

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

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

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

School Mailing Address 1470 Victoria Avenue  
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Lakewood Ohio 44107-3906  
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (216)529-4217 Fax (216)227-5535

Website/URL www.lkwdpl.org/schools  
E-mail mark.gleichauf@lakewood.k12.oh.us

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Superintendent\* Dr. P. Joseph Madak  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Lakewood City School District Tel. (216)529-4000

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

## **PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

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

Data are of the year indicated in boldface.

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

1. Number of schools in the district:
 

|    |                         |
|----|-------------------------|
| 10 | Elementary schools      |
| 3  | Middle schools          |
|    | Junior high schools     |
| 1  | High schools            |
|    | Other (Briefly explain) |
|    |                         |
| 14 | TOTAL                   |
  
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure:   \$9867   **(02-03 data)**  
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure:   \$8441

**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
  - Suburban
  - Small city or town in a rural area
  - Rural
  
4.   1.5   Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.  
  2   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: **(03-04 data)**

| Grade  | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |  | Grade     | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------|--|-----------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| <b>K</b>                                       | 27         | 18           | <b>45</b>   |  | <b>7</b>  |            |              |             |
| <b>1</b>                                       | 23         | 20           | <b>43</b>   |  | <b>8</b>  |            |              |             |
| <b>2</b>                                       | 25         | 30           | <b>55</b>   |  | <b>9</b>  |            |              |             |
| <b>3</b>                                       | 27         | 18           | <b>45</b>   |  | <b>10</b> |            |              |             |
| <b>4</b>                                       | 26         | 21           | <b>47</b>   |  | <b>11</b> |            |              |             |
| <b>5</b>                                       | 28         | 26           | <b>54</b>   |  | <b>12</b> |            |              |             |
| <b>6</b>                                       |            |              |             |  | PSD       | 10         | 3            | 13          |
| <b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →</b> |            |              |             |  |           |            |              | <b>302</b>  |

PSD = Preschool with disabilities

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school: 86.7 % White  
2.7 % Black or African American  
2.7 % Hispanic or Latino  
**(03-04 data)** 2.0 % Asian/Pacific Islander  
0.3 % American Indian/Alaskan Native  
5.6 % Multi-racial  
**100 % Total**

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 13.5 %  
**(02-03 data)**

(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.)

|            |  |        |
|------------|--|--------|
| <b>(1)</b> | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.   | 21     |
| <b>(2)</b> | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 18     |
| <b>(3)</b> | Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]                                       | 39     |
| <b>(4)</b> | Total number of students in the school as of October 1   | 288    |
| <b>(5)</b> | Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)  | .13542 |
| <b>(6)</b> | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100  | 13.5   |

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 9.4 %  
**(02-03 data)** 19 Total Number Limited English Proficient  
 Number of languages represented: 9  
 Specify languages: Albanian, Arabic, Greek, Hindu, Mexican, Romanian, Serb-Croatian, Spanish, Urdu

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 49.4 %  
**(02-03 data)** 120 Total Number Students Who Qualify

\* Only students in grades 1 – 5 are used to compute free/reduced lunch eligibility  
 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: 14.9 %  
**(03-04 data)** 45 Total Number of Students Served

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <u>    </u> Autism                      | <u>    </u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>    </u> Deafness                    | <u>    </u> Other Health Impaired                 |
| <u>    </u> Deaf-Blindness              | <u>  7  </u> Specific Learning Disability         |
| <u>    </u> Hearing Impairment          | <u> 15 </u> Speech or Language Impairment         |
| <u>  4 </u> Mental Retardation          | <u>    </u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>    </u> Multiple Disabilities       | <u>  1 </u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>  5 </u> Severe Emotional Disability |   |
| <u> 13 </u> Preschool with Disability   |   |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:  
**(03-04 data)**

|                                       | <b>Number of Staff</b>  |                         |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                                       | <b><u>Full-time</u></b> | <b><u>Part-Time</u></b> |
| Administrator(s)                      | <u>  1 </u>             | <u>  0 </u>             |
| Classroom teachers                    | <u> 12 </u>             | <u>  0 </u>             |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>  4 </u>             | <u>  4 </u>             |
| Paraprofessionals                     | <u>  2 </u>             | <u>  3 </u>             |
| Support staff                         | <u>  3 </u>             | <u>  1 </u>             |
| Total number                          | <u> 22 </u>             | <u>  8 </u>             |

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 20.1 : 1  
**(03-04 data)**

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 | 95.6      | 95.8      | 95.6      | 95.4      | 95.0      |
| Daily teacher attendance | 96.7      | 95.9      | 96.4      | 96.4      | 94.5      |
| Teacher turnover rate    | 15.8%     | 14.3%     | 19.04%    | 22.2%     | 16.7%     |
| Student dropout rate     | N/A       |           |           |           |           |
| Student drop-off rate    | N/A       |           |           |           |           |

## **PART III – SUMMARY**

Grant Elementary School is a school of 300 students in the virtual center of the city of Lakewood, Ohio, the immediate western suburb of Cleveland. Grant Elementary School, which is one of ten elementary schools in the Lakewood City School District, serves a diverse student population in grades preschool through fifth grade. This uniqueness is reflected in the ten different languages that Grant students speak.

The Grant School mission statement provides an appropriate framework for the unique overall program it provides to its students, thus making it a very worthy candidate for a National Blue Ribbon Award.

*Grant School is a community of learners committed to excellence. In partnership with the family and the community we provide:*

*A nurturing, peaceful climate.* Built in 1969, Grant Elementary School has units or open spaces for its classrooms in grades one through five. These open spaces are approximately 2,800 square feet and house two or three classrooms of students each. This unique physical set-up has many positive by-products, such as increased professional collaboration and increased flexible spacing for different lessons. These ultimately enhance student engagement and higher achievement. Positive parental support and involvement in the day-to-day learning reinforces this achievement-oriented environment. This peaceful climate is further enhanced by the Peacebuilder program, which gives students a sense of their responsibilities in creating a peaceful, productive climate for learning.

*Meaningful curriculum reflecting real life connections with high standards and challenge for all.* Making meaningful connections between the curriculum and real life has been an emphasis of Grant School teachers for many years. Today teachers place a great premium on field trips that enhance the “paper curriculum.” Today teachers craft creative lessons such as Space Night where parents and students stay overnight and experience concepts like thrust, propulsion and Alexander Calder art while drinking cocoa and sitting in their moms’ laps. Today classroom teachers co-teach Ohio History lessons with the Media Specialist using print and electronic resources to investigate these topics.

*Appropriate individualized instruction, and preparation for success in middle school and a desire for long life learning.* In 1969, Grant School introduced Lakewood to the open school philosophy whereby students worked on a continuum from kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade. Students systematically mastered concepts on an individualized time-table. Although that philosophy is not entirely embraced today, Grant School students still benefit from tailored individual instruction in a variety of circumstances. In 2004, seven special education staff members collaborate with the regular education teachers to meet the unique needs of IEP students within the regular classroom setting. As well, nearly fifty gifted and talented students are provided a challenging and advanced program of study while coexisting seamlessly with the remainder of the student body. Nearly every single day, Title I teachers work with students before, during and after-school on specific areas of need based on data from state criterion and nationally norm referenced tests. And each week police officers, Lakewood recycling reps, parent reading volunteers, and other community members can be seen at Grant School working with individual students providing even more positive life-long learning models and preparing students for the challenges that lie ahead.

Grant Elementary School offers this solid instructional experience that results in high achievement in spite of its incredible diversity in demographics. This due in large part to the people behind the hard work: teachers, students and parents who combine to make an effective educational team.

## **PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

### *1. Clear Assessment Results*

Last year at Grant Elementary School 91.75% of our fourth graders passed the 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading Ohio Proficiency Test and 93.8% of our fourth graders passed the 4<sup>th</sup> grade math Ohio Proficiency Test. Our school's results far exceed the state average for passage on the reading and math tests, as though averages are 66.3% and 58.6 % respectively. Grant School's results become more impressive when you factor in that 49% of the students at Grant School are identified to be below the poverty level by federal computation standards as stated on our 2003 fiscal year Consolidated Continuous Improvement Plan. These state criterion referenced tests are based on proficiency outcomes that relate to state content standards in both these areas.

To further understand Grant School's success with the 4<sup>th</sup> grade Ohio Proficiency Test in reading, one should know it is broken into four strands: Constructing Meaning with Fiction Selections, Examining/Extending Meaning with Fiction Selections, Constructing Meaning with Non-fiction Selections, and Examining/Extending Meaning with Non-Fiction Selections. A test item analysis is given to every school after the test is completed. This item analysis details responses to specific questions in the above strands and gives the percentage of students who answered the questions correctly. Examination of this item analysis shows that on Constructing Meaning with Fiction Selections questions Grant School students averaged 81% correctness on each of the questions. Because the test includes multiple choice and written response questions, the possibility for partial credit for answers is present. Therefore, when looking at students who earned total or partial credit for answers the average percent correct rises to 86%. The Examining and Extending Meaning with Fiction strand questions produced an average of 83% rising to 87% when partial credit on written responses was included. Constructing Meaning with Non-Fiction Selections and Examining and Extending Meaning with Non-Fiction Selections, when examined in the same way as described above, resulted in ranges of 76% and 75% - 83%, respectively.

The 4<sup>th</sup> grade Ohio Proficiency Test in Mathematics is broken into eight strands. Examining the mathematics portion of the item analysis for the test in the same manner as described above reveals the following ranges: Patterns, Relations, and Functions 87%, Problem Solving Strategies 89% - 93%, Numbers and Number Relations 82% - 87%, Geometry 87% - 89%, Algebra 89%, Measurement 83% - 87%, Estimation and Mental Computation 66% - 81%, and Data Analysis and Probability 75% - 90%. Again, the range indicates percentages of students with complete points to percentages of students with partial points.

The results show well-rounded students at Grant School who have good skills in all of the objectives tested on the Ohio Proficiency Tests. The examination of each test item also allows the school to prescribe proper intervention to individual students who show weaknesses in specific strands of the test.

Trends over the last five years in the areas of math and reading show a fairly steady climb of passage scores by Grant School students. Also significant is that no students with individual education plans have been excluded from the test during these years. These students, though, are afforded the appropriate accommodations according to their individual education plans. Some Limited English Proficient students were excluded prior to 2002-2003 but none last year and probably none in the foreseeable future according to federal law.

See testing tables on pages 16 and 18 of this application.

## *2. Assessment Data Use*

Grant Elementary School uses a variety of assessment data to shape instruction and improve student performance. Student progress is monitored almost continuously through teacher assessments and through a district-wide standardized testing program. Depending on the grade and level, teachers use Ohio Proficiency Test data, Terra Nova test data, Rigby reading inventories and Successmaker software data to assess student abilities and craft instruction as well. The Successmaker software mentioned is used with all students at Grant Elementary School. It is used in the areas of math and reading for approximately 20 minutes per day. It is self-directed software that students work on at their individual level and pace.

Assessment results are analyzed to identify those students not achieving at their ability level, those not mastering specific objectives, those who qualify for our comprehensive gifted program and those in need of intervention. With that last area, the Ohio Proficiency Test data is used to target intervention areas as well as students who need remediation in a particular area. This intervention is also facilitated by Title I teachers in a smaller after-school setting with a student/teacher ratio of approximately 4:1. Teachers use the state and norm-referenced test data to identify specific skills that need more or reinforced learning. This makes the teaching more prescriptive and subsequently increases student performance in these targeted areas. They are also used to determine levels of interventions for students in the regular classroom setting. The Rigby reading inventories, administered by Title I teachers, provides reading levels for all students. This data helps determine students who could benefit from additional support by the Title I teachers in and out of the regular classroom setting.

### 3. *Communication of Student Performance*

Grant School knows the importance of communicating student performance and assessment data to significant stakeholders. Students and staff become aware of the results very soon after the school receives the data. Formal letters from the school accompany the results to home. These letters describe the nature of the results and how to comprehend the “assessment-ese.” Teachers also relay assessment results through parent/teacher conferences, phone conferences and possibly Intervention Assistance Team meetings. The principal has made formal presentations about general school results to parents at PTA meetings, school Curriculum Nights and through the monthly newsletter, the *Grant Chalk Talk*.

On an even larger scale, the State of Ohio mails an annual Lakewood City School District and Grant Elementary School report card to district residents and displays school assessment data on its website. On the last State of Ohio report card Grant Elementary School received the state’s highest grade, “Excellent.” The school district publishes a quarterly report, which is mailed to every household in the school district. This report contains information about student performance on standardized tests. This information is also filtered to the proper media for publication and announcements.

### 4. *Sharing Success*

Already, the principal has spoken to his elementary principal colleagues about intervention strategies utilized by the teachers and staff in the past year. This group meets twice a month and they share successful practices with each other during this time.

The grade level teachers also share at quarterly grade level meetings for the entire district. Teachers from all the elementary schools, including Grant Elementary School, have opportunities to share successes with their colleagues.

Should we receive the No Child Left Behind/Blue Ribbon Award, we would continue to share our successes by responding to surveys and information requests. This may include but not limited to answering inquiries from other schools, meeting with other school officials, allowing visits from other school personnel and publishing this application on the Grant Elementary School website.

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

### *1. Core Curriculum*

The core curriculum at Grant School and Lakewood City Schools has been patterned after the recently adopted content standards for the core areas of language arts, mathematics, social studies and science. These content standards have been reformatted into usable courses of study that have all been Board of Education approved in the past few years.

The language arts/English area focuses on the development of reading skills through the explicit reading instruction in the following areas: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension. As students mature and begin to master these building blocks, they can begin to apply more sophisticated reading skills and strategies in their studies. The craft of writing is taught to all students, and writing is taught across the curriculum.

The mathematics program of the Lakewood City Schools, and Grant School, promotes reasoning skills to help develop problem-solving strategies. An emphasis is placed on communication skills so that students develop confidence in their mathematical abilities. The math instructional program follows a spiraling approach to the introduction of the various concepts. Students content base is built upon concrete knowledge from previous lessons or even years. There was substantial amount of teacher training prior to the commencement of this math program. The content standards for math are as follows: number, number sense and operations; measurement, geometry and spatial sense; patterns, functions and algebra; data analysis and probability; and mathematical processes.

The Grant School science program greatly emphasizes a hands-on approach to learning science concepts, processes, and ways of thinking. The six main areas of the science content standards are as follows: earth and space sciences; life sciences; physical sciences; science and technology; scientific inquiry and scientific ways of knowing. These standards address the essential knowledge and skills in science that people may use in solving problems creatively, thinking critically, working cooperatively in teams, using technology effectively and valuing lifelong learning.

The Grant Elementary School social studies program is based on the following seven standards: history; people in societies; geography; economics; government; citizenship rights; and social studies skills and methods. Some of these standards are reinforced through the school-wide Peacebuilder program, which encourages students to see themselves as a part of bigger communities and how their positive, peaceful actions have an influence on others around them.

It is worth noting that just recently Grant Elementary School received a Martha Holden Jennings grant for an art initiative that is cross-curricular. The nearly \$2,000 grant was written in collaboration with teachers, parents and the principal. The collaboration extends into the workings of the program, as it will sponsor co-facilitated art lessons by teachers and parents. These lessons will highlight a specific artist or theme each quarter of the school year. Cleveland-area artist Viktor Schreckengost is the current subject of the lessons, which incorporate art and design concepts with topics from the four major subject areas: language arts, math, science and social studies.

## 2. *Reading/English Language Arts Curriculum*

Grant Elementary School, and the Lakewood City Schools, utilizes a *balanced literacy* approach to reading instruction. Based loosely on the work on Cunningham and Allington and their “four block” approach as well as the work of Fountas and Pinnell with guided reading, Grant Elementary takes the best of all worlds.

The State of Ohio Academic Content Standards is the foundation for instruction. Research-based graduate courses are offered to all Lakewood teachers through the Ohio State Department of Education to increase teachers’ skill in assessment-driven instruction. The State Institute for Reading Instruction (SIRI) has been offered for the past five years during a week-long institute in the summer and monthly follow-up sessions throughout the year. Many Grant Elementary School teachers have taken advantage of these valuable SIRI courses.

Assessment in reading progress is on-going and embedded in instruction using formal and informal models. The National Reading Panel report has been studied. Grant School teachers use “best practices” when employing the Five Essential Components of Literacy Instruction: phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Reading is closely linked with writing.

Students who see learning as a life-long experience and who can communicate through reading, writing, listening and speaking are the result of this process.

### 3. *Science Curriculum*

Science has been an area of pride for both Grant Elementary School and Lakewood City Schools for the steady progress on the fourth-grade scores over the last seven years. In 1997, 59% of Grant School students passed the fourth-grade science test. Last year in 2003, 95% of students passed this same test.

As stated in the Grant School's mission statement, the area of science has been an area of meaningful curriculum connections for all students in grades kindergarten through grade five. The district has not only made a commitment to materials for science with the purchase of science literature models and numerous hands-on science kits, but also a commitment to teaching the scientific method and how it relates to all study. This inquiry/hands-on model encourages students to develop conclusions based on first testing, followed by experimentation and investigation, and eventually leading to finding proof. The Lakewood City School District has dedicated a great deal of time in coordinating their science materials as well as in servicing all teachers on the most effective use of these materials and how they relate to our newly established science course of study. Grant School was proud to have two teachers involved in this science curriculum articulation and material development. This Lakewood science course of study is directly related to the State of Ohio Science Content Standards.

Even more importantly, the teachers of Grant School subscribe to the tenets of the science curriculum in all areas of study. They all believe and practice that science is doing, not simply watching or reading about it. It is commonplace to witness teachers encouraging students, individually or cooperatively, to look for creative ways to solve problems in all curricular areas. These are backbones of science study that are directly related to all study at Grant School.

All of these items mentioned above along with a teaching commitment by staff to the scientific ways of thinking and how they relate to all the areas of the curriculum make science an area of great pride to the Grant School community.

#### *4. Instructional Methods.*

The staff of Grant Elementary School realize that students learn in many different ways – verbal instruction, written information, hands-on learning, student-driven learning, exploration and investigation, curriculum-based field trips, computer-aided instruction, and many more. Teachers tailor these different methods to the myriad of different learning styles of students. This connection contributes to the success and high performance of the students.

Some methods have a science base to them such as inquiry learning and hands-on approaches. Students at all levels do a tremendous amount of research through the use of support personnel or technology and participate in project-based learning. These allow students to make discoveries themselves with the content.

Within the area of math alone many effective instructional methods are implemented. The spiraling approach to introducing and reinforcing concepts galvanizes the learning process with students. The project-based activities and the problem solving aspect of math are accentuated as well. Teachers within this problem solving approach have students apply the computation skills to real experiences. There is also extensive use of manipulatives to make the math concepts even more concrete for students.

Many teachers use pre-testing as a common instructional method. This practice allows teachers to identify skills with particular students that are going to need extra attention or intervention. This was a common practice for our fourth graders in preparation for the state proficiency tests. Similarly, pre-teaching concepts for students who are likely to need additional exposure to concepts is a prevalent instructional method used. This is usually facilitated through the use of federally funded Title I teachers, special education teachers or special education aides.

The aforementioned Title I staff offer additional support by allowing other instructional methods like one-on-one tutoring, small group instruction and one-on-one writing conferencing implemented with students.

## 5. *Professional Development*

Grant Elementary School uses a Teacher Education Committee model to provide professional development to the staff that is relevant to the school and district continuous improvement plan. This committee is comprised of the principal and several staff members who meet periodically to review entire staff professional development options. These staff professional development activities are generated where the entire staff has an equal voice in the input, but respecting the committee's ability to facilitate the selection process. Another factor that makes the Grant program so successful is the respect and acceptance of the ideas of each and every staff member and that no idea is too small or unworthy of discussion. This committee in the past year provided or facilitated the following opportunities for the Grant professional staff:

1. Technology in-service on educational websites that can be utilized for classroom use.
2. "Writing as a Craft" in-service facilitated by a poet-in-residence
3. Grade-level and school-level discussions to share how teachers are incorporating language arts into both science and social studies lessons.
4. CPR training was offered to all interested staff after school hours.
5. Yoga for staff – A trained staff member leads interested staff in order to help relieve stress and increase energy levels.

This list does not include the many classes and professional growth activities that staff members are involved with outside of school. Many Grant Elementary School staff members are working on advanced degrees and hours beyond their master's degree. These professional development activities and classes reflect topics that are directly related to their classroom duties. At this time, Grant School has one teacher who is nationally board certified as well.

**STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST**

Grade   4   Test Ohio Fourth-Grade Reading Proficiency Test

Edition/publication year  2003  Publisher Ohio Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered   48  

Number of students who took the test   48  

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?   None  

Number excluded   0   Percent excluded  0% 

For the 2002-2003 school year, Ohio required 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade proficiency tests in reading, writing, mathematics, citizenship, and science. These assessments are based on Ohio’s academic content standards that delineate what a student should know and be able to do at each grade level. The academic content standards are composed of standards, benchmarks and grade-level indicators.

For the 2002-2003 school year, reading scores for the fourth-grade proficiency test were reported as advanced, proficient, basic or below basic. The scaled score standards were:

| <b>Fourth-Grade Reading</b> |                     |                                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Category</b>             | <b>Scaled Score</b> | <b>2002 – 2004 State Percentage</b> |
| At Advanced                 | 250 and higher      | 9.3%                                |
| At or above proficient      | 217 and higher      | 66.3%                               |
| At or above basic           | 198 and higher      | 90.6%                               |
| Below basic                 | below 198           | 9.4%                                |

Performance standards were established by the State Board of Education based on recommendations of standard-setting committees (comprised mainly of Ohio teachers at the appropriate grade levels) and reports from the Testing Steering Committee (comprised of school administrators), the Fairness/Sensitivity review panel (comprised of representatives of the diversity in Ohio looking at equity issues), and the Technical Advisory Committee (comprised of national and state testing experts and psychometricians looking at technical issues).

## Ohio Fourth-Grade Reading Proficiency Test

|                                      | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 | 1998-1999 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                        | March     |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % At or Above Basic                  | 97.9%     | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |
| % At or Above Proficient             | 91.7%     | 85.7%     | 87.5%     | 77.1%     | 69.8%     |
| % At Advanced                        | 12%       | 26%       | 15%       | 6%        | 2%        |
| Number of students tested            | 48        | 39        | 46        | 52        | 45        |
| Percent of total students tested     | 100%      | 92.9%     | 95.8%     | 96.3%     |           |
| Number of students excluded          | 0         | 3         | 2         | 2         | N/A       |
| Percent of students excluded         | 0%        | 7.1%      | 4.2%      | 3.7%      |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| <u>1. Economically Disadvantaged</u> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % At or Above Basic                  | 94.4%     | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |
| % At or Above Proficient             | 83.3%     | 83.3%     |           |           |           |
| % At Advanced                        | 5.6%      | N/A       |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested            | 18        | 12        |           |           |           |
| <u>2. White</u>                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % At or Above Basic                  | 100%      | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |
| % At or Above Proficient             | 95.3 %    | 81.8%     |           |           |           |
| % At Advanced                        | 11.6%     | N/A       |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested            | 43        | 33        |           |           |           |
| <b>STATE SCORES</b>                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % At or Above Basic                  | 90.6%     | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |
| % At or Above Proficient             | 66.3%     | 67.7%     | 56.0%     | 58.2%     | 59.2%     |
| % At Advanced                        | 9.3%      | 7.0%      | 7.0%      | 6.0%      | 4.0%      |

\* Data on free and reduced lunch numbers is expunged annually, thus not having data prior to 2001-2002.

\* In accordance with the requirements of the Federal No Child Left Behind Act, Ohio's calculation of proficiency percentages in 2002-2003 changed in two significant ways from calculations in prior years. First, some students with disabilities who were previously exempted from the accountability calculations were included in all proficiency calculations. Second, students were required to be enrolled in a school 120 consecutive days in order to be included in the proficiency calculations for that school. These two changes may cause the data from 2002-2003 school year to appear markedly different from the data from previous years for some schools.

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TEST

Grade   4   Test Ohio Fourth-Grade Mathematics Proficiency Test

Edition/publication year   2003   Publisher Ohio Department of Education

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered   48  

Number of students who took the test   48  

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed?   None  

Number excluded   0   Percent excluded   0%  

For the 2002-2003 school year, Ohio required 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade proficiency tests in reading, writing, mathematics, citizenship, and science. These assessments are based on Ohio's academic content standards that delineate what a student should know and be able to do at each grade level. The academic content standards are composed of standards, benchmarks and grade-level indicators.

For the 2002-2003 school year, mathematics scores for the fourth-grade proficiency test were reported as advanced, proficient, basic or below basic. The scaled score standards were:

| <b>Fourth-Grade Mathematics</b> |                      |                                       |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Category</b>                 | <b>Scaled Scores</b> | <b>2002-2003<br/>State Percentage</b> |
| At Advanced                     | 250 and higher       | 14.6%                                 |
| At or above proficient          | 218 and higher       | 58.6%                                 |
| At or above basic               | 208 and higher       | 70.4%                                 |
| Below basic                     | below 208            | 29.6%                                 |

Performance standards were established by the State Board of Education based on recommendations of standard-setting committees (comprised mainly of Ohio teachers at the appropriate grade levels) and reports from the Testing Steering Committee (comprised of school administrators), the Fairness/Sensitivity review panel (comprised of representatives of the diversity in Ohio looking at equity issues), and the Technical Advisory Committee (comprised of national and state testing experts and psychometricians looking at technical issues).

## Ohio Fourth-Grade Mathematics Proficiency Test

|                                      | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 | 2000-2001 | 1999-2000 | 1998-1999 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                        | March     |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| % At or Above Basic                  | 93.8%     | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |
| % At or Above Proficient             | 93.8%     | 85.3%     | 85.0%     | 58.3%     | 76.7%     |
| % At Advanced                        | 50%       | 49%       | 49%       | 15%       | 26%       |
| Number of students tested            | 48        | 36        | 46        | 52        | 45        |
| Percent of total students tested     | 100%      | 92.3%     | 95.8%     | 96.3%     |           |
| Number of students excluded          | 0         | 3         | 2         | 2         | N/A       |
| Percent of students excluded         | 0%        | 7.7%      | 4.2%      | 3.4%      |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| <u>1. Economically Disadvantaged</u> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % At or Above Basic                  | 83.3%     | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |
| % At or Above Proficient             | 77.8%     | 83.3%     |           |           |           |
| % At Advanced                        | 16.7%     | N/A       |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested            | 18        | 12        |           |           |           |
| <u>2. White</u>                      |           |           |           |           |           |
| % At or Above Basic                  | 100%      | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |
| % At or Above Proficient             | 97.7%     | 81.3%     |           |           |           |
| % At Advanced                        | 51.2%     | N/A       |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested            | 43        | 32        |           |           |           |
| <b>STATE SCORES</b>                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % At or Above Basic                  | 70.4%     | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       | N/A       |
| % At or Above Proficient             | 58.6%     | 62.9%     | 59.4%     | 48.9%     | 50.6%     |
| % At Advanced                        | 14.6%     | 17.0%     | 16.0%     | 11.0%     | 12.0%     |

\* Data on free and reduced students is expunged annually, thus not having data prior to 2001-2002

\* In accordance with the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act, Ohio's calculation of proficiency percentages in 2002-2003 changed in two significant ways from calculations in prior years. First, some students with disabilities who were previously exempted from the accountability calculations were included in all proficiency calculations. Second, students were required to be enrolled in a school for 120 consecutive days in order to be included in the proficiency calculations for that school. These two changes may cause the data from the 2002-2003 school year to appear markedly different from the data from previous years for some schools.