested	36	19	27	16	11
5. White	78	86	83	80	78
Number of students tested	96	82	87	90	91
STATE PERCENTILE SCORE	71	74	70	68	64