

U.S. Department of Education
2009 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) Elementary Middle High K-12 (K-8)
 Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal: Ms. Christine Collier

Official School Name: Center For Inquiry

School Mailing Address:
725 N New Jersey St.
Indianapolis, IN 46202-3322

County: Marion State School Code Number*: 5635

Telephone: (317) 226-4202 Fax: (317) 226-3740

Web site/URL: http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/SEARCH/snapshot.cfm?schl=5635 E-mail:
collierc@ips.k12.in.us

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

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Dr. Eugene White

District Name: Indianapolis Public Schools Tel: (317) 226-4000

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

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Dr. Mary Busch

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it 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.*
Original signed cover sheet only should be mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as USPS Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

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 for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of 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.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2008-2009 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, or 2008.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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:
- | | |
|-----------|---------------------|
| 45 | Elementary schools |
| 4 | Middle schools |
| 0 | Junior high schools |
| 4 | High schools |
| 19 | Other |
| 72 | TOTAL |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 8200

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 10000

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. 9 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 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
PreK	0	0	0	7	15	17	32
K	20	14	34	8	16	14	30
1	25	17	42	9	0	0	0
2	13	19	32	10	0	0	0
3	19	25	44	11	0	0	0
4	21	23	44	12	0	0	0
5	14	23	37	Other	0	0	0
6	14	21	35				
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							330

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
2 % Asian
45 % Black or African American
6 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
40 % White
6 % Two or more races
100 % **Total**

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 10 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	5
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	28
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	33
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	330
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.100
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	10.000

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 6 %

Total number limited English proficient 19

Number of languages represented: 2

Specify languages:

English and Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 58 %

Total number students who qualify: 192

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 free and reduced-price school meals 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: 19 %

Total Number of Students Served: 63

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>3</u> Autism	<u>1</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>2</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>21</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>22</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>3</u> Mental Retardation	<u>1</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>10</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

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>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>16</u>	<u>1</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
Support staff	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>
Total number	<u>35</u>	<u>13</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 21 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Daily student attendance	97%	96%	96%	97%	97%
Daily teacher attendance	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%
Teacher turnover rate	5%	14%	0%	5%	0%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

In the 2006-07 school year, we opened a second Center for Inquiry school at School 84, replicating the school. Three teachers from Center for Inquiry at School 2 left to work in the replicated school, seeding that staff with Center for Inquiry experienced teachers.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2008 are doing as of the Fall 2008.

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

PART III - SUMMARY

The Center for Inquiry at School 2 (CFI) is one of 72 schools in the urban Indianapolis Public Schools district. CFI, a Grade K-8 magnet school located in downtown Indianapolis and serving 330 students, has operated at full capacity with a lengthy waiting list for the past seven years. The school was replicated in another building in the Fall of 2006 to help reduce the waiting list and meet parental demand for the program. CFI's parent, business, and community partnerships are strong and vital to the success of the school.

CFI's student population is drawn from the entire district and is racially (60% non-Caucasian) and economically (58% Free and Reduced) diverse. Our special education students represent 19% of our enrollment and are all served in classrooms that follow the inclusion model.

Mission/Vision

Our vision is that all students deserve a vibrant place to learn, a curriculum that is rigorous and relevant to global application, and to be held to the highest expectations. Our mission is to develop a community of respectful, life-long learners who use inquiry, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills to be socially responsible contributors to a changing global society.

Reflection of the Magnet Theme

The overarching theme at CFI supports inquiry as the primary method of gaining the knowledge and the understanding necessary to succeed in a global environment. CFI students understand that learning is about asking questions and discovering that answers often generate new and perhaps more complex questions. They also understand that they are never too young to act upon their knowledge and perspective.

In accord with our vision and mission, the Center for Inquiry chose to add the prestigious and globally focused International Baccalaureate Organization's (IBO) programs for all students in the school in addition to the successful inquiry-based program that made CFI so desirable for its first eleven years of operation (1993-2004). CFI reached important milestones when the school was authorized in February 2007 to fully implement the IB Primary Years Program (PYP) in Grades K-6, and in July 2008 to fully implement the IB Middle Years Program (MYP) at Grades 7-8.

Implementing IB programs builds international-mindedness and engages our students in social action, which is vital to developing the "whole" child. All CFI students are engaged in this inquiry-based, enriching curriculum as we strive to equip them with the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and qualities that will enable life-long learning and success in their adult lives. The tenets of the PYP and MYP are infused throughout the curriculum. Teachers guide students through six themes that make up the PYP trans-disciplinary program of inquiry. Student Exhibition Projects are celebrated at sixth-grade as they share their proposed solutions to real-world issues. The framework of the MYP requires students to study all of the major disciplines, including languages, humanities, sciences, mathematics, arts, technology, and physical education, and is organized, in part, around a set of perspectives known as "areas of interaction." The areas of interaction encourage students to make connections between subjects, to link what they learn to the real world and to global issues, and to reflect and act on their learning. The model embodies three fundamental concepts: communication, holistic learning, and internationalism.

Educational Activities

Our daily work with the IB Learner Profile attributes, second language study, inquiry learning, and global themes develops international-mindedness within our school community. Student learning is enriched through the inclusion of second language studies in Spanish and Mandarin, technology integration, and high levels of community interaction and social action. Our students come to see themselves as readers, writers, thinkers, speakers, mathematicians, sociologists, scientists, advocates, humanitarians, and ambassadors.

Achievements

In addition to numerous staff achievements and publications, school awards have included:

- First and only authorized PYP (February 2007) and MYP (July 2008) in Indiana
- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) designation every year since inception
- Magnet Schools of America School of Distinction Award (April 2008)
- Magnet Schools of America School of Excellence Award (2009)
- Finalist for National School Change award sponsored by Panasonic Corporation of North America (June 2007)
- Excellence in Education award from Mayor Bart Peterson (March 2007)
- Teaching Pre K- 8 magazine cover story: “Dream a Little Dream – A Group of Teachers’ Ideal School Becomes a Reality” (November/December 2005)
- Published in the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) Primary Voices K-6 magazine (Volume 10, Number 3): “Inquiry in the Classroom” (January 2002)

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

CFI students are held to the same accountability standards as all public school students within our state and district. Achievement is measured through ISTEP+ (Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus) given statewide beginning at Grade 3. ISTEP+ is a criterion-referenced test that measures what students know and are able to do at each grade level in core academic subjects. Every student receives a comprehensive individual report showing student performance in terms of Pass+, Pass, or Did Not Pass based on performance standards set by the Indiana State Board of Education. Students whose scores place them in either the Pass+ or Pass categories are considered to have met the standard. Information regarding Indiana's test may be found at the ISTEP+ Info Center: <http://www.doe.in.gov/istep/>

CFI's overall student achievement for 2007-08 in both of these categories is higher than the IPS district and state levels: 70.1% passing both E/LA and Math compared to 40.4% (district) and 64.8% (state) and 81.4% average percent passing E/LA and Math combined into a generalized achievement measure compared to 52.8% (district) and 73.4% (state). Our students' achievement has enabled 100% of our eighth-grade class to gain acceptance into the magnet high school programs of their choice.

Results of the 2007-08 ISTEP+ show a greater than 90% pass rate in Mathematics for Grades 3, 6, 7, and 8. Grade 7 also showed the most remarkable elimination of gaps between all subgroups with each subgroup scoring in the mid 90% range. In Math, Grade 3 has experienced a 30 percentage point gain over the last three years in the subgroup of free/reduced students (55% passing to 85% passing) and a 24 percentage point gain in the African American student subgroup (62% passing to 86% passing). At Grade 7, the growth rates have been 10 percentage points in the free/reduced subgroup and 17 percentage points in the African American subgroup. The African American subgroup at Grade 8 made a 32 percentage point gain for the same three-year period. In English/Language Arts, Grade 4 free/reduced student scores increased by 22% in three years and African American student scores increased by 20%. These results reduced a 24 percentage point racial/ethnic gap to a 9 percentage point gap while a 13 percentage point economic gap reduced to 1 percentage point. Students at Grade 7 in the free/reduced subgroup made a 23 percentage point gain in one year over their paid lunch counterparts.

CFI gives attention not only to our passing rates but also to moving students into the Pass Plus range, which is the highest performance level on ISTEP+. In English/Language Arts, 17% of seventh-graders and 20% of eighth-graders scored in the Pass Plus range. In Math, 23% of seventh-graders and 16% of eighth-graders scored in the Pass Plus range. Additionally, 31% of third-graders scored in the Pass Plus range in Math. Special education students also were able to achieve Pass Plus (10% in English/Language Arts and 12% in Math).

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Assessment results are used to guide the future development and direction of curriculum. Purposeful vertical and horizontal analysis of results impacts the development of educational goals and objectives. Assessing school-wide and group performance informs school practice and program implementation. Teachers, staff, students, the community council of the school improvement team, and the Site-Based Decision Making Committee all are included in the work of examining results and making recommendations for improvement, both in setting annual target data goals and in developing the strategies that will be in place to bring about improved teaching and learning performance. School-wide strategies are articulated to address all children, identified subgroups and specific standards within core academic areas. Strategy development includes the "who, what, when, and how of instruction." Professional development is aligned to ensure that staff members

have the necessary skills for strategy implementation.

When examining our ISTEP+ results, we celebrate growth in achievement and the reduction of disparities of performance among subgroups. When disparities exist, we strategically address these areas and focus our attention on the individual children that need attention. When ISTEP+ results reveal a discrepancy among the subgroups of Free/Reduced, African American, and white students, the scores are further analyzed to determine the exact standards that students were unsuccessful in meeting and the individual students that needed extra attention. A detailed plan is then developed to assist identified students in accelerating their growth of knowledge and skills. This plan includes extra time and attention with specific strategies for their instruction and weekly performance checks.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

An Assessment Policy developed by the Center for Inquiry Site-Based Decision Making Committee with input from the full staff includes perspectives, purposes, required and recommended assessments, tools and strategies, and reporting guidelines. Students at all levels are active participants in the assessment of their work, their new understandings, and their process of learning, promoting self and peer reflection. Authentic student performance tasks help learners apply their new learning. Assessing student knowledge prior to instruction gives the teacher insight needed to focus instruction on students' needs and to make connections to students' interests. Teachers assess student progress formatively and summatively using a variety of tools, including observation with anecdotal notes, authentic performance tasks scored with rubrics, inventories, open-ended problems, and benchmarks explicitly designed to measure a process skill or content understanding.

Student progress is shared with parents through quarterly narrative assessments, teacher-led and student-led conferences, midterm progress reports, and weekly reports for parents and students. Parents provide valuable input during fall and spring conferences and are invited to reflect with their child on the development of the International Baccalaureate Learner Profile attributes.

ISTEP+ results are sent home to parents in paper format with a letter of explanation and instructions on how to access results electronically. The school principal offers morning and evening workshops for parents to further assist them in understanding their child's results. Individual conferences are held by request to assist parents in understanding their child's results and to suggest ways to enhance their child's performance. By state statute, school test results are published in The Indianapolis Star newspaper, on the school district's website, on the school's website, and on the Indiana Department of Education website.

4. Sharing Success:

Sharing our successes and lessons learned has always been part of the fabric of our staff. When something works, others need to know. Our stories have been published in our local newspapers many times including a story of our kindergarten/first grade take home reading program, our unique instructional activities, our International Baccalaureate authorization, our staff and student accomplishments, and student social action. Our staff wrote an issue of Primary Voices K-6 (Volume 10, Number 3) entitled "Inquiry in the Classroom." Our school was featured in Teaching preK-8 magazine (November/December 2005) in the article "Dream a Little Dream – A Group of Teachers' Ideal School Becomes a Reality." Our teachers present annually at several national and state conferences including the National Council of Teachers of English, the Indiana Reading Association, the Indiana Teachers of Writing, the Hoosier Association for Science Technology Instruction (HASTI), and the North Central Association (NCA) conference. Several staff members teach graduate-level education courses, often at our school. The principal and a CFI teacher have worked with Annenberg Media to create professional development videos in science inquiry and reading instruction. International Baccalaureate schools are expected to open their doors and give back to the larger community of educators. Educational groups and guest educators from around the globe visit regularly. Recently, the school

hosted a group of visiting principals from Taiwan and educational leaders from South America. Also, a Chicago-area school exploring IB programs chartered a bus and brought their entire staff to the school for a day of shared learning. Additionally, CFI serves as a cohort site for Indiana University/Purdue University at Indianapolis to develop the skills of pre-service teachers. Center for Inquiry staff have and will continue to open their classrooms by honoring all requests for visiting educators and invitations for collaboration.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The curriculum at the Center for Inquiry is structured to honor student choice: choice in questions asked, choice in issues explored, choice in reading selections, and choice in writing topics. In order to assist students in inquiry projects that are meaningful, teachers from every subject area and grade level collaboratively plan and guide instruction. Using Indiana's state content standards and the guiding principles of the International Baccalaureate Organization, teachers design units of inquiry that enable students to develop deep understandings in key concepts and build their skills while contributing to the direction the unit will take, thereby honoring, inviting, and engaging student interest. Teachers are mapping curriculum using Rubicon Atlas software and reflect on each unit of instruction during and after unit implementation.

The Primary Years Program, or the PYP, is for students, ages 3-12. CFI implements the PYP at Grades K-6. The PYP focuses on developing the whole child through a curriculum of inquiry and internationalism. Traditional subjects are a part of the program, but they are taught using an interdisciplinary approach. Global awareness is stressed as students study topics that are relevant around the world. The International Baccalaureate Organization, or IBO, requires that a second language be part of the curriculum in order to stress the international aspect of the program. All CFI students receive Spanish and Mandarin instruction. Teachers work collaboratively to write unit plans that focus on the six PYP themes: Who We Are, Where We Are in Time and Place, How We Express Ourselves, How the World Works, How We Organize Ourselves, and Sharing the Planet. At the end of a unit of study, students are asked to identify actions they can take in response to what they've learned during the unit. Physical education, visual arts, vocal and instrumental music, and media/technology specialists develop curriculum that enhances the units and rounds out each child's total development.

The Middle Years Program, or MYP, is for students, ages 11-16. At the Center for Inquiry, the seventh and eighth grades are implementing the MYP. The interdisciplinary MYP is based on a framework of eight subject areas: literature, foreign language, social studies, science, math, the arts, physical education and technology. All seventh- and eighth-graders take either Mandarin Chinese or Spanish daily. The curriculum is taught through the Areas of Interaction. Communication, holistic learning and internationalism are concepts that drive the MYP.

The PYP and MYP are connected through the Learner Profile. The Learner Profile guides us in developing the whole child to be an inquirer, a thinker, a communicator, and a risk-taker who is knowledgeable, principled, caring, open-minded, balanced and reflective.

Our multi-age classrooms employ Socratic seminars during daily community meetings, and inquiry strategies that facilitate content as a means of personal discovery and explore lengthy lists of student "wonderings." Students benefit from sharing new understandings in multiple ways and extending their experiences through the generation of new questions. Learning is experiential and often includes field trips, guest speakers, and service learning opportunities. Interpersonal interactions are valued. Students are engaged in interconnected and authentic assessments with their teachers and peers. A workshop approach is used within our classrooms. These include author and genre studies during Writer's Workshop, literature discussions during Reading Workshop, and investigations during math. These workshops allow students to share their newly discovered strategies and their thinking with classmates. Our trans-disciplinary IB units are taught using the best practices and tools of inquiry-based instruction. Technology is integrated throughout our teaching and learning as we use tools and applications to explore topics and share understandings. Students record Podcasts, create PowerPoints, explore Webquests, and post assignments and commentary on Oracle's Think.com.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

The reading program at the Center for Inquiry is a holistic language arts program that includes reading, writing, listening and speaking for authentic purposes using authentic instructional materials. Reading and Writing workshops provide the structure for daily student work.

CFI teachers know that development of readers and writers requires a literacy-rich environment that includes reading aloud to children, uninterrupted time to read and write, encouraging self-selected as well as guided reading and writing experiences, conferencing with the students both individually and in small groups, and listening to students' responses and questions as they engage in literature discussions. CFI builds from the known, connecting our curriculum to the students' life experiences. We choose authentic text and trade books across genres instead of traditional basal readers. Quality literature captures the interest and imagination of our students, provides mentorship for good writing, and causes students to fall in love with reading.

A variety of strategies are in place to develop students' skills in the five areas of reading - comprehension, fluency, phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary - as well as their ability to collaborate with other learners. Skills are not taught in isolation but within the context of "real" reading. Strategies such as reader's theatre, sketch to stretch, written conversations, say something, and pair-share reading are engaging and promote higher-level thinking that causes students to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate text.

Critical literacy also is a component of CFI's reading program. The goal of critical literacy is to help children learn to analyze spoken, written, and visual texts to uncover bias and identify whose interests are served as well as whose are being marginalized. These books are used throughout our curricular units to enhance the study of real-world issues. For example, when Grade 2/3 read *Fly Away Home* by Eve Bunting and *The Lady in the Box* by Anne McGovern, the students wanted to understand homelessness. But even more importantly, they wanted to act in alleviating the conditions that lead to homelessness. Critical literacy texts and those with international perspective have broadened the thinking of the students at CFI.

Additional components to our reading program include reading buddies, interest groups, Stories by Starlight and Read-In Day, tutoring by the Dyslexia Institute, and reading mentoring by Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

In an age where second language acquisition is vital to global success, CFI is proud to introduce Spanish and Mandarin Chinese to all students in Grades K-6. Middle school students specialize in one of these two languages in order to deepen their fluency prior to high school. Students are well versed in not just multiple languages, but also multiple cultures. Through CFI's involvement with the International Center of Indianapolis, students have attended naturalization ceremonies, participated in discussions with leaders (most recently the Kenyan ambassador) hosted educators from Taiwan and South America, and helped to facilitate the state's first symposium on international education. Teachers have embraced partnerships with schools and organizations worldwide. Students are currently participating in a global art exchange and studying the music and poetry of international civil rights movements. Teachers have partnered with two schools in Honduras in order to bring both teaching strategies and school supplies to schools in need. These initiatives allow students to explore and participate in the world community are numerous.

4. Instructional Methods:

Students at the Center for Inquiry are invited into a constructivist learning process and are encouraged to view their world from a variety of perspectives. Our constructivist philosophy led us to inquiry-based instruction. Before we can understand the world, we must first know ourselves, explore our relationships with others, and examine our place in the world. This is how we begin with our students. We then are able to connect their understandings to what others, with different experiences than theirs, know and understand about the world.

Looking at these connections guides students in their actions both in the local and global community. Students develop and carry out social action projects as a result of their new understandings.

Because we learn with and from one another, the learning process at CFI is collaborative and social in nature. Students are given multiple ways of showing and sharing the knowledge and ideas gleaned from their learning. Authentic student assessment involves the students in evaluating their work, their new understandings, and the process of learning. Student choice and student voice are valued at CFI.

Students' individual needs are met through differentiated instruction within the reading and writing workshops. Teachers spend time individually conferencing with students and designing mini-lessons based on whole class and individual needs. Math concepts are pre-assessed at the beginning of each unit so that students may begin at their personal starting point and advance at their learning rate. Investigations and real-world math applications engage students in exploring concepts and developing skills. The IB units of instruction are built around a central idea often rooted in science or social studies content. Students delve into the inquiry fueled by teacher- and student-posed questions. Technology is used both in teaching and learning and in student demonstration of their new understandings.

Inclusion teachers addressing students' Individual Education Plans, a Title 1 specialist working with students who are struggling, and general education teachers working with cluster groups of high ability students are ways in which we reach out to each child within our school.

5. Professional Development:

CFI teachers and staff learn and grow through professional development opportunities aligned with the school's mission and goals, as well as those that develop the individual teachers' needs and interests. Collectively and individually, CFI staff participate in peer coaching, book study, action research, and seminars that address our pedagogical understanding and instructional skills. All staff and weekly team meetings are devoted to professional development. Teachers are active members of professional organizations, and both lead and participate in professional development in language arts, fine arts, science, math, technology, cultural competency, student wellness, and inquiry.

Local universities have been tremendous partners in several areas of staff development. In an effort to improve the quality of formative and summative unit assessments, teachers began working with Ball State University in the EPIC project to develop performance assessments and rubrics. Ball State University staff also has helped to build our repertoire of differentiated instruction strategies. Working alongside university professors from Indiana University/Purdue University, Indianapolis, teachers have spent time reading, discussing, collecting and organizing quality critical literacy texts. We have inquired together in monthly critical literacy meetings sharing our classroom encounters, strategies, and successes with the books. CFI teachers are active members of the Partnership for Young Writers working with national consultants to continually improve the quality of our classroom writing workshop and to develop a writing continuum that can be used to analyze the development levels of student writing. Working with the science department at Purdue University, teachers at the intermediate grades study systems thinking and co-develop units of study that engage students scientifically and technologically. A coach from the University of Indianapolis also works with intermediate teachers to develop content knowledge and effective teaching strategies.

All CFI teachers attend multiple levels of Primary Years and Middle Years Program training sponsored by the International Baccalaureate Organization. The knowledge gained is used as we continually revisit and revise our unit planners. Several teachers are participating in summer opportunities to study abroad and/or work on curriculum with international colleagues.

6. School Leadership:

Center for Inquiry has an administrative team that includes a principal who oversees both school sites and a full-time assistant principal. The administrative team works closely with each other and with leadership bodies within the school to develop and implement effective policy and practice. An active Site-Based Decision Making (SBDM) Committee meets monthly with the principal to develop, review and revise school policies and procedures, including school improvement planning and safety planning. The SBDM Committee appoints members to other committees such as the School Improvement Steering Committee and the School Interview and Hiring Committee. The Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) also meets monthly and plans for family learning events and instructional program support.

Weekly meetings with a school-based, multi-disciplinary team (M-Team) and a Building-Based Team (BBT) address individual learning needs of both special education and general education students. Teacher and staff leaders including the social worker, head custodian, behavior support specialist, Title 1 teacher, IB PYP and MYP coordinators, and a parent liaison all have weekly check-ins with the principal to ensure communication and mutual support for the duties of their work. Teacher leaders are supported in leading staff in school improvement efforts.

The work of the school is divided among committees, with all staff members serving on one or more committees. Most committees also have parent representation. For example, a Wellness Committee tends to the physical and emotional health of staff and students.

Student leadership is strongly encouraged and supported by the administrators. Student leadership groups include the Action Kids, O-Ambassadors, Student Ambassadors, and a Junior Rotary Club. The student ambassadors lead a school-wide weekly community meeting in which students share learning accomplishments and classes make presentations to the entire school body.

The administrative team works closely with members of the community forging relationships between the school and neighboring businesses, universities, and community groups. The partnerships chosen provide new experiences and resources to our students and staff, and are carefully selected based on the needs of the school. Both administrators present professionally and facilitate staff development. They are active leaders beyond the school level, serving on district committees and state-level boards.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	91	80	74	61	79
% Pass Plus	30	26	11	4	17
Number of students tested	33	35	27	28	29
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	85	81	55	60	76
% Pass Plus	8	0	0	0	12
Number of students tested	13	16	11	15	17
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	86	69	62	47	69
% Pass Plus	5	0	8	0	19
Number of students tested	21	13	13	15	16
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	100	79	82	80	100
% Pass Plus	73	57	18	10	17
Number of students tested	11	14	11	10	12

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	76	83	89	57	90
% Pass Plus	15	20	19	0	17
Number of students tested	33	35	27	28	29
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	10	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	62	81	73	53	92
% Pass Plus	1	6	0	0	42
Number of students tested	13	16	11	15	17
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	62	77	85	33	88
% Pass Plus	10	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	21	13	13	15	16
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	100	86	100	80	92
% Pass Plus	27	50	45	0	42
Number of students tested	11	14	11	10	12

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	68	67	62	84	
% Pass Plus	21	15	3	26	
Number of students tested	38	39	34	31	
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	42	29	50	78	
% Pass Plus	8	0	0	22	
Number of students tested	12	17	18	18	
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	54	50	53	76	
% Pass Plus	0	0	0	12	
Number of students tested	13	18	17	17	
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	81	87	82	92	
% Pass Plus	38	40	9	46	
Number of students tested	16	15	11	13	

Notes:

Indiana did not administer ISTEP+ to grade 4 during the 2003-04 school year.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	84	85	71	87	
% Pass Plus	16	3	6	16	
Number of students tested	38	39	34	31	
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	83	71	61	83	
% Pass Plus	8	0	6	6	
Number of students tested	12	17	18	18	
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	85	72	65	76	
% Pass Plus	0	0	6	6	
Number of students tested	13	18	17	17	
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	94	93	82	100	
% Pass Plus	31	7	9	31	
Number of students tested	16	15	11	13	

Notes:

Indiana did not administer the ISTEP+ to grade 4 in the 2003-04 school year.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	73	78	77	83	
% Pass Plus	15	5	23	17	
Number of students tested	40	37	30	29	
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	47	85	75	77	
% Pass Plus	0	5	15	15	
Number of students tested	15	20	20	13	
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	68	79	75	72	
% Pass Plus	5	0	13	11	
Number of students tested	19	19	16	18	
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	87	83	77	100	
% Pass Plus	33	17	38	30	
Number of students tested	15	12	13	10	

Notes:

Indiana did not administer ISTEP+ to grade 5 during the 2003-04 school year.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	78	78	87	90	
% Pass Plus	5	8	10	7	
Number of students tested	40	37	30	29	
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. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	60	80	80	85	
% Pass Plus	0	10	0	8	
Number of students tested	15	20	20	13	
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	74	74	75	83	
% Pass Plus	0	11	0	0	
Number of students tested	19	19	16	18	
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	93	83	100	100	
% Pass Plus	13	8	23	20	
Number of students tested	15	12	13	10	

Notes:

Indiana did not administer the ISTEP+ to grade 5 in the 2003-04 school year.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	93	89	90	72	78
% Pass Plus	7	22	38	16	9
Number of students tested	29	37	21	25	23
Percent of total students tested	100	97	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	3	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus		83	90	67	75
% Pass Plus		8	30	11	0
Number of students tested	9	24	10	18	12
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	86	86	83	72	73
% Pass Plus	0	5	17	17	0
Number of students tested	14	21	12	18	11
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	100	100			82
% Pass Plus	20	50			18
Number of students tested	10	14	9	5	11

Notes:

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	76	89	86	80	78
% Pass Plus	3	14	14	8	13
Number of students tested	29	37	21	25	23
Percent of total students tested	100	97	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	3	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus		83	80	72	75
% Pass Plus		0	20	0	0
Number of students tested	9	24	10	18	12
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	57	81	75	83	73
% Pass Plus	0	0	8	6	9
Number of students tested	14	21	12	18	11
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	90	100			82
% Pass Plus	10	36			18
Number of students tested	10	14	9	5	11

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 7 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	94	80	84	68	
% Pass Plus	28	28	16	11	
Number of students tested	32	25	19	19	
Percent of total students tested	97	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	93	81	83		
% Pass Plus	7	13	8		
Number of students tested	14	16	12	8	
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	94	64	77		
% Pass Plus	6	0	15		
Number of students tested	16	14	13	9	
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	93				
% Pass Plus	57				
Number of students tested	14	8	5	9	

Notes:

Indiana did not administer ISTEP+ to grade 7 during the 2003-04 school year.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 7 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	84	64	74	84	
% Pass Plus	22	8	16	0	
Number of students tested	32	25	19	19	
Percent of total students tested	97	100	100	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	86	63	75		
% Pass Plus	14	6	8		
Number of students tested	14	16	12	8	
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	69	43	77		
% Pass Plus	13	0	8		
Number of students tested	16	14	12	9	
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	100				
% Pass Plus	36				
Number of students tested	14	8	5	9	

Notes:

Indiana did not administer ISTEP+ to grade 7 during the 2003-04 school year.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 8 Test: ISTEP+

Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	95	57	71	59	50
% Pass Plus	18	0	6	14	7
Number of students tested	22	14	17	22	14
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus		64			
% Pass Plus		0			
Number of students tested	7	11	7	9	7
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	92	60		50	
% Pass Plus	0	0		0	
Number of students tested	12	10	8	12	9
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus					
% Pass Plus					
Number of students tested	8	3	8	9	5

Notes:

Subject: Reading
Edition/Publication Year: published annually

Grade: 8 Test: ISTEP+
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep	Sep
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	73	57	94	77	43
% Pass Plus	23	0	12	9	0
Number of students tested	22	14	17	22	14
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students					
% Pass and % Pass Plus		55			
% Pass Plus		0			
Number of students tested	7	11	7	9	7
2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): African American					
% Pass and % Pass Plus	50	70		58	
% Pass Plus	0	0		0	
Number of students tested	12	10	8	12	9
3. (specify subgroup): White					
% Pass and % Pass Plus					
% Pass Plus					
Number of students tested	8	3	8	9	5

Notes: