

2008 No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Public Private

Cover Sheet

Type of School (Check all that apply) Elementary Middle High K-12
 Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal Mr. Andrew Leonard Latchford

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

Official School Name Harriet Child Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address PO Box 38 Church Street

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

East Smithfield

Pennsylvania

18817-0038

City

State

Zip Code+4(9 digits total)

County Bradford

State School Code Number* 117080503

Telephone (570) 596-4244

Fax (570) 596-4141

Web site/URL http://www.athensasd.k12.pa.us/metad E-mail alatchford@athensasd.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

Principal's Signature _____

Name of Superintendent Mr. Douglas Alan Ulkins

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Athens Area School District

Tel. (570) 888-7766

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature) _____

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Mr. Edward Gorman

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 3, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date _____

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

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

Mail by commercial carrier (FedEx, UPS) or courier original signed cover sheet to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 5E103, Washington DC 20202-8173.

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

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

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not 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 2007-2008 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have 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 2002 and has not received the No Child Left Behind–Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district wide compliance review.
6. 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 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. Throughout the document, round numbers to the nearest whole number to avoid decimals, except for numbers below 1, which should be rounded to the nearest tenth.

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

1. Number of schools in the district: _____ 4 Elementary schools
 _____ 1 Middle schools
 _____ 1 Junior High Schools
 _____ 1 High schools
 _____ 0 Other
 _____ 7 TOTAL
2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 8635
 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: _____ 11485

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 are
 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.
 _____ 0 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?
5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Pre K | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 10 | 9 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 11 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 8 | 11 | 19 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 8 | 9 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 12 | 5 | 17 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 9 | 8 | 17 | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL | | | | | | | 104 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- | | |
|----|------------------------------------|
| 0 | % American Indian or Alaska Native |
| 0 | % Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 3 | % Black or African American |
| 0 | % Hispanic or Latino |
| 97 | % White |

100 % TOTAL

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

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year 6 %

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

| | | |
|--------------|--|------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year | 2 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year | 4 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 6 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 104 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.06 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 6 |

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

Number of languages represented: _____

Specify languages:

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 35 %

Total number students who qualify: 36

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

A more accurate estimate of students eligible for free/reduced-price meals is 42%. I believe this for three reasons: 1) participation in the program is voluntary and some parents do not return the paperwork or choose not to participate; 2) we have some families who prefer to send their children's lunches to school; and 3) the economic base in our community is often seasonal so many parents may find work at one time of year and then lose it so some students who may initially be disqualified could be instated but may not think of this as their family's work situation changes. Additionally, in a school our size one large family or even a small group of students can drastically alter the percentage of students under the program. I believe these considerations should be taken into account when reviewing our school.

10. Students receiving special education services: $\frac{19}{20}$ % Total Number of Students Served

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

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| <u>1</u> | Autism | <u>0</u> | Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> | Deafness | <u>0</u> | Other Health Impairment |
| <u>0</u> | Deaf-Blindness | <u>12</u> | Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>0</u> | Emotional Disturbance | <u>5</u> | Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> | Hearing Impairment | <u>1</u> | Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>1</u> | Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> | Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> | Multiple Disabilities | | |

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

| | Number of Staff | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | <u>Full-time</u> | <u>Part-time</u> |
| Administrator(s) | <u>0</u> | <u>1</u> |
| Classroom teachers | <u>6</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>2</u> | <u>6</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>3</u> | <u>2</u> |
| Support Staff | <u>2</u> | <u>1</u> |
| Total number | <u>13</u> | <u>10</u> |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 $\frac{17}{1}$: 1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Please explain a high teacher turnover rate. 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 in attendance, dropout or the drop-off rates. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates, and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 96 % | 95 % | 95 % | 96 % | 95 % |
| Daily teacher attendance | 95 % | 96 % | 96 % | 94 % | 97 % |
| Teacher turnover rate | 25 % | 25 % | 0 % | 12 % | 25 % |
| Student drop out rate (middle/high) | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % |
| Student drop-off rate (high school) | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % |

Please provide all explanations below

Teacher turnover rates are generally the result of teacher transfers to other schools in the district. Transfers account for 86% of the turnover at this school with retirement accounting for the other 14%.

14. **(High Schools Only. Delete if not used.)**

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2007 are doing as of the Fall 2007.

| | | |
|--|------------|----------|
| Graduating class size | 0 | |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | 0 | % |
| Enrolled in a community college | 0 | % |
| Enrolled in vocational training | 0 | % |
| Found employment | 0 | % |
| Military service | 0 | % |
| Other (travel, staying home, etc.) | 0 | % |
| Unknown | 0 | % |
| Total | 100 | % |

PART III - SUMMARY

Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 600 words). Include at least a summary of the school's mission or vision in the statement.

Harriet Child Elementary School is located within the Athens Area School District and serves the small farming community of East Smithfield, Pennsylvania. Our enrollment hovers around 100 students who are served in one class at each grade level K-5. We have a stable population with many families having lived in the area for generations, many on the family owned farms that predominate the countryside.

Student population is 96% White/Caucasian with 4% being African American. The socio-economic status of the school shows just over a third of all students coming from economically disadvantaged homes. Children with non-gifted individual education plans account for 19% of the student body.

The school's full time faculty consists of a classroom teacher at each grade K-5, a Learning Support teacher, and a Title 1 (K-3) reading specialist. Of these teachers, 50% have less than three years' experience while the most experienced teacher is in his 18th year. This is a decided change from five years ago when a majority of the faculty had over 25 years of experience. Support staff and paraprofessionals are 100% highly qualified and serve the school or individual students in various positions. White teachers dominate the faculty and staff, with only one teacher of Asian descent. The building principal, in his fourth year at the school, is also the principal of two other elementary schools in the district. In his absence, the school's Head Teacher addresses instructional, disciplinary, and scheduling issues.

Harriet Child Elementary has experienced great success academically since the state began standardized testing. Scores on the annual PSSAs have been well above the percentages required to meet AYP. The school decided that having high expectations from the start would better serve the community and students so they created, with the district's assistance, an action plan that helped guide the school in those areas deemed most important for student success. The action plan included 12 designs that touched upon reading and math instruction, character education, and study skills. Over the course of the last five years the plan has been reviewed annually with additions, deletions, and revisions having been made. The planning meetings, open to all teachers and school administration, have allowed a majority of those attending to choose the direction of the educational program. While this was not always a simple venture, it certainly led the professional staff to support their beliefs with research and evidence of success if they wanted their proposals to be considered.

The school's mission statement puts states that the school will provide an environment in which all students will learn to their ability and feel safe while doing so. It goes on to say that the school will work with parents, community, and staff to ensure this mission.

While we have certainly excelled in most instances, we've experienced some frustrations as well. At times we've had teachers critique one another when there's a questions as to the best way to address student needs. We've had difficulties accepting that our expectations were too high for certain students, leading to frustration for student and teacher alike. Certain designs in our action plan had to be revised or removed when staffing or funding could not be secured to a sufficient extent. Still, the challenges we have faced have helped us to identify our strengths and weaknesses and so we are better able to move our program in the right direction. Harriet Child Elementary will continue to strive for a high quality product whether or not recognition is given at this time. After all, it has been and will continue to be our students for whom we work so hard.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Our school has had continued success in state reading and math assessments and thus our scores have been decidedly higher than other schools in our district and region. While the state initially set reading and math performance goals of approximately 50% advanced or proficient in order to be deemed as meeting expectations, we have worked to meet the goals coming seven to ten years in the future which require 90% or better.

When performance data is reviewed we can see classes moving through our school and scoring at similar levels each year, yet in many cases the percentages improve in steady increments. The only time this increase is not apparent are those years following 90-100% scores. To make drastic improvements from those scores is difficult at best and it has often been the IEP subgroup that has limited additional improvement. This is not to say there is no improvement, but the improvement might better be realized in a growth model method of reporting whereas our state only considers whether a student meets grade level expectations. The only exception is if a student takes an alternate assessment. No Harriet Child student has taken an alternate assessment in the last three years.

We ask that people keep in mind that having a small population as we do, our class sizes have varied from 12 to 23 students over the last five years, can mean that small changes to the make up of a class can drastically alter our scores. Fortunately we have not been negatively affected in this way. Our small population also limits our ability to report out subgroup performance since the state does not publicize a subgroup's score unless there are more than 10 students within it in a grade and school. This means that much of the data requested later in this application cannot be completed for our school since the state has not broken it down this way. Having small subgroups does not mean we get to hide those students, however. Since many of our scores have fallen between 80 and 100% proficiency, few students score below the desired thresholds set by the state and those that do are not guaranteed to be part of a subgroup. State performance levels use a performance index to map out the assessment cut scores. It is these cut scores that will determine whether a student is deemed below basic, basic, proficient, or advanced. With a solid curriculum, quality materials, consistent instruction, and test preparation, our students have proven themselves to be high achievers worthy of recognition.

To see for yourself, please go to

<http://www.pde.state.pa.us/pas/cwp/view.asp?a=3&Q=95497&pasNav=|6150|&pasNav=>

2. Using Assessment Results

In 2007-2008 our school district moved to a more standardized, periodic assessment tool - the 4Sight test - to aid us in modifying instruction to improve student and school performance. Prior to this the only assessment data we had available was the annual Pennsylvania System of School Assessment report which typically was released in the fall of the following school year. While this information was useful, it certainly was not timely enough for use during the year in which the assessment was given.

Instead, our teachers had to create their own assessments and evaluative tools. They did this using the district's 'essential learnings' and the state's learning standards and assessment anchors. We had a team that met periodically throughout the year to discuss the progression of skills through each grade level and to insure that subsequent teachers would be able to easily build onto the prior year's instructional practices. This consistency eliminated some of the adjustment period typically required as a student moved from one classroom to the next. It also ensured that the resources and practices in place in all classrooms were considered best practices by a majority of the faculty.

3. Communicating Assessment Results

The basic manner in which student performance data is distributed to parents is through written communication. This comes in the form of teacher correspondence with the home through newsletters, teacher websites, and notes home. When state assessment results are released, school administration includes that information on letters to the families, usually attached to monthly calendars, and in district publications such as the Athens Area School District newsletter that is sent home quarterly.

Another means of disseminating this information is in meetings with parents. At Back to School

Nights, parent information nights, and school conferences, timely references are made so as to let the public know that their support and diligence does produce dividends.

Students are informed as to their progress through monthly assemblies recognizing those who met classroom goals, were recognized as Students of the Month, and represented the monthly character traits promoted by the district. They also see their work hanging in the hallways and classrooms, subsequently feeling a sense of pride in their accomplishments.

Finally, we try to promote our school and our successes through the local media. Although we do not have 'local' television or print outlets, we do invite reporters to our schools for special events or write our own stories for submission to the regional newspaper publishers.

4. Sharing Success:

Harriet Child Elementary is one of three small elementary schools within our school district. School administration has made an effort to make these schools 'sister schools' so as to increase collaboration unavailable in what would otherwise be a one-class-per-grade-level situation. With its successes in helping students reach their potential, Harriet Child's faculty was able to share directly and indirectly some of their strategies that, in turn, benefited students at those other two schools. Conversely, this same exchange of information allowed Harriet Child teachers to learn about the successes experienced at other schools. They could then mold some of those practices to fit the programs they had implemented.

The exchanges of information have continued to present with a recent afternoon having been dedicated to the sharing of information on how teachers are meeting the requirements of the social studies curriculum without having the use of a textbook on the subject. There is a plan to create an online learning community together that will further encourage the exchange of ideas between these schools. Using the Blackboard interface, the hope is to create a virtual school that will function as a clearinghouse of ideas, information, and resources that Harriet Child teachers and others can contribute to and access on a regular basis. That program should be up and running beginning sometime in the summer of 2008.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Our curriculum in all areas is based on two criteria: Pennsylvania State Standards and the Athens Area School District's Essential Learnings. The district's 'Essential Learnings' were reissued four years ago. They were developed through an endeavor that brought School Board members, community representatives, parents, teachers, and administrators together to review what specific skills were considered important in our district. Research was conducted to determine what skills local employers wanted to have in graduates and institutions of higher learning were consulted to determine which skills seemed most lacking in incoming freshman. As those skills were identified, homogenous groups of representatives worked out what skills needed to be built into the curriculum in order to provide a strong foundation for students making their way through the district K-12.

At the elementary level, we have broken down these essential learnings by grade level and also placed them into a monthly curricular map that ensures we are teaching the same skills at around the same time in every school and classroom in the district.

These skills are broken down by subject: Math, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies, Art/Music, and physical education. Other subjects, of importance to secondary schools, are also included. All such skills are primarily focused on the State Standards and simply further define the expectations for learning in our district.

The elementary schools do not have foreign language instruction.

In Language Arts the focus is on reading and writing. Letter knowledge and their long and short sounds provide the foundation for further instruction. Kindergarten students are expected to have mastered the alphabet before entering first grade and many have developed early reading skills by that time. Sight word lists, the use of word walls, and further experience with instructional-level text allows students to proceed through the higher grades. Reading interventions are put into place when students show signs that their growth is being hampered at a particular level of success. Writing in Kindergarten is addressed through the Kidwriting program which encourages students to put their letter and sound knowledge to good use when drawing a picture and telling a corresponding one or two sentence story. At the end of First Grade, teachers switch to the 6+1 Traits writing system. Students are encouraged to look at various aspects of their writing and identify deficiencies, then make use defined strategies to make corrections.

In Mathematics, specific skills are identified at each grade level so that teachers can quickly assess and determine which students are struggling with particular concepts. Addition, subtraction, tallies, arrays, and graphing eventually lead into multiplication, division, geometry, and concepts of calculus. The Everyday Math program, purchased soon after the revision of the essential learnings is the primary vehicle for ensuring students meet the requirements at each grade level. The spiral and multiple ways of performing math tasks, although at first a difficulty for many, has shown its value and is a program of pride in the school.

Science instruction became a lesser priority when the first NCLB regulations were reported. Since that time we have found ways to include science instruction in our reading program through the use of trade books and non-fiction resources. We now use specifically designed science experiment kits in Third and Fourth Grade to better meet the standards we seemed to be missing in recent years. These kits have improved teacher confidence and increased student interest in the sciences.

Our Social Studies curriculum was reviewed again about two years ago. It was revised so that duplication of topics was not as prevalent K-12 as it had been in years prior. While Pennsylvania history was moved out of Fourth Grade, the expectations that were placed at the elementary as a result of the revisions have since been met with excitement. Teachers, no longer responsible for all instruction of a particular subject, are now able to broadly address topics and know that as students progress to higher grade levels they will define their knowledge and ultimately meet the State Standards.

Art, Music, and Physical Education teachers also have essential learnings for their subject areas. Although not as comprehensive as the other areas, they are also based on State Standards and provide a strong base of knowledge to participating students. When possible, teachers in these subjects draw in skills from the writing, reading, and math curriculum so that they are not just standards-based in their subject area. All teachers understand that they are responsible for the development of these important core skills.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

Our school utilizes the Four Block method of language arts instruction. We have not had a new basal reader or commercial reading program in the district within the last eight years. We realize that reading is a skill unique to the learner and that no one program will provide every student with the instruction necessary to meet all of their reading needs. Many programs are also cost prohibitive. The Four Block method allows us to use multiple reading resources in the main instructional block: past basal readers, trade books, and print materials acquired through online memberships. In the guided reading component, teachers select materials specific to the reading levels of their students or utilize classroom readers to touch upon grade level content in science or social studies. In the writing block, students are instructed in writing for enjoyment or to a prompt. They review the use of graphic organizers and skills such as revision and editing. When working with words the teachers demonstrate to students how words are a combination of letters, sounds, formations, and have common principles. Self-selected reading allows students to practice reading at their instructional level and encourages reading for enjoyment. All these components form a connected program that improves students' abilities in reading, writing, and communicating their knowledge to others.

We chose this method specifically because it allows for greater differentiation while covering the bases of language arts instruction. No one area, such as phonetics instruction or reading comprehension, is stressed at the expense of other skills. Students can draw knowledge from these various activities and apply it to the other areas, becoming more successful with every attempt. For intensive reading instruction and for those students with learning difficulties we employ the Read Naturally and Wilson Reading programs, as appropriate.

2b. (Secondary Schools) English:

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

One other area of our curriculum that we are very proud is our character education curriculum. As mentioned previously, we recognize students who excel in each trait at an assembly once per month. The 10 traits promoted include honesty, goal setting, accountability, self-discipline, and cooperation. Each of these specifically affects a student's ability to succeed in the educational environment. By promoting and recognizing these skills, we hope to affect all other facets of the curriculum.

Classes also participate in Second Steps lessons. This research-based, scripted program offers students an opportunity to review social situations and discuss appropriate reactions. It provides examples for students on how to interact with their peers and ways to avoid reacting in an inappropriate manner. The lessons cover topics as simple as social interaction and also delve into matters such as bullying in a developmentally appropriate manner. The use of pictures, stories, and leading questions allows students to talk through issues they might not otherwise have had experience with.

We also began the ESAP program this year. While we are still forming teams and learning how to best serve the students, we recognize the benefits it may provide us long term. Since our elementary schools do not have guidance counselors or the like available, programs such as these are sometimes our first line of defense when a student is in crisis and unable to function, without targeted assistance, in the regular educational environment.

4. Instructional Methods:

Our school is limited only by each teacher's imagination and their chosen classroom structure when it comes to using different instructional methods with students. We have Kindergarten students engaging in small group work and that cooperative learning and collaboration is only increased as students get older. Teachers involve themselves in small group activities both as leaders and facilitators so that students can learn from an adult and also from each other.

Technology plays a role in the education of our students as well. We utilize the Compass program, Successmaker, and Type to Learn in an effort to differentiate reading and math instruction for each student. We promote typing and other 21st Century skills when we have students go on webquests and research information found online in an effort to produce projects or complete classroom assignments. Yet we are aware of the dangers presented by online predators so we have offered presentations on internet safety with

support from district trainers and local sources such as the Bradford County Sheriff's Department.

We do a small amount of pull out re-teaching for those students identified with specific learning disabilities. We also conduct re-teaching in the classroom thanks to flexible classroom scheduling. Teachers frequently schedule independent work for their classes after introducing a concept and then either goes to student desks or pull students from their seats so as to review the same once again or to go over something the student had struggled with in past lessons.

In fact, creative scheduling is probably our most used instructional method. Our Title 1 reading and Learning Support programs work hand in hand with teachers and students to insure that time spent with students is maximized. If the Title 1 teacher pulls a small group of low readers, the classroom teacher typically conducts a more challenging activity with the remaining students and, as a result, expands the curriculum for high achievers.

5. Professional Development:

Our professional development program relies on three separate, yet equally important, priorities. The first is district initiatives. The school district frequently promotes on teacher workdays various trainings and development activities that assist teachers in areas such as instructional practice and technology usage. These activities helped the district to improve the consistency of programming from school to school.

The second priority is the programming used in the school building. Each of the four elementary schools in our district has unique characteristics, faculties, and communities that affect their educational mission. In the case of Harriet Child Elementary there were certain strategies and methods that our teachers thought valuable while other buildings were not as interested. Training in these methods and strategies was secured or provided and then the school staff implemented aspects of these activities to improve instruction from classroom to classroom within the building itself.

Finally, the final priority was the preference of the administration and individual classroom teacher. Following observations or in other discussions, teachers could suggest to the principal, or vice versa, that a professional development opportunity should be searched out in order to improve the instructional practice within a particular classroom. With approval and implementation, these activities improved the ability of teachers to meet all needs within the class so that individual student improvement could be realized.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Subject Reading (LA) Grade 3 Test Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
 Edition/Publication Year _____ Publisher McGraw-Hill

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | March | March | March | | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 100 | 70 | 83 | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | 28 | 29 | 33 | | |
| Number of students tested | 18 | 17 | 12 | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (not gifted) | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | 0 | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | 0 | | |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 5 | 2 | | |
| 2. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 8 | 2 | 3 | | |
| 3. Black | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | March | March | March | | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 89 | 88 | 92 | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | 28 | 59 | 17 | | |
| Number of students tested | 18 | 17 | 12 | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (not gifted) | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 5 | 2 | | |
| 2. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 8 | 2 | 3 | | |
| 3. Black | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | March | March | | | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 75 | 100 | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | 25 | 36 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 16 | 11 | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | | | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (not gifted) | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 1 | | | |
| 2. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 3. Black | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 0 | | | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | March | March | | | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 87 | 100 | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | 56 | 91 | | | |
| Number of students tested | 16 | 11 | | | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | | | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (not gifted) | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 1 | | | |
| 2. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 4 | | | |
| 3. Black | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | March | March | March | March | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 93 | 94 | 79 | 73 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | 29 | 56 | 32 | 43 | |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 16 | 19 | 23 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (not gifted) | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | |
| 2. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 60 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | 40 | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 4 | 7 | 10 | |
| 3. Black | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

| | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | March | March | March | March | |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | 93 | 94 | 85 | 83 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | 93 | 94 | 74 | 48 | |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 16 | 19 | 23 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. IEP (not gifted) | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | |
| 2. Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | 70 | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | 40 | |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 4 | 7 | 10 | |
| 3. Black | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % Proficient plus % Advanced | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| % Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| % "Meeting" plus % "Exceeding" State Standard | | | | | |
| % "Exceeding" State Standards | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |