U.S. Department of Education **November 2002**

2002-2003 *No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program* Cover Sheet

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

Official School Name Frank T. Simpson-Waverly Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 55 Waverly Street
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Hartford Connecticut 06112-1699
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (860)695-5160 Fax (860)724-3548

Website/URL Email: jthompson@hartfordschools.org

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

Date March 14, 2003
(Principal's Signature)

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

Name of Superintendent Mr. Robert Henry
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., (Mr.), Other)

District Name Hartford Public Schools Tel. (860)695-8000

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

Date
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Rev. Wayne A. Carter
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., (Other))

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

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

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

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

1. Number of schools in the district:
   27 Elementary schools
   4 Middle schools
   N/A Junior high schools
   3 High schools

   34 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 10,500

   Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 7,669

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

   [x] Urban or large central city
   [ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [ ] Suburban
   [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
   [ ] Rural

4. 17 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

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

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
Pre-K*	24	16	**40**
K	29	23	**52**
1	16	28	**44**
2	20	21	**41**
3	26	25	**51**
4	13	34	**47**
5	19	21	**40**
6	16	21	**37**
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL			**352**

* Simpson-Waverly Elementary School houses the Early Childhood Assessment Team (ECAT) that serves the district in identifying and servicing 3 and 4 year old children qualifying for special education. As they await an opening in a community based program, 40 of these students are bused weekly to receive their special education services provided to them by ECAT. Although registered at Simpson-Waverly, these students are not included in the school's special education count because they are provided services by district personnel and not school staff.

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

.3 % White
88.4 % Black or African American
11.0 % Hispanic or Latino
.3 % Asian/Pacific Islander
0 % American Indian/Alaskan Native

100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 38.11%

(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	68
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	57
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	125
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	328
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.3811
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	38.11%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 0 %
0 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 0
Specify languages:

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 100 %

352 Total Number Students Who Qualify*

* This count includes the Pre-Kindergarten ECAT program participants.

10. Students receiving special education services: ____15___%
____47__Total Number of Students Served

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

__2_Autism	____Orthopedic Impairment
____Deafness	____Other Health Impaired
____Deaf-Blindness	_24_Specific Learning Disability
____Hearing Impairment	_11_Speech or Language Impairment
__5_Mental Retardation	____Traumatic Brain Injury
____Multiple Disabilities	____Visual Impairment Including Blindness
__4_Non-catergorial due to age	__1_Socially/Emotionally disturbed

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

	Number of Staff	
	Full-time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	___2___	_____
Classroom teachers	___18__	_____
Special resource teachers/specialists	___1___	_____
Paraprofessionals	__3.5__	____.5___
Support staff	___5___	_____
Total number	_29.5__	____.5___

12. Student-"classroom teacher" ratio: _18 to 1

13.

	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999	1997-1998
Daily student attendance	94.5%	95.7%	94.7%	97.9%	97.2%
Daily teacher attendance	96.30%	95.57%	95.44%	91.06%	92.51%
Teacher turnover rate	0%	13.5%	3%	14%	N/A

PART III – SUMMARY

Simpson-Waverly Elementary School Narrative

The Frank T. Simpson-Waverly Elementary School, located in Hartford, CT, is an oasis of academic excellence in the midst of crime and poverty. Hartford, the capitol of Connecticut, is the second-poorest large city in America according to a Children's Defend Fund Report. Yet despite all of the obstacles to life in the inner city, our school provides an atmosphere that fosters academic rigor in a nested learning community. The expectations of high academic achievement, in conjunction with creative, goal oriented staff and strong leadership from the building administration, has transformed this school from a low to moderately low performing city school to a top performer within the Hartford metro area. The school has its roots deeply imbedded in the urban neighborhood that surrounds it. Its namesake is a man who was dedicated to his community and the education of children. In keeping with his commitment to education, Simpson–Waverly honors his legacy through our mission of "Teaching for Learning".

Our school is situated in the northeast end of Hartford and is located only one mile from Main Street. Our close proximity to institutions of higher learning such as Trinity College, the University of Hartford, St. Joseph's College, and UCONN-West Hartford facilitates easy access to resources for faculty and students. As these institutions are resources to our school, our school is a resource to neighboring transitional suburban schools that are beginning to experience a more diverse student population.

Our school provides instruction for youngsters from pre-school through grade six. The school is also home to a City Day Care Center and a Head Start Center. The Early Childhood Program includes three extended-day kindergarten classes and several preschool special education programs. A team approach model, integrating special needs children within the Day Care, Head Start and Kindergarten classrooms, provides for heterogeneous grouping for three, four, and five year old children. This provides a smooth transition into the first and second grades. For students in grades three through six, the school offers the Classical Magnet Program. This program, which began in 1994, gives students the opportunity to study the classics through materials provided by St. John's College in Maryland. Weekly seminars are led by classroom teachers who have been trained in the Classical Magnet model and supported through monthly lectures on related topics delivered by Trinity College professors. The teachers and administration adopted this model because it offers a foundation in the classics and promotes higher order thinking by training students to critique and analyze information.

The development and implementation of instructional practices occurs through a team approach where the instructional leadership fosters a partnership with teachers. The foundation of this team approach is based on the philosophy that the administration is accountable to teachers and teachers are accountable to students. This collaborative climate promotes high staff retention. This relationship also promotes the development of a highly effective, multi-layered professional development plan that provides training and workshops at the district and school level. At the classroom level, modeling and workshops are provided to address our school community's specific instructional needs.

The instructional staff and administration have worked hard to develop strong partnerships with community agencies, foundations, other educational institutions and programs. Our partnerships include the Sister School Partnership with Elmer-Thienes-Mary Hall and the Mystic Aquarium partnership. Simpson-Waverly also participates in two successful mentoring programs: Governor's Prevention Partnership Mentoring Program and the Simpson-Waverly Mentoring Program.

Our school has been successful in achieving its mission of "Teaching for Learning" through a comprehensive, data-driven, research-based school improvement plan that is implemented in collaboration with staff, parents, and community representatives. A highly dedicated and qualified staff of experienced teachers, with a commitment for making a difference, contributes to our increasing success in furthering student achievement. Simpson-Waverly has successfully achieved a unique balance between fulfilling the needs of a neighborhood school and satisfying the demands of an urban school system, ensuring that no child is left behind

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

The Connecticut (CT) State Department of Education has stated in its five-year plan that its first goal is "to set and meet high expectations for academic achievement for all students." The Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) is the tool used to assess the state's progress towards meeting that goal. The CMT assesses essential reading, writing and mathematic skills expected to be mastered by most students by the end of the 3rd and 5th grades. The test has evolved since 1980's from a 1st to a 2nd Generation and onto the 3rd Generation, launched in the fall of 2000. The major changes that have improved the quality and usefulness of the test in mathematics include new extended problem solving tasks designed to assess integrated mathematical understanding, a better balance of test items, and a close alignment with the new CT mathematics framework. The 3rd Generation language arts CMT is aligned with the performance standards delineated in CT's Language Arts Curriculum framework and assesses student performance on skills mastered by the end of grades 3 and 5. The CMT and other assessment tools have also been utilized by our School Improvement Team to assess progress towards the goals outlined in the School Improvement Plan. Similar to the state goals, our goals include increasing academic achievement in reading, math and writing.

Unlike the 2nd Generation CMT, in the 3rd Generation there is an expectation that all students take the tests. In the past, students who were designated as special education (SpEd) were exempt from taking the test. Currently, 80% of our SpEd students take the test at their appropriate grade level, although a SpEd student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP) may specify that the test be given on that child's instructional level. A test administered at the child's instructional level is referred to as an "Out of Level Test" and assesses the same content material, but at a more appropriate level.

The 2002 CMT results in mathematics show that 83% of the 4th grade students scored at or above the proficient level, with the remaining 17% scoring at the basic level. This represents an increase of eight percentage-points from the 2000 scores where 75% of students were at or above proficiency. The 2002 scores are also 2% above the statewide percentage for at or above proficiency. Although a direct comparison would not be valid between the 2nd and 3rd Generation tests, it is significant to note that only 18% of the 4th graders tested in 1998 met the state math goal, leaving 82% of the 4th graders scoring below state goal. Our 6th grade students share the dramatic increase in math achievement made by 4th graders between 1998 and 2002. In fact more of our 6th graders have scored at or above proficiency than their statewide cohorts for the past 3 years, 2000-2002. The 6th graders had a 10 percentage-point increase from their 2000 CMT results of 81% at or above proficiency to the current 2002 results of 93% at or above proficiency, with an additional 3% percent at the advanced level. In the 1998 2nd Generation test only 27% of the 6th graders met the state math goal, leaving 73% of the grade 6 students below the state goal in mathematics. The 2002 results indicate that only 7% of 6th graders scored at the basic level.

There are similar increases in CMT reading performance in both 4th and 6th grades in the past 5 years. For example, 72% of our 4th graders are at or above proficiency level, with 5% at the advanced level on the 2002 CMT. This represents a 10% increase above the 2000 results. The 2001and the 2002 results indicate that more of our fourth graders scored at or above proficiency than the statewide percentage for that same year. In the CMT 2nd Generation, only 16% of the 4th graders tested in 1998 met the state goal, leaving 84% of the 4th graders below the state goal. Currently, the 2002 assessment year, only 24% of 4th graders are at or below the basic level. The 6th grade 2002 CMT reading results show that 77% of our 6th graders are at or above proficiency level with 7% at the advanced level. This represents a 5% increase above the 2000 results. Our 2001 results show that while only 75% of 6th graders statewide scored at or above proficiency, 81% of our 6th graders scored at or above proficiency. In the 1998 CMT 2nd Generation, only 28% of the 6th graders met the state goal, with the remaining 72% of the 6th graders scoring below state goal.

These results reinforce our belief that the educational needs of our students are met through the application of data-driven, research-based best practices. The school-wide gains further highlight our efforts at closing the achievement gap through innovative approaches to fulfilling our mission of "Teaching for Learning".

2. Show how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.

Our teachers, assistant principal and principal have developed and implemented a process involving the review of student portfolios and assessment data provided by the state, the district and the school. This mechanism is called the Student Academic Review Process. The purpose of the Review Process is to monitor student programs through the review of portfolios, facilitates the development of student intervention plans, and identifies targeted professional development. The foundation of the process is built on self-evaluation and peer-evaluation through a team approach. The team is comprised of experienced teachers on staff, an administration representative, a Student Support Team member, and a reading, writing and math specialist.

The Academic Review team meets once a month to review student work and assessment data with the classroom teacher and brainstorm to find alternative strategies to address the data-identified learning gaps. This process also allows the teachers to tap into the expertise of educators, while also garnering support for the variety of learning styles in the classroom. The Review Process also drives the professional development program by identifying the needs that are highlighted by the data from their individual classrooms.

Along with the Review team, The School Improvement Team (SIT) analyzes and reviews the various assessment tools in order to monitor the progress of our students. The goals of the School Improvement Plan focuses on student academic achievement in math, writing and reading; therefore, the results of the CMT and other assessment tools are integral to the planning process of the SIT. These results determine the benchmarks set by the SIT in order to continue moving forward towards the academic achievement of every student. The Academic Review Process in conjunction with the School Improvement Plan uses assessment data as the foundation to the on-going growth and success of our students.

3. Describe how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.

Simpson-Waverly school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community using a "community inclusion" philosophy. The task of "community inclusion" has been addressed and outlined in the School Improvement Plan that was developed by the School Improvement Team. The team developed a step-by-step plan to increase parent and community awareness of student and school performance.

The communication plan includes Parent/Teacher conferences, Student/Parent/Teacher conferences, Parent/ Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings, Parent workshops and other school sponsored programs. For example, "Back to School Night" is a school-sponsored program where various community agencies are invited to join our students and parents in celebrating the beginning of the school year. At this event parents can benefit from informational booths promoting topics relating to "How to Support Your Learner". Finally, parents can find school information through our monthly Parent Newsletter.

The school's effort to communicate student performance is successful as evidenced by a better than 95% parent participation in Parent/Teacher conferences. During these conferences teachers review assessment data and various benchmarks to help parents understand the meaning of the data as it reflects their child's educational progress. Finally, the Parenting Center provides parents with a venue to attend workshops, meetings and as a place to view student work. The success of our students would not be possible without the purposeful work of informing and involving everyone in the challenges and rewards in continued academic achievement.

4. Describe how the school will share its successes with other schools.

The intent of the Simpson-Waverly staff is to provide information to other districts, locally or nationally, on our best practices. Further follow-up, to support other schools with visits and on-going contact, can guide these schools and districts in the understanding and implementation of a School Improvement Plan, the Student Academic Review Process and other successful strategies. The Student Academic Review Process is a tool for gauging student performance through various assessment tools and a mechanism to address the achievement gaps highlighted by the data. Our staff hopes to share this mechanism for addressing the stubborn achievement gaps throughout the state and nation. We are eager to share our success and exchange ideas on "things that work" with others and then help to support other schools in finding ways to adjust the new strategies to meet the individual needs of the school or classroom.

Our principal has already toured many schools to share our School Improvement Plan and Academic Review Process. We have developed a pamphlet and a protocol so that others can replicate the process and we encourage guests to join us during one of our Academic Review sessions. In addition, several staff members have shared learning strategies as part of the professional development program not only for our district teachers, but also for other districts. Our plan is to submit proposals to present our ideas at state and national conferences in order encourage other schools to use assessment data to direct the development of new learning and teaching strategies and targeted professional development.

The use of technology can also facilitate the sharing of ideas. Our school could provide an interactive website that outlines the step-by-step process that was followed by our staff to change our direction and tackle the achievement gap. This website would allow administrators and teachers of other school systems access to our protocols and facilitate communication with our staff on the particular challenges of their school. Our school could also develop videos to demonstrate how the Academic Review Process works and support this instructional medium with visits from other state and national school representatives.

Ultimately, we feel that the success of any school is in its ability to maintain focus on the goal of "Teaching for Learning", but have the flexibility to learn, change and improve the strategies that affect student achievement. Therefore, it will be a privilege to continue, on a broader scale, to share our ideas and learn from others, if we win this prestigious "No Child Left Behind" Blue Ribbon Award.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Describe the school's curriculum and show how all students are engaged with significant content, based on high standards.

Our current Hartford Public School curriculum was revised in August of 2000. It meets the national and state standards and is aligned with Connecticut's Common Core of Learning. Hartford Public Schools is committed to providing educational programs that allow all students to become responsible and productive citizens in our continuously changing world.

Teachers use a comprehensive approach to language arts instruction. It is a balanced literacy curriculum in which students are explicitly taught the relationship between letters and sounds with equal importance given to the construction of meaning and the ability to think critically and creatively. Students grow in literacy through authentic, interactive and successful experiences in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing. The literacy curriculum integrates all facets of language and thinking.

The mathematics curriculum is aligned with the Connecticut Frameworks and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards for mathematics. The NCTM standards are problem solving, communications, connections, and reasoning. These essential understandings bind together the specific concepts and skills which are taught in the seven strands of the mathematical curriculum. The seven strands are: number sense, patterns and relationships, operations and computation (including problem solving), measurement, geometry, probability and statistics (including graphs, tables, and charts), and algebra. The curriculum was designed to actively engage students in activities that enable them to apply mathematical understandings to life situations.

The science program in Hartford has moved from a pencil and paper program to a kit-based, hands-on, interactive experience for our students. Our K-6 kit based science program follows the Connecticut Framework for science and is endorsed by the National Science Foundation. Three kits that include hands-on lessons are taught in each grade. Students have hands-on experiences with the Life, Physical and Earth Science kits. Students ask questions and use the method of inquiry, as well as do research and experience problem solving above and beyond their classroom study.

The Hartford Public School social studies curriculum is aligned with the National Council of Social Studies and Connecticut State Department of Education. The social studies curriculum exposes our students to a body of knowledge about their community, their nation and their world, and equips them with the skills they need to become involved, informed citizens. The curriculum is multicultural and emphasizes the student as an active learner. Multiple strategies to involve the students are: guided inquiry (discovery), interviewing, analyzing pictures and photographs, reading and interpreting primary source material, working with maps and the five themes of geography, writing paragraphs of opinion, reactions, descriptions and answers to hypothetical situations, contributing timelines, and completing projects.

Art, Music, and Physical Education Curricula are aligned with National Standards. They offer a unique contribution to the development of knowledge and positive attitudes. With classroom teachers, interdisciplinary and thematic units can be incorporated into the school year to enhance student learning. The arts provide a balance among verbal, analytical and intuitive experiences. They also foster creative thinking, problem solving, self-awareness, sensitivity, and personal expression.

Since our mission statement is "Teaching for Learning", our school is a community of active learners that nurtures self-confidence, respect and excellence in all of its members. Within such a community, all students master communication, computation, analytical and problem solving skills; develop their physical and artistic potential; acquire strong ethical values; and learn to act creatively, responsibly, and effectively in meeting the challenges of a diverse and changing world, leaving no child behind.

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

Our literacy curriculum is mandated by the Hartford School system and is aligned with national and state standards. In the spring of 1999 Simpson-Waverly, along with the Hartford school district, adopted the Success For All (SFA) reading model as its primary reading program. Over 80% of the Simpson-Waverly staff chose this research-based reading program that includes many effective reading strategies. The ninety- minute block begins with a daily twenty-minute read-aloud time in which teachers model fluency, expression, and meta-cognitive strategies to increase comprehension. During this time, students work in pairs or individually to respond to higher order questions. They then share their ideas with the whole group to increase meaningful discussion. The students read from the Houghton Mifflin anthology that includes materials from a wide variety of genres. The teachers implement reading strategies and use questioning aligned with Bloom's Taxonomy. Students engage in lively discussions and support their answers with evidence from the text. They make connections that increase comprehension. The SFA program requires teachers to access prior knowledge as a key to making those contextual connections. Vocabulary development is increased through exposure and practice. Teachers utilize graphic organizers to provide visual support for teaching skills and comprehension strategies. The second literacy block focuses on reading for information. During this ninety- minute block the students are exposed to expository text in the forms of newspaper articles, Time for Kids, content area texts, and on-line materials. Our CMT comprehension strands include Initial Understanding, Developing Interpretation, and Critical Stance. These are the major focus during both literacy blocks. Answers are always supported with evidence from the text. The goal of Simpson-Waverly School's research-based literacy program is that all of our children read on or above grade level, meet goal on the Connecticut Mastery Test, and most rewardingly, read with purpose and pleasure.

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

Our writing curriculum is part of a balanced approach to literacy instruction, which focuses on the reading/writing connection across the curriculum. Writing is aligned with both state and national standards as a process approach in the reading/writing workshop. The five steps: prewriting, first draft, revision, editing, and publishing become an integral part of the student's way of analyzing and reflecting on his/her writing to foster the development of higher-order thinking skills.

Students learn to write by summarizing reading materials and focusing on the author's use of time-ordered words in sequencing the written material. They also analyze the styles of various authors by comparing and contrasting characters, themes, and situations. The authors become the students' writing models as they write across a wide variety of genres. Students are required to write from various points of view as they respond to the literature and when they answer open-ended questions.

In mathematics, students use writing to explain their thinking as they respond to open-ended problems. They write in math journals during daily lessons to clarify both process and product. In science and social studies both descriptive and expository writing are employed as students write about current events, complete research reports, record and report experiment results.

Student writing is assessed through the following venues: portfolios, academic reviews, peer review, student teacher conferencing and rubric/holistic scoring, self- evaluation, CMT/ 3rd generation, and teacher observations. Instructional materials include Empowering Writers, Writers Express, Writing from the Heart, and in the primary grades: Bare-Bones scaffolding to facilitate narrative writing. Simpson-Waverly's writing program is strongly supported in all content areas. Our data indicates that 97% of fourth grade and 93% of sixth grade students reached the "at or above proficiency" level on the 2002 CMT. Our strong writing program validates our belief that all children can learn and writing across the curriculum substantiates our mission, "Teaching for Learning".

4. Describe the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

In keeping with our mission statement, "Teaching for Learning," classroom instructional methods are based on current research on the ways children learn. In the early childhood programs (K-2), children are encouraged to explore materials and their environment. Through the use of learning centers, which include the sensory table, manipulatives, art materials, dramatic play, and science activities, children have the opportunity to experience a variety of modalities to facilitate learning. In grades 3-6 integrated learning centers focus on cross-curricular methodology. Students make connections in task completion among the disciplines. They learn to apply strategies from one discipline to another. They become aware of similarities between reading and writing and between math and science. A variety of developmental stages and learning styles are met through the use of both large and small group instruction. These include, but are not limited to, cooperative learning, technical reading, tutoring, lectures, seminars, guided inquiry, and discussions. Varying learning styles are addressed in a variety of ways. Visual learners benefit from: graphic organizers, realia, brainstorming, modeling, and video. Read-a-loud, cassettes, videos, brainstorming and metacognitive strategies are methods used for auditory learners. The kinesthetic learners are provided with manipulatives, hands-on activities, center time, movement, and field trips. Also included is the inquiry method through hand-on activities, the use of technology, and thematic, interdisciplinary units. Technology is also an important instructional tool. Technology and information literacy is used to extend and enhance teaching and learning. Computers are also used to support the classroom curriculum. Students use classroom computers in drafting, editing and publishing written work as well as searching the web for information. Calculators are available to students for basic computation that enable them to concentrate on higher level thinking skills rather than basic computation. They are used to reinforce skills and provide students with the additional practice needed for mastery

5. Describe the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

Professional Development (PD) for the staff of Simpson-Waverly School is provided on a multi-layered continuum. The broadest of which is the district wide professional development that occurs eight times during the school year, two full days in August and one full day in February. The focus for these workshops is on the content areas of the curriculum and is presented to the entire district at designated school sites.

The second layer is that which takes place at the school site. There are six half days that are allocated to each school for PD to focus on the school's specific needs. At Waverly, using the action plan from our school improvement plan, we focus on Connecticut Mastery Test strategic instruction within the content areas: reading comprehension, writing and numeracy. Individuals from the State Department of Education are brought in to provide workshops to refine instruction for the purpose of increasing student performance.

In the third layer, literacy support staff provide small workshops and component meetings to refine our Success For All reading program and our additional literacy block that focuses on reading for information and non-fiction genres. This professional development is usually grade level or reading level specific, but all provide teachers with techniques and strategies aligned with the Connecticut Mastery Test.

The final layer happens within the classroom on a daily basis. Our literacy support staff work directly with the classroom teachers and the students to enhance instruction and increase student achievement. These support teachers, along with the consultants from the State Department of Education, model lessons and give feedback to teachers on instructional techniques on an ongoing basis. Teachers are also offered the opportunity to visit classrooms both within and outside of the school to observe best practices.

Grade 4 – Mathematics

Test Information	CMT Third Generation			CMT Second Generation	
Grade Assessed	Fourth				
Test Title/Name	Connecticut Mastery Test Third Generation			Connecticut Mastery Test Second Generation	
TEST YEAR/ publication year	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Edition	Form M	Form M	Form L	Form H	Form H
Publisher	Harcourt Educational Measurement				
What groups were exempt from testing? Why and how were they assessed?	None	None	None	Special Education	Special Education
# Of students given an "out-of-level" assessment.	4	3	4		
% Of students given an "out-of-level" assessment.	9%	8%	10%		
Number exempt	0	0	0	10	10
Percent exempt	0%	0%	0%	20%	23%

Third Generation CMT	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing month – September	9/02	9/01	9/00
SCHOOL SCORES			
TOTAL 4TH GRADE POPULATION	46	37	40
School Mean Scaled Score	235	240	231
At or Above - Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or Above - Basic	93%	91%	94%
At or Above - Proficient	83%	85%	75%
At or Above - Goal	50%	56%	42%
At - Advanced in 2002 only*	0%		
# Of students tested	42	34	36
% Of total students tested	91%	92%	90%
# Of students out of level/Special Education	4	3	4
% Of students out of level/Special Education	9%	8%	10%
# Of students exempt	0	0	0
% Of students exempt	0%	0%	0%
STATE SCORES			
TOTAL POPULATION	42,813	41,473	41,649
State Mean Scaled Score**	248.7	248.7	250.1
At or Above - Below Basic	100%	100%	100%
At or Above - Basic	90%	91%	92%
At or Above - Proficient	81%	81%	82%
At or Above - Goal	60%	61%	60%
At - Advanced in 2002 only*	21%		

Second Generation CMT	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month – September	9/99	9/98
TOTAL 4TH GRADE POPULATION	49	44
School Mean Score	70	48
At or Above - Goal	46%	18%
At or Below - Goal	54%	82%
# Of students tested	39	34
% Of students tested	80%	77%
# Of students exempt	10	10
% Of students exempt	20%	23%
STATE SCORES		
TOTAL POPULATION	40,682	38,979
State Mean Score**	79.5	77.1
At or Above - Goal	64%	61%
At or Below - Goal	36%	39%

* The Advanced category was introduced in the 2002-2003 testing year.

** State Mean differs by generation: Generation 2, the table shows the Index score - Generation 3, the table shows the Average Scale Score.

Grade 4 – Reading

Test Information	CMT Third Generation			CMT Second Generation	
Grade Assessed	Fourth				
Test Title/Name	Connecticut Mastery Test Third Generation			Connecticut Mastery Test Second Generation	
TEST YEAR/publication year	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Edition	Form M	Form M	Form L	Form H	Form H
Publisher	Harcourt Educational Measurement				
What groups were exempt from testing? Why and how were they assessed?	None	None	None	Special Education	Special Education
# Of students given an "out-of-level" assessment.	3	5	5		
% Of students given an "out-of-level" assessment.	7%	14%	13%		
Number exempt	0	0	0	9	7
Percent exempt	0%	0%	0%	18%	16%

Third Generation CMT				Second Generation CMT		
	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001		1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month – September	9/02	9/01	9/00	Testing month – September	9/99	9/98
SCHOOL SCORES						
TOTAL 4TH GRADE POPULATION	46	37	40	TOTAL 4TH GRADE POPULATION	49	44
School Mean Scaled Score	239	243	228	School Mean Score	55	37
At or Above - Below Basic	100%	100%	100%			
At or Above - Basic	86%	84%	74%			
At or Above - Proficient	72%	72%	63%			
At or Above - Goal	42%	56%	34%	At or Above - Goal	30%	16%
At - Advanced in 2002 only*	5%			At or Below - Goal	70%	84%
# Of students tested	43	32	35	# Of students tested	40	37
% Of total students tested	93%	86%	87%	% Of students tested	82%	84%
# Of students out of level/Special Education	3	5	5			
% Of students out of level/Special Education	7%	14%	13%			
# Of students exempt	0	0	0	# Of student s exempt	9	7
% Of students exempt	0%	0%	0%	% Of students exempt	18%	16%
STATE SCORES				STATE SCORES		
TOTAL POPULATION	42,374	41,070	41,075	TOTAL POPULATION	40,175	38,604
State Mean Scaled Score**	246.0	248.4	249.7	State Mean Score**	67.0	65.5
At or Above - Below Basic	100%	100%	100%			
At or Above - Basic	79%	81%	80%			
At or Above - Proficient	69%	71%	71%			
At or Above - Goal	56%	58%	57%	At or Above - Goal	56%	54%
At - Advanced in 2002 only*	19%			At or Below - Goal	54%	56%

* The Advanced category was introduced in the 2002-2003 testing year.

** State Mean differs by generation. For Generation 2, this table shows the Index score. For Generation 3, this table shows the Average Scale Score.

Grade 6 – Mathematics

Test Information	CMT Third Generation			CMT Second Generation	
Grade Assessed	Sixth				
Test Title/Name	Connecticut Mastery Test Third Generation			Connecticut Mastery Test Second Generation	
TEST YEARS/publication year	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Edition	Form M	Form M	Form L	Form H	Form H
Publisher	Harcourt Educational Measurement				
What groups were exempt from testing? Why and how were they assessed?	None	None	None	Special Education	Special Education
# Of students given an "out-of-level" assessment.	4	2	7		
% Of students given "out-of-level" assessment.	12%	6%	21%		
Number exempt	0	0	0	5	10
Percent exempt	0%	0%	0%	11%	27%

Third Generation CMT				Second Generation CMT		
	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001		1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month – September	9/02	9/01	9/00	Testing month – September	9/99	9/98
SCHOOL SCORES						
TOTAL6TH GRADE POPULATION	34	33	33	TOTAL 6TH GRADE POPULATION	45	47
School Mean Scaled Score	258	258	239	School Mean Score	76	52
At or Above - Below Basic	100%	100%	100%			
At or Above - Basic	100%	97%	88%			
At or Above - Proficient	93%	94%	81%			
At or Above - Goal	67%	65%	38%	At or Above - Goal	63%	27%
At - Advanced in 2002 only*	3%			At or Below - Goal	37%	73%
# Of students tested	30	31	26	# Of students tested	40	37
% Of total students tested	88%	94%	79%	% Of students tested	89%	79%
# Of students out of level/Special Education	4	2	7			
% Of students out of level/Special Education	12%	6%	21%			
# Of students exempt	0	0	0	# Of students exempt	5	10
% Of students exempt	0%	0%	0%	% Of students exempt	11%	27%
STATE SCORES				STATE SCORES		
TOTAL POPULATION	43,105	41,018	39,314	TOTAL POPULATION	38,030	37,885
State Mean Scaled Score**	255.1	255.3	249.8	State Mean Score**	74.7	72.9
At or Above - Below Basic	100%	100%	100%			
At or Above - Basic	92%	92%	90%			
At or Above - Proficient	82%	82%	79%			
At or Above - Goal	61%	61%	58%	At or Above - Goal	45%	47%
At - Advanced in 2002 only*	20%			At or Below - Goal	55%	53%

* The Advanced category was introduced in the 2002-2003 testing year.

** State Mean differs by generation. For Generation 2, this table shows the Index score. For Generation 3, this table shows the Average Scale Score.

Grade 6 – Reading

Test Information	CMT Third Generation			CMT Second Generation	
Grade Assessed	Sixth				
Test Title/Name	Connecticut Mastery Test Third Generation			Connecticut Mastery Test Second Generation	
TEST YEAR/publication year	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Edition	Form M	Form M	Form L	Form H	Form H
Publisher	Harcourt Educational Measurement				
What groups were exempt from testing? Why and how were they assessed?	None	None	None	Special Education	Special Education
# Of students given an "out-of-level" assessment.	4	2	8	N/A	N/A
% Of students given an "out-of-level" assessment.	12%	6%	24%	N/A	N/A
Number exempt	0	0	0	2	7
Percent exempt	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%

Third Generation CMT				Second Generation CMT		
	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001		1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing month – September	9/02	9/01	9/00	Testing month – September	9/99	9/98
SCHOOL SCORES						
TOTAL6TH GRADE POPULATION	34	33	33	TOTAL 6TH GRADE POPULATION	44	47
School Mean Scaled Score	245	260	239	School Mean Score	74	45
At or Above - Below Basic	100%	100%	100%			
At or Above - Basic	83%	97%	88%			
At or Above - Proficient	77%	81%	72%			
At or Above - Goal	63%	65%	44%	At or Above - Goal	71%	28%
At - Advanced in 2002 only*	7%			At or Below - Goal	29%	72%
# Of students tested	30	31	25	# Of students tested	42	40
% Of total students tested	88%	94%	76%	% Of students tested	95%	85%
# Of students out of level/Special Education	4	2	8			
% Of students out of level/Special Education	12%	6%	24%			
# Of students exempt	0	0	0	# Of students exempt	2	7
% Of students exempt	0%	0%	0%	% Of students exempt	5%	15%
STATE SCORES				STATE SCORES		
TOTAL POPULATION	42,948	40,836	39,237	TOTAL POPULATION	37,970	37,370
State Mean Scaled Score**	251.5	253.0	249.7	State Mean Score**	74.9	74.2
At or Above - Below Basic	100%	100%	100%			
At or Above - Basic	82%	82%	82%			
At or Above - Proficient	74%	75%	75%			
At or Above - Goal	64%	64%	62%	At or Above - Goal	66%	66%
At - Advanced in 2002 only*	19%			At or Below - Goal	34%	34%

* The Advanced category was introduced in the 2002-2003 testing year.

** State Mean differs by generation. For Generation 2, this table shows the Index score. For Generation 3, this table shows the Average Scale Score.

GRADE 4 - UNDERSTANDING THE SCALE SCORES FOR MATHEMATICS - CMT THIRD GENERATION

Scale Score	
288 –400 Advanced	Students who score at this level are performing above the statewide mathematics goal. Generally, students who score at this level possess the knowledge and skills necessary to perform tasks and assignments expected of 4th graders independently. These students demonstrate well-developed conceptual understanding and computational skills as well as an advanced ability to solve complex and abstract mathematical problems.
242 –287 Goal	Students who score at this level are performing at the statewide goal in mathematics. These students possess the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the tasks and assignments expected of 4th graders with minimal teacher assistance. Generally, these students demonstrate well-developed computational skills, conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills.
210 –241 Proficient	Students who score at this level are performing below the statewide mathematics goal. Generally, students who score at this level demonstrate well-developed computational skills, adequately developed conceptual understanding, but only partially developed problem-solving skills.
187 –209 Basic	Students who score at this level are performing well below the statewide Basic mathematics goal. Generally, students who score at this level demonstrate adequately developed computational skills, but limited conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills.
186 or below Below Basic	Students who score at this level are performing within the statewide Below Basic mathematics below basic level. Generally, students who score at this level demonstrate some computational skills, but are very limited in conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills.

GRADE 6 - UNDERSTANDING THE SCALE SCORES FOR MATHEMATICS - CMT THIRD GENERATION

Scale Score	
293 –400 Advanced	Students who score at this level are performing above the statewide mathematics goal. Generally, students who score at this level possess the knowledge and skills to perform the tasks and assignments expected of 6th graders independently. These students demonstrate well-developed conceptual understanding and computational and problem-solving skills as well as an advanced ability with solving complex and abstract mathematical problems.
245 –292 Goal	Students who score at this level are performing at the statewide Goal mathematics goal. These students possess the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the tasks and assignments expected of 6th graders with minimal teacher assistance. Generally, these students demonstrate well-developed computational skills, conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills.
215 –244 Proficient	Students who score at this level are performing below the statewide mathematics goal. Generally, students who score at this level demonstrate well-developed computational skills, partially developed conceptual understanding, but only partially developed problem-solving skills.
191 –214 Basic	Students who score at this level are performing well below the statewide Basic mathematics goal. Generally, students who score at this level demonstrate partially developed computational skills, limited conceptual understanding and very limited problem-solving skills.
190 or below Below Basic	Students who score at this level are performing within the statewide Below Basic mathematics below basic level. Generally, students who score at this level demonstrate limited computational skills, very limited conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills.

GRADE 4 - UNDERSTANDING THE SCORES FOR READING – CMT THIRD GENERATION

Scale Score	
288 –400 Advanced	Students who score at this level are performing above the statewide reading goal. They possess the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully perform the tasks and assignments appropriately expected of a student at the grade level which minimal teacher assistance. Generally, they can comprehend textbooks and other materials typically used at grade 4 or above.
243 –287 Goal	Students who score at this level are performing at the statewide reading goal. They possess the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully perform the tasks and assignments appropriately expected of a student at the grade level which minimal teacher assistance. Generally, they can comprehend textbooks and other materials typically used at grade 4 or above
225 –242 Proficient	Students who score at this level are performing below the statewide reading goal. Generally, students who score at this level can comprehend (with some teacher assistance) textbooks and other materials typically used at grade 4 or below.
109 –224 Basic	Students who score at this level are performing well below the statewide reading level. Generally, students who score at this level can comprehend, with varying degrees of difficulty, materials written below a grade 4 level.
100-208 Below Basic	Generally, students who score at this level can comprehend, with varying degrees of difficulty, material written well below a grade 4 level.

GRADE 6 - UNDERSTANDING THE SCORES FOR READING – CMT THIRD GENERATION

Scale Score	
295 –400 Advanced	Students who score at this level are performing above the statewide reading goal. They possess the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully perform the tasks and assignments appropriately expected of a student at the grade level which minimal teacher assistance. Generally, they can comprehend textbooks and other materials typically used at grade 4 or above.
239 –294 Goal	Students who score at this level are performing at the statewide reading goal. They possess the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully perform the tasks and assignments appropriately expected of a student at the grade level which minimal teacher assistance. Generally, they can comprehend textbooks and other materials typically used at grade 4 or above
222 –238 Proficient	Students who score at this level are performing below the statewide reading goal. Generally, students who score at this level can comprehend (with some teacher assistance) textbooks and other materials typically used at grade 6 or below.
208 –221 Basic	Students who score at this level are performing well below the statewide reading level. Generally, students who score at this level can comprehend, with varying degrees of difficulty, materials written below a grade 6 level.
100-207 Below Basic	Generally, students who score at this level can comprehend, with varying degrees of difficulty, material written well below a grade 6 level.