U.S. Department of Education September 2003

2003-2004 *No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program* Cover Sheet

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

Official School Name Carderock Springs Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records

School Mailing Address 7401 Persimmon Tree Lane
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Bethesda	Maryland	20817 - 4511
City	State	Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (301) 469 – 1034 Fax (301) 469 - 1115

Website/URL www.mcps.k12.md.us/schools/carderockspringses
E-mail Linda_J_Jones@fc.mcps.k12.md.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.

_____ Date_____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Jerry D. Weast
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Montgomery County (MD) Public Schools Tel. (301) 279 - 3381

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

_____ Date_____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mrs. Sharon W. Cox
(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 I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

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

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

2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 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 1998.

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

6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

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

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

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district:

__125___ Elementary schools
__36___ Middle schools
___0__ Junior high schools
___23__ High schools
___7 __ Other (Briefly explain)
MCPS has 6 Special Education or Alternative Schools and 1 Career/Technology Center

___191__ TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: ___$9,475.00_____

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: ___$8,351.00_____

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

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

4. ___4___Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

_____ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal 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
K	12	23	**35**
1	27	25	**52**
2	25	27	**52**
3	30	29	**59**
4	27	27	**54**
5	39	29	**68**
6			
Total Students in the Applying School			320

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

78.8 % White
2.2 % Black or African American
6.9 % Hispanic or Latino
12.2 % Asian/Pacific Islander
0 % American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 7.8%

(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	15
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	10
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	25
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	319
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.078
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	7.8

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 3.1 %
10 Total Number Limited English Proficient
Number of languages represented: 5
Specify languages: Spanish, Korean, Russian, Japanese, Bengali

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 1.6 %

5 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method does not produce a reasonably 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: 7.2 %
23 Total Number of Students Served

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

__1__Autism	____Orthopedic Impairment
____Deafness	_1__Other Health Impaired
____Deaf-Blindness	_4__Specific Learning Disability
____Hearing Impairment	_17_Speech or Language Impairment (many of these students receive Specific Learning Disability support as well)
____Mental Retardation	____Traumatic Brain Injury
____Multiple Disabilities	____Visual Impairment Including Blindness

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

	Number of Staff	
	Full-time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	____1___	_____
Classroom teachers	___12____	____1____
Special resource teachers/specialists	____6___	____6____
Paraprofessionals	____2___	____3____
Support staff	____4___	____8____
Total number	____25___	___18____

12. Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio: K= 17:1 Gr. 1 to 2 = 25.8 :1 Gr. 3 to 5 = 22.6:1

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.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	96.3%	96.5%	95.8%	96.5%	96.2%
Daily teacher attendance	93%	96%	94%	97%	94%
Teacher turnover rate	10%	10%	14%	14%	10%
Student dropout rate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Student drop-off rate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

PART III - SUMMARY

Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 475 words). Include at least a summary of the school's mission or vision in the statement.

Carderock Springs Elementary School is nestled in the far southwest corner of Montgomery County, Maryland with a physical address of Bethesda. The children who attend Carderock Springs come from the suburban communities of Bethesda and Potomac, just outside of our nation's Capitol. Our families represent a variety of backgrounds, professions and nationalities including many international families with bilingual students. Although not participants in the English for Speakers of Other Languages program, the international community inside our school brings to our school a rich mosaic from which we all learn and grow. All students find a warm, caring and secure environment inside our walls with a staff that demonstrates daily their belief that high quality teaching and learning is a basic right of all children. We pride ourselves at Carderock Springs on being a community of learners. This is typified in our motto: "We Love to Learn" where this "we" includes staff, parents and community members as well as our students. We envision a school where we promote the development of successful lifelong learners who contribute to their changing global society. We believe that respected students will be encouraged to reach their full potential through a cooperative partnership between home and school. We strive to provide learning experiences that build on students' successes, foster independence in learning, promote responsibility for self and others, nurture self-esteem, and enhance critical and divergent thinking skills.

Our students are taught the value of ethical citizenship daily through our participation in the Whitman cluster of schools *Pillars of Ethics* program. In our school students give one another "heartprints" for demonstrating one of the seven pillars which include: responsibility, moral courage, cooperation, honesty, respect, caring and empathy and fairness. Student ethical behavior is celebrated with ethics pep rally assemblies twice a year where students from the cluster high school often come over to cheer with the elementary school students. Part of the assembly is the introduction of the upcoming community service project run jointly by our student government and the Parent Teacher Association. Carderock students have been recognized for a number of community service efforts including the money they have raised for the Humane Society, Lymphoma Research, Bethesda Cares, and their ongoing partnership to assist the residents of the Stepping Stones Homeless Shelter.

Students participate actively in their academic, artistic as well as in their ethical education. Learning is a "minds on -- hands on" experience where students are expected to become thinkers and problem solvers. In this vein they are thoroughly involved through class projects and organizations such as student government, safety patrols and the yearly musical production in planning and decision -making related to the topic or project under study. For example, the fifth grade each year runs an in-school mail system. The students are divided into committees and each committee organizes a part of the larger enterprise from designing the postal station, designing stamps for the in-house mail, and researching worthy organizations to receive the proceeds from their project. By the time students leave Carderock they have had significant experience in working with others and understand the value of effective effort in producing successful outcomes.

Active parental support through activities such as the Welcome Back-to-school Picnic, International Night, Muffins with Mom & Donuts with Dad Breakfast and Open House, Book Fairs, the annual Teacher Appreciation Raffle, Monthly Cultural Arts Assemblies, New Parent Packets and Informational Parent Forums on topics of interest like Gifted Programs, Special Education Programs and the Educational Management Team Process plays a significant role in the success we enjoy at our school.

Carderock Springs is a remarkable learning community. In spite of a cramped physical plant, every student at our school is afforded a first class elementary education that has taken our students to the most respected institutions of higher education worldwide. The start students receive at Carderock allows them to matriculate forward still saying "We Love To Learn" and that makes all the difference.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Describe in one page the meaning of the school's assessment results in reading (language arts or English) and mathematics in such a way that someone not intimately familiar with the tests can easily understand them.

Over the past three years, the state of Maryland has made major transitions in its school performance accountability system. *The Maryland School Performance Assessment Program* (MSPAP) was in place from 1993 through 2002 for grades 3 and 5. The *Maryland School Assessment* (MSA) began in 2003 for grades 3 and 5. Both assessments measure the *Maryland Learning Outcomes* in reading and math. The MSPAP provided performance measurement at the school level, while the MSA provides performance measurement at both the school and student levels. Satisfactory and excellent performance standards for the MSPAP were set such that 70% of student scores were expected to meet the satisfactory standard, and 25% of student scores were expected to meet the excellent standard. Proficient and advanced performance standards were set for the MSA with the expectation that 100% of students will meet the proficient standard by 2014. No expectations have been set for the percentage of students attaining the advanced standard at this writing. Carderock Spring's results for grade 3 Reading moved from about 50% satisfactory to over 95% proficient, for grade 3 Math moved from about 70% satisfactory to 100% proficient, for Grade 5 Reading moved from 67% satisfactory to over 95% proficient, and for Grade 5 Math moved from 92% satisfactory to 94% proficient. Our current state ranking on proficiency percentiles is 99% proficient for Grade 3 Reading and Math combined and 98.5% proficient for Grade 5 Reading and Math combined.

To supplement the school-level performance measurement of the MSPAP, the state of Maryland also required the *Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills* (CTBS) for grades 2 and 4 through 2002. Our school district also administered the CTBS to grades 2 and 4 in 2003. The CTBS provides performance scores for students and schools. Maryland reports the median national percentile (MNP) rank for each school. Thus the CTBS can provide a more stable comparison of our school's performance scores across years. Carderock Springs' results from 2001 to 2003 showed an increase in the MNP rank from 82 to 90 for Grade 2 Reading, an increase in the MNP rank from 82 to 94 for Grade 2 Math, changes in the MNP rank from 84 to 92 to 84 for Grade 4 Reading, and an increase in the MNP rank from 85 to 94 for Grade 4 Math.

Over time our results demonstrate the strength of the instructional program as well as reflect the dedication of our teachers to continuously challenge and move our students forward. The performance-based tasks of the assessments in Maryland led to a real culture change in instructional practice at Carderock Springs, requiring more authenticity in the daily tasks required of students. Considering the small size of our testing cohorts at each grade level, student performance is consistently high and moving forward, keeping pace with the increased rigor of the curriculum. Our students, staff and parent community are proud of the record of achievement that their daily efforts produce.

2. Show in one-half page (approximately 200 words) how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.

The administration, staff and parent community have consistently used all student performance data available including standardized test program results, daily class tasks, performance on homework and other independent assignments as well as periodic grade reports to analyze and respond appropriately to student performance at the level of the individual student as well as the class, grade level and school. Recent improvements in the Montgomery County Public Schools Instructional Management System have facilitated this effort tremendously as we are now able to produce color graphic representations of student progress on a number of measures with a few mouse clicks. This technology allows the critical links between curriculum, instruction and assessment to be managed at the individual teacher level. Individual teachers monitor multiple sources of student data, both formative and summative, with interpretation assistance, as needed from the staff development teacher, reading specialist, special education resource teacher and principal to fashion academic interventions for individual students or groups of students. For example, a recent review of our *Maryland School Assessment* data pointed up a weakness in our third grade word study program. Both the third grade team and the fourth grade team planned a specific series of lessons to erase this gap in the knowledge base of a specific group of students. The staff development teacher coordinated the effort with the reading specialist to ensure we targeted the appropriate skills and did not sacrifice other needed curriculum in the process. Consistent monitoring of our assessment data allows our school to plan thoughtfully for the success of every student. While the emphasis for student instructional goal attainment remains formative assessments and quality planning and adjustment for instruction, our emphasis in the school level analysis begins with summative data over time and then moves into finding appropriate formative assessments to measure cohort progress on the goal.

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

Recognizing that parents are our partners in the success of each student, performance is communicated to parents on an ongoing basis through a variety of means. Teachers send graded student performance tasks home to parents in a weekly work folder. In addition, every parent is invited to a face-to-face conference in November each year. The goal of the conference is to review student progress up to that point in the school year, including a review of relevant student standardized assessment results. This is a follow up to the beginning of the school year parent meetings grade levels hold to establish instructional goals for students at the grade level. At any point in the school year parents or teachers may initiate additional phone, or in-person conferences to share progress updates, negotiate current challenges, or for any other reason that makes the contact profitable in the course of the child's education. Parents receive a home report of their child's standardized assessment results and the principal invites parents at the tested grades to a meeting for general questions and answers about the assessment. All of the school level assessment results are shared with parents in writing through the principal's monthly newsletter as well as through a general Parent Teacher Association meeting presentation. Assessment results as well as other school level data are maintained on the website of the school system in a "Schools at a Glance" feature that is also available in hardcopy at the school and in public libraries. Local newspapers publish information about school performance to the general community and the Maryland State Department of Education maintains a website that also publishes individual school performance data. Perhaps the most powerful communication of progress occurs between teacher and child. Through an individual conference feature of our program student and teacher look at student work and the student suggests ways to improve and with teacher guidance a plan is put in place. This is particularly true in our writing program, which is the priority target of our school-wide improvement plan.

4. Describe in one-half page how the school will share its successes with other schools.

Several venues allow our school to share its successes with other schools including:

- We maintain a school website through which a virtually limitless audience can access information about activities at Carderock, including our school improvement plan and contact information.
- Teachers from our school have contributed lessons to the school system website to share best practice in integrating technology in relevant ways that match our curriculum.
- The cluster model in our school system allows "job-alike" sharing in a pre-kindergarten through grade twelve cross articulation. In this venue the principal, staff development teacher, reading specialist, special educators, and counselor can share ideas and strategies. Our quad-cluster staff development specialists have also arranged lesson sharing sessions among teachers where each brings a "best lesson" to share with others. Carderock's staff has been an active contributor to these sessions.
- Our technology teacher and third grade teacher have presented to other educators at state and national level conferences and this type of venue allows a wide cross section of educators to benefit from lessons we have learned as we work with children.
- Our kindergarten teacher has served on a county level task force designed to document "best practice" in working with young children.

The accomplished staff of Carderock Springs willingly shares its expertise with local, state and national audiences. We will continue to seek and welcome opportunities to share what we know as well as to learn from other generous educators. We have found over time that in every opportunity and venue through which we share with other educators, we gain as much as we have given.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Describe in one page the school's curriculum. Outline in several sentences the core of each curriculum area and show how all students are engaged with significant content based on high standards

Teaching and learning at Carderock Springs is organized around implementing the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) curriculum with the particular need, interests and abilities of our students in mind. MCPS asks four essential questions that guide the conduct of any instructional program in the district:

- What do students need to know and be able to do?
- How will we know they have learned it?
- What will we do when they haven't?
- What will we do when they already know it?

Over the last three years the MCPS curriculum has been revised to ensure that it incorporates the state-mandated framework with the *Maryland Content Standards* and *Maryland Learning Outcomes*, as required by law. MCPS has worked to incorporate recognized world-class standards in addition to what is required by our state.

All students receive instruction in Reading, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, Art, Music and Physical Education weekly. All students in the school are working on the diploma requirements of our state, including those who receive specialized services based on their individualized education plan, section 504 plan for accommodations or their plan for students with limited English proficiency. Because all of our students are therefore expected to master the curriculum at their grade level indicators or above, all of our students are engaged in the MCPS curriculum, which is based on world-class standards. Many areas of our curriculum incorporate a variety of interdisciplinary principles. Students read non-fiction text about science, they write in math class to making their thinking visible to others, they experiment in Social Studies to better understand how land features affect the decisions groups of people make about where to settle and they infuse technology throughout their studies to enhance their learning experiences.

In Social Studies the goal of the curriculum is to engage students in a comprehensive study that begins in kindergarten with themselves and their family, moves to the community of their classroom and school then finally expands as they move through the grades to include a larger definition of our community. The study of community, then our nation and world offers students the skills and knowledge they will need to thrive in an increasingly complex society.

Our school's implementation of the science curriculum has as its goal to develop and utilize curiosity and achieve scientific literacy by developing a balanced understanding of the concepts of life science, chemistry, physics, earth/space, and environmental science. In addition students engage rigorously in the process skills of science through real-world applications. Every child is afforded the opportunity, working in cooperative groups, to participate in hands-on science learning. MCPS provides stocked science kits and active engagement lessons which teachers adapt for their students. The process of open-ended scientific inquiry is stressed from kindergarten through grade five and students excel at making qualitative and quantitative observations and drawing conclusions based on their observations. The development of sound reasoning skills are emphasized.

Reading is based on the rigorous MCPS revised curriculum. Students are exposed to a reading program that equips students with a variety of before, during and after reading strategies that allow them to unlock text and make meaning from print. A variety of genres and a wide selection of material are resources from which teachers and students make strategic decisions to help every child become an accomplished reader, as well as writer, by the end of their elementary years.

The mathematics program has been revised to increase the rigor available to every child. The emphasis of the program is to develop mathematical thinking and problem solving abilities that will both foster a lifelong love of mathematics but also facilitate decision-making ability.

Art, music and physical education programs are based on Maryland's Essential Learner Outcomes for the Fine Arts and are a significant part of our interdisciplinary focus. Students have additional opportunities to respond to the content of other disciplines in an artistic form or through the design of skill development activities in physical education. The overall goal of our curriculum in the content described here as well as in the significant effort ethic developed along the way, is to have children experience an elementary program that provides enriching, multicultural, interdisciplinary learning that both inform and enhance decisions they make throughout their lives.

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

Carderock Springs implements a balanced reading approach as defined by MCPS curriculum, which incorporates the following components into daily reading instruction:

- **Read aloud** by the teacher or another individual of a variety of text to model fluent reading behaviors, expose children to a variety of genre, and help develop a love of reading.
- **Shared reading** during which teacher and students read chorally from big books, poems, and songs to develop concepts about print and phonemic connections as well as to provide a supportive group environment for fluency development.
- **Guided reading and writing instruction** in small group settings, which allow for the development and refinement of explicit reading and writing instruction by the teacher at the student's reading level. Students receive direct instruction in phonics, vocabulary and comprehension strategies
- **Paired/cooperative reading and writing** during which students have opportunities for reading and writing without the teacher's participation which allows students to use the reading and writing strategies they have learned in a social setting with opportunities for practice with the support of peers. Students have a chance to model, share and extend their comprehension and ideas.
- **Independent reading and writing** allows students to select their own text and to write for their own purpose. Students have an opportunity to process information at their own pace matched to their own interest and ability.

Using the curriculum blueprints and instructional guides developed over the last three years in MCPS, student instruction in reading at Carderock Springs is based on best practice research in reading including information contained in works such as the report of The National Reading Panel (NRP) which reviewed more than 100,000 studies on reading and identified five components essential to a child's ability to learn to read: phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Each of these components as well as the Maryland content standards embedded within the MCPS curriculum guide the planning of Carderock teachers for the delivery of quality reading instruction.

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

The general music program of Carderock Springs is an integral part of our goal to wholly develop our children. In addition to exposing students to the artistry and aesthetic appreciation of music as required by the Maryland Essential Learner Outcomes in the Fine Arts, we also pride ourselves on a music program that provides opportunities to strengthen the academic understanding of concepts from other disciplines. For example, our talented music teacher incorporates African rhythms and instruments into a supportive unit on folk tales that students study in their reading class. Students learn how music and speech work together through rhythm. Because rhythm is inherent in the language we speak, rhymes, poems, and riddles offer endless possibilities for exploring musical elements. Often in music class, materials are chosen that are rhythmic, repetitive and rhyme. The students are often intrigued by the rhythmical phrases and remember the decoding of some of the words because of the nature of the rhythm, rhyme and repetition. Through music, a child at Carderock Springs has an additional learning approach to reading. Orff techniques are also used in music classes. Carl Orff wanted children to play with the sound of their words. For example a word like "dark" or "deep" could be in a poem. The student would then think of ways to pronounce the words with its meaning in mind and afterwards find an instrument whose tone color matched the words. This playing with words gives students strategies for memorizing beginning, middle and ending sounds while helping them look for patterns. Music classes at Carderock also have a strong connection with math through concepts such as meter and note value. Our music teacher has demonstrated musical connections to other disciplines for parents in workshops, which were very well received, as are the numerous performances of our school chorus, third grade recorder concert, and the annual fifth grade musical.

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

Because each learner is unique and possesses varied learning styles the staff at Carderock works to present an eclectic mix of teaching strategies that will meet the needs of our diverse learners. Considerable effort is expended to utilize research-based instructional strategies that have proven to be effective in their impact on student achievement. Most recently the staff is incorporating the work *Classroom Instruction That Works: Research Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement* (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001; ASCD) into our repertoire of strategies. Other instructional strategy development have included works such as *Mosaic of Thought*: *Teaching Comprehension in a Reader's Workshop* (Ellin Keene and Susan Zimmermann, 1997 Heinneman) and *The Skillful Teacher: Building your teaching skills* (by Jon Saphier & Robert Gower, 1997 5th Edition). Examples of strategies in use at Carderock include:

- Using specific activities to activate student background knowledge prior to new instruction, as well as the use of other specifically designed activities at the conclusion of the instructional episode to summarize the experience, helping the student to integrate and retain the learning
- Helping students visualize as an aid to comprehension
- Helping students make connections to their own life, other texts read and to the larger world
- Using a variety of graphic organizers to assist students with the organization of their learning
- Using authentic tasks and authentic purposes to stimulate student motivation and interest in their

learning

- Using instructional approaches which engage students actively in their learning through the use of manipulatives, role plays, games, and choice activities which allow their selection of project alternatives or text selection with appeals to their learning style or interest
- Encouraging multiple representations of data or answers
- Comparing and contrasting information to identify similarities and differences.

Our school works with students in a variety of instructional settings including small group instruction, individual projects, cooperative groupings and whole class instruction as needed to differentiate instruction based on the needs of the students.

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

The four critical questions mentioned above in question one demand clarity of instructional purpose and significant investment in developing the capacity of staff to differentiate instruction appropriately for all learners. To this end the instructional capacity of the Carderock Springs staff is developed in a number of ways. On a personal level, each staff member develops an individual professional growth plan that is tied into the goals of the school improvement plan. These goals take into account the individual differences in staff experience, personal professional goals and previous professional training. Staff members identify human and material resources they need to accomplish their goals which can range from taking a traditional graduate course, participation in a peer classroom visit with reflection, using the internet to research an instructional topic, or presenting to other educators at a national conference. The staff development teacher and principal work with individual staff members to monitor progress and adjust the personal plan as needed. At each grade level the team meets monthly to plan the upcoming unit of instruction with whichever specialists might be needed to assist the team in accomplishing the objectives of instruction. We use these monthly meeting opportunities to provide grade specific staff development. Groups of teachers also work together across grade levels on topics of mutual interest. For example, we currently have five teachers working together as they pursue certification from the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. Finally at the whole school level we work on instructional strategy development relevant to the staff development plan of our school improvement plan. The overall effect of our staff development coordination is the consistent development of increased instructional capacity of our staff.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

MARYLAND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (MSPAP)
Carderock Springs Elementary School 2001 & 2002 Assessment Results

Content: Reading Testing month: May Grade: 3	2001-2002	2000-2001
SCHOOL SCORES		
% Below Satisfactory	48.0	55.0
% At or Above Satisfactory	52.0	45.0
% At Excellent	2.0	5.0
Number of students tested	50	50
Percent of total students tested	92.6%	96.8%
Number of students excluded	4	2
Percent of students excluded	7.4%	3.2%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. _White, not Hispanic_ (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	52.8	56.0
% At or Above Satisfactory	47.2	44.0
% At Excellent	0.0	4.0
Number of students tested	36	50
2. Asian/Pacific Islander (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	42.9	50.0
% At or Above Satisfactory	57.1	50.0
% At Excellent	0.0	16.7
Number of students tested	7	6
3. Hispanic (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	16.7	*
% At or Above Satisfactory	83.3	*
% At Excellent	16.7	*
Number of students tested	6	<5
4. Males		
% Below Satisfactory	57.7	61.3
% At or Above Satisfactory	42.3	38.7
% At Excellent	0.0	3.2
Number of students tested	26	31
5. Females		
% Below Satisfactory	37.5	48.3
% At or Above Satisfactory	62.5	51.7
% At Excellent	4.2	6.9
Number of students tested	24	29
6. Special Education		
% Below Satisfactory	57.1	*
% At or Above Satisfactory	42.9	*
% At Excellent	0.0	*
Number of students tested	7	<5
STATE SCORES		
% Below Satisfactory	65.6%	58.2%
% At or Above Satisfactory	34.4%	41.8%
% At Excellent	3.7%	5.3%

*Results are not reported in the state of Maryland in any cell containing fewer than 5 students.

MARYLAND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (MSPAP)
Carderock Springs Elementary School 2001 & 2002 Assessment Results

Content: Mathematics **Testing month: May Grade: 3**	**2001-2002**	**2000-2001**
SCHOOL SCORES		
% Below Satisfactory	31.4	23.0
% At or Above Satisfactory	68.6	77.0
% At Excellent	2.0	18.0
Number of students tested	51	61
Percent of total students tested	94.4%	98.4%
Number of students excluded	3	1
Percent of students excluded	5.6%	1.6%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White, not Hispanic (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	32.4	21.6
% At or Above Satisfactory	67.6	78.4
% At Excellent	2.7	15.7
Number of students tested	37	51
2. Asian/Pacific Islander (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	28.6	16.7
% At or Above Satisfactory	71.4	83.3
% At Excellent	0.0	50.0
Number of students tested	7	6
3. Hispanic (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	16.7	*
% At or Above Satisfactory	83.3	*
% At Excellent	0.0	*
Number of students tested	6	<5
4. Males (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	29.6	25.0
% At or Above Satisfactory	70.4	75.0
% At Excellent	3.7	12.5
Number of students tested	27	32
5. Females (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	33.3	20.7
% At or Above Satisfactory	66.7	79.3
% At Excellent	0.0	24.1
Number of students tested	24	29
6. Special Education (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	37.5	*
% At or Above Satisfactory	62.5	*
% At Excellent	0.0	*
Number of students tested	8	<5
STATE SCORES		
% Below Satisfactory	69.2%	57.6%
% At or Above Satisfactory	30.8%	42.4%
% At Excellent	2.1%	4.6%

* Results are not reported in the state of Maryland in any cell containing fewer than 5 students

MARYLAND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (MSPAP)
Carderock Springs Elementary 2001 & 2002 Assessment Results

Content: Reading Testing month: May Grade: 5	2001-2002	2000-2001
SCHOOL SCORES		
% Below Satisfactory	32.1	32.8
% At or Above Satisfactory	67.9	67.2
% At Excellent	15.1	29.3
Number of students tested	53	58
Percent of total students tested	98.1%	100%
Number of students excluded	1	0
Percent of students excluded	1.9%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White, not Hispanic (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	31.6	28.6
% At or Above Satisfactory	68.4	71.4
% At Excellent	13.2	30.6
Number of students tested	38	49
2. Asian/Pacific Islander (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	30.0	*
% At or Above Satisfactory	70.0	*
% At Excellent	30.0	*
Number of students tested	10	<5
3. Hispanic (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	*	*
% At or Above Satisfactory	*	*
% At Excellent	*	*
Number of students tested	<5	<5
4. Males (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	40.9	50.0
% At or Above Satisfactory	59.1	50.0
% At Excellent	13.6	21.9
Number of students tested	22	32
5. Females (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	25.8	11.5
% At or Above Satisfactory	74.2	88.5
% At Excellent	16.1	38.5
Number of students tested	31	26
6. Special Education (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	42.9	62.5
% At or Above Satisfactory	57.1	37.5
% At Excellent	0.0	0.0
Number of students tested	7	8
STATE SCORES		
% Below Satisfactory	46.6%	43.1%
% At or Above Satisfactory	53.4%	56.9%
% At Excellent	11.2%	12.3%

* Results are not reported in the state of Maryland in any cell containing fewer than five students

MARYLAND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (MSPAP)
Carderock Springs Elementary School 2001 & 2002 Assessment Results

Content: Mathematics Testing month: May Grade: 5	2001-2002	2000-2001
SCHOOL SCORES		
% Below Satisfactory	7.5	8.6
% At or Above Satisfactory	92.5	91.4
% At Excellent	32.1	43.1
Number of students tested	53	58
Percent of total students tested	98.1%	100%
Number of students excluded	1	0
Percent of students excluded	1.9%	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES		
1. White, not Hispanic (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	7.9	8.2
% At or Above Satisfactory	92.1	91.8
% At Excellent	34.2	44.9
Number of students tested	38	49
2. Asian, Pacific Islander (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	0.0	*
% At or Above Satisfactory	100.0	*
% At Excellent	40.0	*
Number of students tested	10	<5
3. Hispanic (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	*	*
% At or Above Satisfactory	*	*
% At Excellent	*	*
Number of students tested	<5	<5
4. Males (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	9.1	12.5
% At or Above Satisfactory	90.9	87.5
% At Excellent	36.4	37.5
Number of students tested	22	32
5. Females (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	6.5	3.8
% At or Above Satisfactory	93.5	96.2
% At Excellent	29.0	50.0
Number of students tested	31	26
6. Special Education (specify subgroup)		
% Below Satisfactory	28.6	37.5
% At or Above Satisfactory	71.4	62.5
% At Excellent	0.0	0.0
Number of students tested	7	8
STATE SCORES		
% Below Satisfactory	50.6%	45.7%
% At or Above Satisfactory	49.4%	54.3%
% At Excellent	9.6%	11.7%

*Results are not reported in the state of Maryland for any cell containing fewer than five students.

MARYLAND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT (MSA)
Carderock Springs Elementary 2003 Assessment Results

Content: Reading **Testing month: March** **Grade: 3**	**2002-2003**
SCHOOL SCORES	
% At Basic	3.5
% At or Above Proficient	96.5
% At Advanced	38.6
Number of students tested	57
Percent of total students tested	100%
Number of students excluded	0
Percent of students excluded	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	
1. White, Not Hispanic (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	2.2
% At or Above Proficient	97.8
% At Advanced	44.4
Number of students tested	45
2. Asian/Pacific Islander (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	14.3
% At or Above Proficient	85.7
% At Advanced	14.3
Number of students tested	7
3. Hispanic (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	*
% At or Above Proficient	*
% At Advanced	*
Number of students tested	<5
4. Males (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	33.3
Number of students tested	30
5. Females (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	7.4
% At or Above Proficient	92.6
% At Advanced	44.4
Number of students tested	27
6. Special Education (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	*
% At or Above Proficient	*
% At Advanced	*
Number of students tested	<5
STATE SCORES	
% At Basic	41.9%
% At or Above Proficient	58.1%
% At Advanced	8.6%

*Results are not reported in the state of Maryland for any cell containing fewer than five students.

MARYLAND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT (MSA)
Carderock Springs 2003 Assessment Results

Content: Mathematics **Testing month: March Grade: 3**	**2002-2003**
SCHOOL SCORES	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100
% At Advanced	49.1
Number of students tested	57
Percent of total students tested	100%
Number of students excluded	0
Percent of students excluded	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	
1. White, Not Hispanic (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	55.6
Number of students tested	45
2. Asian/Pacific Islander (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	28.6
Number of students tested	7
3. Hispanic (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	*
% At or Above Proficient	*
% At Advanced	*
Number of students tested	<5
4. Males (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100
% At Advanced	50.0
Number of students tested	30
5. Females (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	48.1
Number of students tested	27
6. Special Education (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	*
% At or Above Proficient	*
% At Advanced	*
Number of students tested	<5
STATE SCORES	
% At Basic	34.9%
% At or Above Proficient	65.1%
% At Advanced	14.8%

*Results are not reported in the state of Maryland for any cell containing fewer than five students.

MARYLAND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT (MSA)

Carderock Springs 2003 Assessment Results

Content: Reading **Testing month: March Grade: 5**	**2002-2003**
SCHOOL SCORES	
% At Basic	4.3
% At or Above Proficient	95.7
% At Advanced	66.7
Number of students tested	69
Percent of total students tested	100%
Number of students excluded	0
Percent of students excluded	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	
1. White, Not Hispanic (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	3.6
% At or Above Proficient	96.4
% At Advanced	71.4
Number of students tested	56
2. Asian/Pacific Islander (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	80.0
Number of students tested	5
3. Hispanic (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	33.3
Number of students tested	6
4. Males (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	7.7
% At or Above Proficient	92.3
% At Advanced	53.8
Number of students tested	39
5. Females (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	83.3
Number of students tested	30
6. Special Education (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	16.7
Number of students tested	6
STATE SCORES	
% At Basic	34.4%
% At or Above Proficient	65.7%
% At Advanced	26.0%

MARYLAND SCHOOL ASSESSMENT (MSA)
Carderock Springs 2003 Assessment Results

Content: Mathematics **Testing month: March** **Grade: 5**	**2002-2003**
SCHOOL SCORES	
% At Basic	5.8
% At or Above Proficient	94.2
% At Advanced	44.9
Number of students tested	69
Percent of total students tested	100%
Number of students excluded	0
Percent of students excluded	0%
SUBGROUP SCORES	
1. White, Not Hispanic (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	5.4
% At or Above Proficient	94.6
% At Advanced	46.4
Number of students tested	56
2. Asian/Pacific Islander (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	0.0
% At or Above Proficient	100.0
% At Advanced	40.0
Number of students tested	5
3. Hispanic (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	16.7
% At or Above Proficient	83.3
% At Advanced	50.0
Number of students tested	6
4. Males (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	7.7
% At or Above Proficient	92.3
% At Advanced	35.9
Number of students tested	39
5. Females (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	3.3
% At or Above Proficient	96.7
% At Advanced	56.7
Number of students tested	30
6. Special Education (specify subgroup)	
% At Basic	16.7
% At or Above Proficient	83.3
% At Advanced	16.7
Number of students tested	6
STATE SCORES	
% At Basic	45.0%
% At or Above Proficient	55.0%
% At Advanced	9.5%

CARDEROCK SPRINGS CTBS ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

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

Grade 2 Test TerraNova CTBS Reading Subtest

Edition/publication year 1996 Publisher CTB/McGraw Hill

What groups were excluded from testing? None

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

Grade: 2 Content: ***Reading***	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**	**2000-2001**
Testing month			
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score, Median NP	90	90	82
Number of students tested	54	55	51
Percent of total students tested	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %
Number of students excluded / absent	0	0	0
Percent of students excluded / absent	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. White, not Hispanic	90	90	86
Number of students tested	48	45	40
2. Asian / Pacific Islander	90	90	82
Number of students tested	6	6	5
3. Hispanic	–	*	96
Number of students tested	0	<5	5
4. Males	90	90	73
Number of students tested	27	30	27
5. Females	96	90	96
Number of students tested	27	25	24
6. Special Education	*	–	64
Number of students tested	<5	0	7

* indicates fewer than 5 students
– indicates no students in the category

CARDEROCK SPRINGS CTBS ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

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

Grade __4__ Test _TerraNova CTBS Reading Subtest

Edition/publication year_1996__ Publisher _CTB/McGraw Hill

What groups were excluded from testing? _None

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores _____ Percentiles __X__

Grade: 4 Content: ***Reading***	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**	**2000-2001**
Testing month			
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score, Median NP	84	92	84
Number of students tested	50	60	54
Percent of total students tested	100.0 %	98.4 %	100.0 %
Number of students excluded / absent	0	1	0
Percent of students excluded / absent	0.0 %	1.6 %	0.0 %
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. White, not Hispanic	84	92	84
Number of students tested	37	51	40
2. Asian / Pacific Islander	80	92	92
Number of students tested	6	5	9
3. Hispanic	88	*	*
Number of students tested	6	<5	<5
4. Males	84	84	84
Number of students tested	24	32	23
5. Females	84	92	84
Number of students tested	26	28	31
6. Special Education	54	80	75
Number of students tested	7	6	5

* indicates fewer than 5 students
– indicates no students in the category

CARDEROCK SPRINGS CTBS ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

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

Grade __2__ Test _TerraNova CTBS Mathematics Subtest

Edition/publication year_1996__ Publisher _CTB/McGraw Hill

What groups were excluded from testing? _None

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores _____ Percentiles __X__

Grade: 2 Content: ***Mathematics***	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**	**2000-2001**
Testing month			
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score, Median NP	94	90	82
Number of students tested	54	54	51
Percent of total students tested	100.0 %	98.2 %	100.0 %
Number of students excluded / absent	0	1	0
Percent of students excluded / absent	0.0 %	1.8 %	0.0 %
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. White, not Hispanic	94	94	70
Number of students tested	48	45	40
2. Asian / Pacific Islander	94	94	87
Number of students tested	6	6	5
3. Hispanic	–	*	87
Number of students tested	0	<5	5
4. Males	94	98	70
Number of students tested	27	30	27
5. Females	87	87	75
Number of students tested	27	24	24
6. Special Education	*	–	52
Number of students tested	<5	0	7

* indicates fewer than 5 students
– indicates no students in the category

CARDEROCK SPRINGS CTBS ASSESSMENTS
REFERENCED AGAINST NATIONAL NORMS

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

Grade __4__ Test _TerraNova CTBS Mathematics Subtest

Edition/publication year_1996__ Publisher _CTB/McGraw Hill

What groups were excluded from testing? _None

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs____ Scaled scores _____ Percentiles __X__

Grade: 4 Content: ***Mathematics***	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**	**2000-2001**
Testing month			
SCHOOL SCORES			
Total Score, Median NP	94	91	85
Number of students tested	50	60	54
Percent of total students tested	100.0 %	98.4 %	100.0 %
Number of students excluded / absent	0	1	0
Percent of students excluded / absent	0.0 %	1.6 %	0.0 %
SUBGROUP SCORES			
1. White, not Hispanic	91	91	85
Number of students tested	37	51	40
2. Asian / Pacific Islander	98	97	97
Number of students tested	6	5	9
3. Hispanic	91	*	*
Number of students tested	6	<5	<5
4. Males	97	91	91
Number of students tested	24	32	23
5. Females	91	97	85
Number of students tested	26	28	31
6. Special Education	78	91	82
Number of students tested	7	6	5

* indicates fewer than 5 students
– indicates no students in the category