U.S. Department of Education
2010 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) [] Charter [**X**] Title I [**X**] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal: Ms. Marjorie Neff

Official School Name: Julia R. Masterman Laboratory and Demonstration School

School Mailing Address:
1699 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130-3913

County: Philadelphia State School Code Number*: 3808

Telephone: (215) 299-4661 Fax: (215) 299-3425

Web site/URL: www.philasd.org/schools/masterman E-mail: mneff@philasd.org

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. Arlene Ackerman,

District Name: Philadelphia Tel: (215) 400-4000

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: Mr. Robert Archie

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.*
The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. 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 2009-2010 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 2004.

6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.

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: (per district designation)

176	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
29	Middle/Junior high schools
62	High schools
	K-12 schools
267	**TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 11490

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

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

4. 3 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position 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	**6**	101	97	198
K			0	**7**	82	112	194
1			0	**8**	82	117	199
2			0	**9**	48	59	107
3			0	**10**	49	57	106
4			0	**11**	50	64	114
5	75	88	163	**12**	54	63	117
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					1198

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 %	American Indian or Alaska Native
18 %	Asian
29 %	Black or African American
6 %	Hispanic or Latino
0 %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
44 %	White
3 %	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: 1 %

This rate is 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.	0
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	7
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	7
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	1207
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.006
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	0.580

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 0 %

Total number limited English proficient 5

Number of languages represented: 5

Specify languages:

French, Russian , Mandarin Chinese, Tibetan, Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 44 %

Total number students who qualify: 531

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: 3 %

Total Number of Students Served: 36

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

2	Autism	2	Orthopedic Impairment
	Deafness	14	Other Health Impaired
	Deaf-Blindness	3	Specific Learning Disability
1	Emotional Disturbance	11	Speech or Language Impairment
1	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
	Mental Retardation	1	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
	Multiple Disabilities		Developmentally Delayed

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

	Number of Staff	
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	3	
Classroom teachers	51	
Special resource teachers/specialists	13	6
Paraprofessionals	8	7
Support staff	6	4
Total number	81	17

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 **23 :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%.

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Daily student attendance	97%	97%	97%	96%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	97%	96%	96%	96%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	3%	9%	12%	16%	7%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

Approximately 80% of the teacher turnover in all years resulted from retirements. A large number of retirements in 2005-2006 and a change in adminstration resulted in the temporary assignment of teachers during the 2006-2007 school year so that the turnover rate remained higher than usual.

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

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

Graduating class size	114	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	98	%
Enrolled in a community college	1	%
Enrolled in vocational training		%
Found employment	1	%
Military service		%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)		%
Unknown		%
Total	**100**	%

PART III - SUMMARY

The Julia R. Masterman Laboratory and Demonstration School was established in September 1958 for high–achieving elementary school students in grades five and six. A junior high program was initiated in 1959, and a senior high school, which started at grade ten, was added in 1976. In 1990, Masterman was re-organized as a middle school (grades five through eight) and a high school (grades nine through twelve).

Masterman's goals reflect the pursuit of excellence in both teaching and learning. Academic excellence and person growth take place in a genuinely, diverse atmosphere. Masterman's student population is diverse in every way: ethnically, racially, economically, and geographically, coming from all areas of Philadelphia. Their admission is based on academic performance and standardized test scores; admission to Masterman is highly competitive. Staff members are selected based on professional expertise. The middle school program prepares students for rigorous work at the high school level. The senior high school is a small college preparatory program for selected students of superior ability. For the past 3 years, Masterman has been sited by US News and World Reports as one of the best 100 public high schools. Philadelphia Magazine regularly cites Masterman as one of the top public schools in the tri-state region. For several years, Masterman has scored number one on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) in reading and mathematics.

The students follow a rigorous accelerated program and the curriculum is rich in academic subjects. Our curriculum is enriched with accelerated middle school courses and with fourteen Advanced Placement Courses. All students who take these courses take the AP exam. Of the 175 students (75% of the eleventh and twelfth graders) who took AP courses, eighty percent scored a 3 or higher on the May 2009 AP exams with thirty-four percent scoring a five. One hundred percent of Masterman graduates matriculate at four-year colleges.

Masterman's small size ensures that each student has the opportunity to take a leadership role in one of a variety of activities on campus. Some of these activities include orchestra, jazz band, choir, vocal and instrumental ensembles, student government, dramatics, yearbook, newspaper, mock trail, debate team, national academic league, nationally ranked chess teams, literary magazine, competition in academic contests and science fairs and many clubs. Almost a quarter of the school participates in an annual, fully staged musical production.

At the same time, the students of our school compete successfully on the interscholastic sports teams at both the varsity and junior varsity level in basketball, cross-country, soccer, tennis, track, baseball, softball, and volleyball. Students also participate in unified teams with other schools in gymnastics and swimming.

The school was named for Julia Reynolds Masterman who was instrumental in establishing the Philadelphia Home and School Council and served as its first president. Consistent with the tradition of Julia Masterman, the school has an extremely active community of parents.Parents are fully committed to improving the educational program of the school. Numerous committees have been formed to address various concerns. The Academic Affairs committee plans educational workshops, and staff development sessions utilizing parents, community leaders and noted scholars as presenters. The school council is a school-based governance body which addresses issues of mutual concern of teachers, students and parents. Our home and school association sponsors a magazine sale and auction which raise money for the school. Grants have been written which provide interactive white boards and four mobile laptop carts each equipped with 30 laptops.

The local community supports the school as well. In particular, The Community College of Philadelphia, provides a dual enrollment math class for accelerated math students, use of their facilities and on-going connection with their education students.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

Masterman's standardized test data shows strong performance over time. Based on its scores on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment exam (PSSA), Masterman has been recognized as a Distinguished School by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Division of Federal Programs. Masterman was the number one performing school in Pennsylvania on the PSSA in 2008-2009. In each of the past five years, no less than 95% of Masterman's students scored at the Proficient and Advanced levels on the state assessment. Masterman has made Adequate Yearly Progress in each of the past 5 years with students scoring well above the target. For example during the 2008-2009 school testing, to make Adequate Yearly Progress, school must have 63% of their students scoring at the Proficient or Advanced level in reading. Masterman students exceeded this target with 97.9% of our students scored Proficient or Advanced. Likewise, in math our students exceeded the 56% target with 99.5 % of our students scoring Proficient or Advanced. Information about the state of Pennsylvania's assessment system and further information about Masterman's performance is available on the Pennsylvania Department of Education's website: http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/school_assessments/7442

Of particular note is our students' performance over time. The data shows that students entering Masterman improve their performance as they move through the grades. While Masterman 11th grade students perform at high levels, our middle school performance is most telling. Because only half of our entering 5th graders attend the high school, this trend is best illustrated by examining the performance of a cohort of students as they move from 5th grade through 8th grade. In 2008-2009 eighth grade students moved from the 96% Advanced and Proficient in 2005-2006 in reading to 100 % Advanced and Proficient. More importantly, the percentage of students scoring Advanced in reading rose from 67% in 2005-2006 to 96% in 2008-2009.

Masterman students perform at comparable levels across all sub-groups in the percentage of students who meet the standard by scoring at the Proficient or Advanced level. However, there is a continued need to insure that all students perform at the Advanced level. In examining the results of the 2007-2008 PSSA testing, the school community identified the need to address the achievement gap in the area of mathematics. African-American and Latino students were represented in smaller numbers in the Advanced category. By providing additional supports to these students, the school was able to close the gap in mathematics in the 2008-2009 testing. The school continues to address this area and is working to maintain high levels in mathematics while addressing students' performance in reading.

In addition to success on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment exam, Masterman students succeed in other areas as well. The graduation rate for Masterman student in each of the past 5 years is 99% to 100%. The 2009 graduating class had 100% of the students accepted to four-year colleges. In the past 5 years between 98% and 100% our students have been accepted to four-year colleges with a few students electing to attend 2-year institutions or trade programs that best fit their career goals.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Masterman uses a variety of data sources to improve instruction. At the beginning of the school year, teachers and administrators review the state assessment data to determine adjustments to the instructional program and to plan for supports for students whose performance is not up to standard. This test data provides feedback on students but more importantly provides important information about needed changes in the delivery of instruction.

Throughout the year, the school community looks at data. The School District of Philadelphia's 6 week benchmark assessments are used to help pinpoint the needs of particular students or groups of students and to measure the success of instructional delivery. In addition to these common assessments, teachers meet and review students' grades and performance on school assessments such as quarterly exams. Feedback from program assessments such as First In Math is also used.

An example of this process was mentioned briefly in the question above. The school community in reviewing 2007-2008 data identified a need to improve the math performance of African-American and Latino students. Additional supports were provided to identified students during the 2008-2009 school year. Student appeared to be clustered in the 5th and 6th grade. These students received additional math instruction. In addition, the data review pointed out underperformance in the area of geometry in 7th and 8th grade. A trimester long course was added to address this weakness. As a result of both interventions there was improved performance in the 2008-2009 school year.

Teacher and administrators also meet to discuss students' academic performance during grade and subject meetings. Progress monitoring by administrators and deans takes place on a weekly basis for those students who are experiencing academic, social or emotional struggles.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Masterman staff communicates regularly with parents, students and the community about student achievement. The communication takes a variety of forms. Student performance in the state assessment is communicated at a micro and macro level. The School District of Philadelphia maintains school performance data on its website and published a school report card and performance index which gives school performance information. While academic information is of primary importance, the district also provides the community with information about safety, climate and parent involvement.

At the school level, there is commitment to keeping parents and students informed. The school sends reports of students' performance on the state assessment as soon as test results become available. Parents receive their students' scores and an explanation of the scores in a document prepared by the state. The school sends the reports home to parents and has staff available to answer questions. Whole school results are communicated to parents in school community meetings at the beginning of the year. Information is also communicated through the School Governance Council which meets monthly and to students through our advisory program. All student data is available through the district's student data website. Parents can access test scores, grades and other information about their individual child through website.

In addition to communicating about performance on the state assessment, the school makes an effort to communicate about student performance on other high stakes assessments such as the SAT and ACT exams. Teacher communicate regularly with parents about students' individual performance with quarterly conferences and access through the Comprehensive Student Assistance Program.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Masterman was created as a demonstration school whose mission was develop and share best practices. We continue that mission today. Our classrooms are open to colleagues from within the district and from the larger education community. This year we hosted administrators from China, a team from another school district and teachers from another district school sharing our knowledge and always learning as well.

One important way that we share our success is through our involvement in the larger education community. Our teachers and administrators present at conferences, write articles and participate in professional organizations such as the National Writing Project, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. In 2007, a school team presented at the Pennsylvania

annual Title I conference in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Our teachers are active in the district's professional development program, in particular, they facilitate Advanced Placement course workshops and have provided SAT prep training for high schools in our area. Their biggest impact comes from their willingness to host student teachers and college observers. Each year we have between 13 and 20 student teachers and numerous undergraduate observers.

Since we don't consider ourselves to be experts, we find that we share best by actively engaging with others in the larger education community. Several of our teachers are part of the Teacher's Learning Cooperative which is a group for teachers to discuss and improve their practice. Our staff also serve on committee and are members of education activist groups.

If we are so honored as to be named a Blue Ribbon School, we will continue to reach out to our colleagues to share what we have learned and to learn from them.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

Masterman students follow a rich, rigorous college preparatory program that is also multicultural, interdisciplinary, and differentiated. In the middle school, students work extensively on time management and study skills. Such skills serve them well, as they take high school level courses, such as algebra and foreign language, by the time they finish eighth grade. Middle school students are also exposed to a variety of electives, such as art and Japanese culture, which are taught by staff with expertise in those areas. Coursework emphasizes writing skills, with students writing in every class and completing a research paper before the end of 8th grade. Teachers often meet, formally and informally, to standardize the curriculum across grade levels and to discuss ways for lessons to cut across disciplines.

In the high school, all students take a minimum of four years of advanced language, history, literature, and mathematics courses, including Calculus, before graduation. All students also complete Biology, Environmental Science, and Physics, and many continue with a fourth year of advanced study in the sciences. During the final semester, all seniors complete an interdisciplinary project, which includes an academic research paper and a two-week professional internship, as the culmination of their studies.

Many students take AP courses, which include US History, Biology, Statistics, Government, Environmental Science, Music Theory, French, English, Calculus AB, Calculus BC, Spanish, Mathematics, Computer Science, Physics B, and Physics C. Those students who exhaust course offerings by the end of the eleventh grade, completing AP Calculus BC, for example, take courses at local colleges. This year, for instance, 18 students are taking a college course in Discrete Mathematics at Community College of Philadelphia.

More than 30 small group seminars, many taught by highly qualified volunteers from the community, expand the curriculum. These seminars include Renaissance Music, Architecture, Business, Hindi, Playwriting, Russian, Arabic, Foreign Film, Yoga, Korean Pop Culture, Psychology, and Philosophy, among others. Orchestra, jazz band, choir, and other vocal and instrumental ensembles, including a gospel choir and an a capella group, ensure that students can pursue their musical interests. Art is offered as an elective at Masterman, and many students create projects of their own, with staff guidance, to further pursue this interest. This year, for example, one group of students is building a Japanese Tea House on Masterman's roof, while another is completing a public mural at a largely Hispanic elementary school, celebrating the heritage of those students. Additionally, Masterman's location on the edge of center city allows for frequent trips to the cultural institutions of Philadelphia. Students in all grades regularly attend plays, art exhibits, musical performances, and author readings as part of the curriculum.

Finally, a wide variety of sports teams and myriad clubs ensure that every student is able to find a home at Masterman. Clubs include Yearbook, Newspaper, Literary Magazine, Chess Team, Debate Team, Mock Trial, Hispanic Club, Allies, African American Cultural Committee, Student Government, National Honor Society, and Spanish and French National Honor Society.

Classroom instruction is delivered in a variety of ways, including Socratic seminars, project based learning, and student facilitated discussions. Every effort has been made to ensure that teachers use the latest technology in delivery. There are 20 classrooms wired as interactive whiteboard classrooms, many LCD projectors, two fully equipped computer labs, and four laptop carts including 33 computers each, all of them with wireless Internet access. All teachers in the School District of Philadelphia have an Apple laptop equipped with wireless capacity.

Administrators, teachers, support staff, and students of Masterman continually try to live up to the school's motto, "Dare to be excellent," and the curriculum reflects this desire.

2b. **(Secondary Schools) English:**
(This question is for secondary schools only)

Masterman's English language curriculum challenges students to read, think, and write critically. The middle school reads a novel per month, and high school approximately five novels and a Shakespearean play annually. While many of the novels are chosen by the individual teacher, grade group instructors select three titles that are required for their grade level. Students with reading deficiencies receive extended class time, tutoring, and assistance from a learning support professional.

We make a concentrated effort to layer our units with a variety of genres including poetry, short story, memoir, personal essay, reviews, and editorials. Full class and small group discussions are a vital part of the English curriculum. During Socratic seminars, for instance, students support their assertions with textual references. Debates, student led discussions, and presentations build the students' leadership capacity.

Opportunities to write academically and creatively are embedded into the curriculum. Requirements include an eighth grade research paper, a ninth grade biography, and a tenth grade cross curricular National History Day paper. Juniors and seniors focus on literary analysis and senior project presentations. Additionally, we have a student run literary magazine and newspaper. Students plan, write, design, and lay out the paper, coordinating all aspects of production.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

The social studies curriculum at Masterman varies by grade level in terms of content, but the skills emphasized are consistent. Courses are built around developing critical thinking, written and verbal expression, and understanding of multiple perspectives. We develop students' competencies by focusing on this key set of skills at increasingly sophisticated levels. The analysis of primary sources, essay writing, debates, simulations, and class discussion are hallmarks of each of our social studies courses.

The sequence begins with a year of Pennsylvania History in 5th grade. Sixth graders take Geography focusing on the Western Hemisphere, while 7th graders learn about the Eastern Hemisphere. A survey American History class is required for eighth graders.

Freshmen study World History from the 14th Century to the present. Tenth graders take a yearlong African American History class as mandated by the School District. Juniors revisit American history in a course that spans the colonial period through the twenty-first century. Finally, Government and Economics is required for seniors.

Qualified juniors have the option of taking AP US History and seniors can take AP US Government. All of our social studies classes, however, are considered Honors courses because of our extensive use of supplementary materials and our rigorous writing requirements.

Major research and writing projects are required in every high school social studies class. Sophomores write a paper and prepare a project for National History Day. Juniors in the AP US History course choose an individual whose name they find at a local Victorian-era cemetery and then do extensive research to document the person's life and the era in which they lived. For both of these projects, students are required to visit research institutions such as the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, City and National Archives, and the Blockson Afro-American Collection and Urban Archives at Temple University.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

Differentiating instruction takes many forms at Masterman. Our courses are rigorous and challenge students to read, write and think critically. To meet the needs of our gifted population, we offer advanced placement courses, in history, math, science, world language, music and English. Specific programs and workshops are also provided. Middle school students attend a year-long workshop while high school workshops meet for a trimester.

Communication among staff is vital, and we meet consistently to identify students who need additional academic support. To address the needs of these students, we develop a comprehensive support plan. The plan is implemented, monitored, and revised accordingly for each individual student. Our counselors and deans facilitate this process, ensuring that parents and students are informed.

Some of our English language learners, for instance, may need additional copies of textbooks or text in their first language. One of our students who is hearing impaired attends classes with both an interpreter and a note taker. We are fortunate to have access to white boards, mobile laptop carts, LCD projectors, and computer labs. The technology helps us address the needs of our diverse population.

To better support all of our students, we have a guidance program. During this time we invite guest speakers and offer courses. Seventh and eighth graders have high school peer counselors, who guide the students through discussions about such topics as peer pressure and eating disorders. To support the high school transition, we also have a ninth grade initiative program. During free periods, student tutors assist their classmates. Daily tutoring, facilitated by faculty and NHS members is also available.

5. **Professional Development:**

J.R. Masterman's professional development program emphasizes the practical application of what we learn. The school draws exceptional students, and the teachers here work diligently to meet the needs of these students.

Masterman has made a significant effort to use professional development time to align each department's curriculum from 5th to 12th grade. This plan is teacher-centered; educators spend time working together and listening to one another in order to create a curriculum that expands each year on the core knowledge created in the prior years. These curricular decisions are aligned with and surpass the state standards, which is reflected by the students' scores on standardized tests. The science department in particular has worked extensively on aligning their curriculum. This process has led to the creation of electives for the upper grades and less redundancy in the coursework throughout the grades.

Once a month, the district dismisses students at noon so that teachers can engage in professional development time. The staff splits this time between faculty-wide development, often run by a teacher or by an outside professional, and department time, which allows specific topics to be addressed in small groups. Most recently, the full staff time has included a teacher-led workshop on ways to reach students with limited English proficiency and another workshop run by a specialist on dealing with students with Asperger's. In our departments, we're reading books that offer insight into our curriculum, and we're discussing them and sharing pertinent information.

Additionally, because we are a small school, and teachers and students know each other well, we have been able to spend time planning more than just curriculum. Students spend forty-five minutes a week in small, teacher-led groups. A group of teachers met this summer to plan for this time. As a result, students at Masterman now use this period to discuss communication, study skills, and preparation for further education. Teachers use their professional development time to create an environment where students can succeed.

6. **School Leadership:**

The principal of Masterman oversees the instructional program and operation of the school with input from all members of the school community, including staff, students and parents. The talents and knowledge of many people, and several teams, help form the framework and tenor of our school. The principal is responsible for the major areas of curriculum, budget and roster, and decisions are made with contributions from staff with a top-down and bottom-up flow of information.

Instrumental to the leadership design is the principal's cabinet, which meets regularly on a bi-weekly basis. The team consists of the two assistant principals, five deans, multiple department heads and a counselor. Administration and staff share academic and leadership information and concerns, which often are further addressed in smaller (or more extended) groups as needed. The minutes of cabinet meetings are disseminated to the entire staff.

Deans meet with the administration separately, also bi-weekly. Student progress is discussed in depth and individuals at risk are recommended for various interventions. Department heads meet with teachers in their content area twice monthly to share information, best practices and other areas of concern within the department. The departments have a degree of autonomy and generally are characterized by an ability to work together to the benefit of all.

The principal is in constant communication with the assistant principals who share the responsibility for the instructional program, performing such duties as teacher observation and review of lesson plans. Together with the roster chairperson and co-chair, organizational decisions are made affecting the academic structure of the school, particularly teacher and student rosters. Our School Council, which is made up of administration, staff, students and parents, provides input toward the formation of school policies and procedures and the allocation of resources.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 11 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	99	97	99	99
% Advanced	88	82	80	82	87
Number of students tested	117	112	118	103	106
Percent of total students tested	100	99	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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	100	100	100
% Advanced	92	85	86	92	85
Number of students tested	12	20	14	12	13
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	96	96	100	97
% Advanced	76	73	73	74	76
Number of students tested	25	32	25	27	33
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		67			
Number of students tested		10			
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	97	97	98	100
% Advanced	93	80	80	81	93
Number of students tested	64	63	64	52	56

Notes:

Subject: Reading Grade: 11 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	99	97	99	99
% Advanced	88	82	80	82	87
Number of students tested	117	112	118	103	106
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	100	100	100
% Advanced	100	65	64	83	85
Number of students tested	12	20	15	12	13
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	96	100	97
% Advanced	92	69	65	74	76
Number of students tested	24	32	25	27	33
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100			
% Advanced		91			
Number of students tested		11			
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	97	100	100	100
% Advanced	92	80	75	87	93
Number of students tested	64	63	65	52	59

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	99	99	97	99
% Advanced	91	88	87	84	82
Number of students tested	162	162	164	161	164
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	96	100	95	98
% Advanced	87	86	82	80	78
Number of students tested	40	49	27	40	55
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	96	100	95	100
% Advanced	80	80	77	80	75
Number of students tested	46	54	56	59	55
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				100	93
% Advanced				80	73
Number of students tested				10	15
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	97	97	100
% Advanced	93	90	80	90	90
Number of students tested	73	73	75	70	62

Notes:

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	95	99	96	98
% Advanced	67	68	69	67	68
Number of students tested	162	162	164	161	164
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	97	99	99	98
% Advanced	60	53	63	47	60
Number of students tested	40	49	27	40	55
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	99	98	98	96
% Advanced	46	56	57	61	47
Number of students tested	45	48	55	58	53
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				100	100
% Advanced				40	47
Number of students tested				10	15
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	98	100	99	100
% Advanced	68	68	71	62	68
Number of students tested	71	73	75	70	62

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 6 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	99	99	100	
% Advanced	92	94	91	96	
Number of students tested	198	197	196	191	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	100	100	
% Advanced	92	92	83	81	
Number of students tested	62	37	42	58	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	99	99	
% Advanced	88	91	92	70	
Number of students tested	68	64	72	69	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		92	99	95	
% Advanced		92	72	74	
Number of students tested		12	12	19	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				100	
% Advanced				90	
Number of students tested				10	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	99	99	99	
% Advanced	94	95	93	87	
Number of students tested	83	87	87	71	

Notes:
Grade six was not a tested grade in 2004-2005.

Subject: Reading Grade: 6 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	96	98	97	
% Advanced	91	81	82	73	
Number of students tested	198	197	197	194	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	94	98	96	
% Advanced	74	76	81	72	
Number of students tested	62	37	42	58	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	95	97	99	
% Advanced	66	69	82	64	
Number of students tested	68	64	72	69	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91	99	94	
% Advanced		83	72	53	
Number of students tested		12	12	19	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced				100	
% Advanced				100	
Number of students tested				10	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	97	97	
% Advanced	85	86	85	83	
Number of students tested	83	87	87	71	

Notes:
Grade 6 was not a tested grade in 2004-2005..

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 7 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	98	98	100	
% Advanced	96	81	88	96	
Number of students tested	198	194	198	191	
Percent of total students tested	99	100	100	99	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	97	98	100	
% Advanced	97	95	90	96	
Number of students tested	32	41	52	49	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	99	100	100	
% Advanced	95	96	80	93	
Number of students tested	65	71	71	58	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	94	100	
% Advanced	84	100	83	100	
Number of students tested	12	12	18	14	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100	100	
% Advanced			100	100	
Number of students tested			11	12	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	100	100	100	
% Advanced	95	96	97	98	
Number of students tested	84	85	70	89	

Notes:
Grade 7 was not a tested grade in 2004-2005.

Subject: Reading Grade: 7 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	99	97	99	
% Advanced	91	85	79	84	
Number of students tested	198	196	194	191	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	100	98	96	
% Advanced	87	83	90	82	
Number of students tested	32	41	52	49	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	99	96	100	
% Advanced	85	85	65	76	
Number of students tested	65	71	71	58	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	95	93	
% Advanced	100	75	78	79	
Number of students tested	12	12	18	14	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			100	100	
% Advanced			100	100	
Number of students tested			11	12	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	99	98	98	
% Advanced	93	84	87	88	
Number of students tested	84	85	70	89	

Notes:
Grade 7 was not a tested grade in 2004-2005.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 8 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	98	98	98	98
% Advanced	93	81	88	85	87
Number of students tested	196	194	198	193	193
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	100	94	100
% Advanced	87	82	94	76	82
Number of students tested	36	54	46	33	38
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	96	98	96	97
% Advanced	91	68	76	74	78
Number of students tested	69	68	63	52	68
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	94	93	100	100
% Advanced	83	77	86	71	91
Number of students tested	12	17	12	17	19
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100	100		
% Advanced		100	100		
Number of students tested		12	12		
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	100	98	100	99
% Advanced	94	90	92	91	90
Number of students tested	84	69	89	95	84

Notes:

Subject: Reading Grade: 8 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: N/A Publisher: PA Dept of Education/DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	98	99	98
% Advanced	96	89	90	93	79
Number of students tested	195	194	198	193	193
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	100	97	97
% Advanced	100	89	91	88	82
Number of students tested	36	54	46	33	38
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	95	98	98	97
% Advanced	97	78	84	94	73
Number of students tested	69	68	63	52	68
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	100	100	100
% Advanced	92	77	87	94	100
Number of students tested	12	17	12	17	18
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100	100		
% Advanced		100	100		
Number of students tested		12	12		
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	100	100	99
% Advanced	96	97	93	94	81
Number of students tested	84	69	89	95	84

Notes: