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

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

Name of Principal: Mr. David Criscuolo

Official School Name: Tinicum School

School Mailing Address:
    First and Seneca Streets
    Essington, PA 19029-1116

County: Delaware   State School Code Number*: 000004847

Telephone: (610) 521-4450   Fax: (610) 521-5775

Web site/URL: www.interborosd.org   E-mail: criscud@interborosd.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. Nancy Hacker

District Name: Interboro   Tel: (610) 461-6700

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. Christopher Kelly

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)

4	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
	Middle/Junior high schools
1	High schools
	K-12 schools
5	**TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: __13192__

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

[   ] Urban or large central city
[X] 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	31	22	53
K			0	7	20	22	42
1	15	8	23	8	18	16	34
2	20	17	37	9			0
3	23	17	40	10			0
4	30	20	50	11			0
5	21	24	45	12			0
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					324

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 %	American Indian or Alaska Native
3 %	Asian
2 %	Black or African American
3 %	Hispanic or Latino
0 %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
91 %	White
1 %	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: __5__ %

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.	9
(2)	Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	6
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	15
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	321
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.047
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	4.673

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: __2__ %

Total number limited English proficient __6__

Number of languages represented: __4__

Specify languages:

Gujarti, Cambodian, Cantonese and Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: __44__%

            Total number students who qualify: __141__

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: __31__%

    Total Number of Students Served: __100__

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

1	Autism	0	Orthopedic Impairment
0	Deafness	1	Other Health Impaired
0	Deaf-Blindness	51	Specific Learning Disability
15	Emotional Disturbance	32	Speech or Language Impairment
0	Hearing Impairment	0	Traumatic Brain Injury
0	Mental Retardation	0	Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0	Multiple Disabilities	0	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)	2	0
Classroom teachers	15	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	15	2
Paraprofessionals	2	0
Support staff	25	2
Total number	59	4

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 __19__ :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	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Daily teacher attendance	96%	94%	95%	95%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	0%	16%	4%	10%	10%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

The 16%teacher turnover rate in 2007-2008 represents five positions. Three of those five positions were a result of retirement.

The 94% teacher attendance rate in 2007 - 2008 was primarily due to the fact that a physical education staff member was out for a lengthy amount of time with a medical condition.

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

PART III - SUMMARY

Tinicum School serves a blue collar community which has struggled under the recent economic downturn. 44% of the School's population receives free or reduced meals. However the families and staff of Tinicum School do not view the tough times as an excuse, but as an opportunity.

The mission statement of our School is:

"The Tinicum School Community is a partnership of teachers, students, parents, administrators, and concerned citizens. We are committed to providing a safe, healthy environment to meet the needs of all learners. We hold high expectations for all learners to achieve their potential. We are committed to fostering creativity and developing basic skills for life-long learning."

The School Community has supported our students on two major fronts, academic and behavioral. Academically we believe in data driven, individually designed, evidence-based instruction. The District administers numerous assessments (i.e. PSSA, 4Sight, DIBELS, etc.) to identify group and individual student strengths and areas of need. The School holds quarterly Data Team meetings that include the RtI teacher and our reading specialist as well as administrators and the classroom teachers. This partnership extends to the parents and students through individual student-teacher data centered conferences as well as parent teacher meetings and numerous community outreach evening programs.

Behaviorally the entire school community is in the process of adopting Positive Behavior Support and character education frameworks. This process is being developed through a large teacher committee, parent and student surveys and meetings as well as District-supported technological support and professional development. Our behavioral system is also data driven. As a school staff we look at individual student behaviors as well as areas of the school or times in the schedule that seem to be more troublesome than others. We have posted our behavioral expectations throughout the building including the classrooms, gym, cafeteria and main office. These posted expectations afford the staff opportunities to recognize our students in a positive way when we witness the shared target behaviors being met. We have also provided a minimum of two adults in every elementary homeroom in the morning to assist our students with their organizational skills.

The School-wide focus on academics and behavior has produced significant results. Although you will see more detailed academic growth in latter portions of this application our eighth grade students' scores illustrate our significant improvement. Five years ago only 52% of our eighth graders reached proficiency or better in Math and Reading. This past year we could boast of 83% proficiency in Math and 85% in Reading.

Although Tinicum School makes academic achievement and appropriate behavior our top priorities we do not ignore the other areas that contribute to the creation of well rounded citizens. The School boasts an award winning band and chorus in which approximately 70% of our fourth through eighth grade students participate. The students may also perform in our Drama Club, be a member of our Student Council or a reporter for the "Tinicum Times" school newspaper. The Interboro School District also fields numerous athletic teams for our seventh and eighth grade students. Tinicum School also provides students the opportunity to play intramural sports before the academic day begins. Staff members also play in the intramural league.

The staff of Tinicum School not only supports our students but their families as well. The Student Assistance Program helps families with issues such as drug and alcohol abuse, mental health services, physical and sexual abuse and economic support. The District implemented a breakfast program last year in order to better meet the needs of our community.

The Tinicum School community does not just have a mission statement. We believe we have a true mission – to support our kids in any way necessary in order to achieve academic and behavioral success.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

Adequate Yearly Progress for Pennsylvania elementary schools is based on attendance rates and standardized test scores. Tinicum School students in grades three through eight are assessed using The Pennsylvania State System of School Assessment (PSSA). There are four levels of performance in the PSSA. From highest to lowest, the four levels are as follows: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic. In order to reach AYP, a minimum of 56% of our students must score proficient or advanced in math and 63% must score proficient or advanced in reading. All of the data listed below is based on the PSSA test. (Additional information regarding PA state testing and performance levels can be found at: http://www.pde.state.pa.us). Our data is housed and may be manipulated at www.emetric.net.

In analyzing our PSSA Data, we review the following three areas for grades three through eight for mathematics and reading: overall student scores, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores, and special education student scores.

Mathematics (percentages refer to students scoring at the proficient level or better)

Grade three analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a four percent increase over a five year span, socio-economic disadvantaged percentages fluctuated from 50 percent to as high as 80 percent over a five year span, and special education students have had a 20 percent increase over the five year span.

Grade four analysis reports that overall school scores illustrates a 32 percent increase over the five year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had 22 percent increase over a three year span, and special education students have impressively had a 79 percent increase over the five year span.

Grade five analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 16 percent increase over the five year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had a 16 percent increase over a five year span, and special education students have had a 34 percent increase over the five year span.

Grade six analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 31 percent increase over the four year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had a 26 percent increase over a 4 year span, and special education students have demonstrated a 55 percent increase over the 4 year span.

Grade seven analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 26 percent increase over the four year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had 6 percent decrease over a four year span, and special education students have had a 34 percent increase over the 4 year span.

Grade eight analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 31 percent increase over the five year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had a19 percent increase over a five year span, and special education students have had a 31 percent increase over the five year span.

Reading (percentages refer to students scoring at the proficient level or better)

Grade three analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 6 percent increase over the five year span, socio-economic disadvantaged percentages of students reaching the benchmark have remained steady near the 60th percentile, and special education students have had a 40 percent increase over the five year span.

Grade four analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 19 percent increase over the five year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had a 25 percent decrease over three year span although students still met the benchmark, and special education students have demonstrated a 46 percent increase over the four year span.

Grade five analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 20 percent increase over the five year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had a 12 percent increase over five year span peaking at 92% in 2007-2008, and special education students have demonstrated a 39 percent increase over the five year span.

Grade six analysis reports that overall school scores have held steady. In 2009, an impressive 63% of students reached proficiency, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had a 19 percent increase over a three year span, and special education students have had a 12 percent increase over the three year span.

Grade seven analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 14 percent increase over the four year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had an 18 percent decrease over the three year span (although students still met the benchmark), and special education students have had 15 percent increase over the four year span.

Grade eight analysis reports that overall school scores illustrate a 33 percent increase over the five year span, socio-economic disadvantaged student scores have had a 17 percent increase over a five year span, special education students have demonstrated a 51 percent increase over the five year span.

Conclusions: PSSA data illustrates a substantial upward trend as it pertains to student achievement in math and reading. Furthermore, although our percentage of socio-economically disadvantage and special education student population continues to increase, student achievement in reading and math continues to increase with these students. All grades have demonstrated an increase of students achieving proficiency, except for sixth grade. In order to tackle this area, we have started a reading supplementary program called Corrective Reading, assigned a new special education teacher, and implemented a co-teaching model.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Data drives instruction. That belief is the force behind Tinicum School's approach to assessment. Understanding student strengths and needs allow our teachers to design instruction effectively. Our school is student-centered and our philosophy is a belief in differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students in a positive environment.

The Interboro School District follows an Assessment Calendar that monitors all student progress in kindergarten through grade 12. Various assessments are administered two to four times per year in multiple academic areas. The results are shared and discussed at grade-level data team meetings where decisions regarding whole class, small group and individual interventions are made.

In addition to our district assessments, Tinicum School progress monitors students at risk over short periods of time. The purpose of progress monitoring is to look at student achievement in relation to specific intervention programs. The data collected through progress monitoring provides teachers with immediate feedback in regards to instruction. When a student is not making adequate progress the data team will make adjustments to the intervention plan in order to better support the student.

As a student transitions from kindergarten to fifth grade an Assessment Portfolio follows them on their journey. This portfolio contains district assessments, progress monitoring data, intervention information, and student work samples. Cross grade-level teams meet every June to discuss student assessment data and form class groups for the following September. Instructional strategies and interventions are shared to ensure the transition from grade to grade is seamless.

Tinicum School's goal is academic achievement for all students, but the road to achievement is not always a smooth ride. As educators it is our responsibility to use assessment results to better understand our students' strengths and weaknesses. Our teachers differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all learners. Data drives instruction, but the key is finding what works for each student.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Communication is at the heart of everything that Tinicum School does. The professional staff of Tinicum School provide guardians and, most importantly, the students with up to date feedback based on numerous assessments. Pennsylvania's state test, the PSSA, is administered in the spring of every school year. Obviously, the parents receive those scores as soon as the state makes them available to us, but a lot is done before we celebrate our recent successes on the state test.

The Interboro School District also administers 4Sight testing three times a year to all students in grades three through eight. This allows our school data teams to monitor the progress of every child throughout the year so we can apply safety net programs, such as tutoring, mentoring, or small group instruction. The growth of the students is communicated to the parents during our two parent conference weeks. Traditional report cards are given out four times a year and coincide with the parent conference weeks. The students are informed of their progress through one on one teacher-student conferences after the 4Sight administrations. Our Title I reading specialist holds numerous parent education nights throughout the year that cover a wide array of topics from an explanation of assessments for elementary age children such as DIBELS and running records to tips on how to incorporate reading in the home. Good data is worthless if it is not interpreted correctly. That is why we believe it is important to educate the community about the data before they see a lot of numbers in the local newspaper that they don't fully understand.

In addition to the aforementioned strategies we also communicate about our students' performance with some other tools. Weekly communication folders and student planners allow for a smooth and organized flow of information between home and school.

4. **Sharing Success:**

Tinicum School has been sharing its successes and setbacks with other schools within the District for the past three years. This sharing has taken place in numerous settings. The administrators discuss and present data, strategies, safety nets, tools and of course opinions at formally planned Administrative Council meetings. Topics in the past have included state testing reports, methods for running Data Teams, and the value-added growth system known as PVAAS in the state of Pennsylvania.

Formal presentations have been made by the School's administrators at the monthly School Board Curriculum Committee meetings. Numerous other Tinicum staff members besides the administrators have shared their experiences in their particular areas of expertise. These include, but are not limited to, our reading specialist, RtI instructor and math paraprofessional.

Our District also has Subject Area Coordinators. These positions are held by full-time teachers who oversee their subject area at the District level. Tinicum is fortunate enough to have three of these coordinators on staff. Every teacher serves on a curriculum committee. Each subject area is on a five year review cycle to ensure that the methods and materials never become outdated. Each year of the five year cycle contains specific duties for the committees to accomplish including research, data gathering, purchasing, etc. Through this process, our staff shares our story with all of the other schools in our District.

If Tinicum School were fortunate enough to be named a Blue Ribbon School, we would be prepared to share our experiences with any educational institution that could benefit from our continuing journey. We assume that the publicity that would surround a Blue Ribbon commendation would lead to an increase in outreach from our staff and we are more than willing to share.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

Math:

Our elementary students use the Harcourt HSP Mathematics program. Harcourt's program is standards based and builds off of the Pennsylvania State System of Assessment with a variety of resources that are Pennsylvania based.

Many assessments are teacher generated based on a differentiated model within the classroom or are program based. 4Sight Benchmark Assessments are administered three times each school year to help match data to instruction. The Pennsylvania State System of Assessment (PSSA) provides our teachers with feedback on whether the standards were addressed in the classroom and is utilized as an instructional learning tool for teachers.

Our middle school department uses the McDougal Littell series for Pennsylvania. The books we use include Courses One through Three, as well as Algebra I for our accelerated eighth grade math program. The series is aligned with our state standards. To increase our student's abilities to meet standards, our school has piloted a program where sixth grade students have been given math-blocked schedules.

Performing Arts:

In the area of music, teachers adhere closely to the National Standards for Music Education for a comprehensive approach to a broad musical experience. The current text used is Silver, Burdett, and Ginn. Students are assessed through formal text-created activities, student feedback rubrics, as well as teacher observation under the realm of National Standards.

Chorus participation starts in first and second grade, through choral-type activities and small programs twice a year. In fourth and fifth grade, students are all welcome to join our 'Intermediate Chorus', which practices once a week. Ninety-eight percent of students in these two grades participate and perform in annual winter and spring concerts. Our Middle School Chorus (grades 6-8) includes about seventy-five percent of our students.

Drama Club is an extra-curricular activity that allows our fourth through eighth graders to engage in every part of play production. Students audition for speaking and singing roles, and everyone who auditions is given a part in the play. Traditionally, students perform two shows – one for the students and one for the community.

Language Arts:

Tinicum School's Language Arts curriculum is directly aligned with the Pennsylvania State Academic Standards for Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening, and our instruction and assessment techniques are designed and implemented based upon the state's assessment anchors.

These essential communication skills are taught through an integrated, developmental, and student-centered Language Arts curriculum rooted in the Pennsylvania State Standards. Data from a variety of assessments (emergent reader checklist, running records, D.I.B.E.L.S, developmental Spelling, writing assessment, 4 Sight assessments, publisher's tests, teacher-made assessments, portfolios, observations and conferencing, and P.S.S.A.) is used to make instructional decisions to meet students' diverse learning needs.

Instruction is delivered through the use of the McDougal Littell Language of Literature, Bridges to Literature, and the Language Network Series, Novels, Harcourt Trophies Guided Reading, Project Read, L.L.I, Corrective Reading, Read Naturally, Lexia, Kid Writing, Word Walls, Writing Workshop, Touchstone Books, Mentor Texts, and 4-Square Writing.

 Science:

The Science Curriculum at Tinicum School follows the Pennsylvania State Standards-Based content. Our teachers use the Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Series for instruction. Students receive courses in ecosystems scientific method, solar system, atoms, the periodic table, as well as other related topics. Performance-based assessments, rubric-based projects, lab assignments, reinforcement activities, writing assignments, and state assessments are utilized throughout the science curriculum.

Social Studies:

The Social Studies curriculum at Tinicum School is aligned with the Pennsylvania State Social Studies Standards and assessed through tests, quizzes, homework assignments and quarterly projects. Geography, culture, economics, US History and World History are a just a few of the enriching topics students experience at Tinicum School.

Tinicum School and the Interboro School District do not currently have a foreign language program at the middle school level.

2a. **(Elementary Schools) Reading**:
(This question is for elementary schools only)

Tinicum School's elementary language arts curriculum is based on the Pennsylvania State Standards in reading, writing, speaking & listening. The curriculum is broken down by standard and grade-level with smooth transitions, increasing benchmarks and clear expectations. We take a balanced literacy approach to reading instruction with an emphasis on individual student success. Although we look for a combination of phonics-based instruction and whole language exposure to great literature, the recipe may differ from student to student.

Our literacy framework incorporates all five core reading skills determined essential by the National Reading Panel for reading proficiency. These skills are phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. The framework describes which research-based programs and materials should be used to target students who are performing at various instructional levels (eg. below basic/basic, proficient, advanced). This allows our teachers to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners while being consistent from one classroom to the next.

The curriculum is the glue that holds our literacy framework together. It was designed to build knowledge and understanding from grade to grade to ensure students are able to gain and persist in all skill areas. The assessment schedule supports the curriculum by monitoring student progress based on the state standards and academic benchmarks. Data teams implement interventions to support students who are not making adequate progress.

In addition to district programs such as Harcourt Trophies and Project Read, classroom teachers have access to a wealth of material in our Reading Room. Tinicum School has an extensive collection of leveled guided reading books in a variety of genres and topics. Big books, shared reading posters, mentor texts, professional development books, language arts games and fluency materials are organized and easily accessible. There are student, teacher and parent lending libraries as well. The Reading Room is a wonderful resource to support Tinicum School's reading curriculum and our families.

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

Tinicum School strives to address the needs of all students in the middle school English language curriculum. This curriculum focuses on the Pennsylvania standards in reading, writing, speaking, and listening, while differentiating instruction to meet individual student needs. Students are exposed to a variety of novels, short stories, myths, poems, and dramas. Writing instruction involves responses to these reading activities, as well as exposure to different types of writing and essays, grammar, and editing skills. The language arts teachers incorporate technology through the use of laptop carts, LCD projectors, and Promethean interactive whiteboards.

In an effort to improve the reading skills of students who read below grade level, Tinicum has instituted a variety of strategies and programs. The middle school has adopted a co-teaching model to offer small-group instruction in the Corrective Reading program for students reading below grade level. This program focuses on both fluency and comprehension difficulties. Middle school data teams consisting of the core area teachers meet regularly to discuss standardized test results in reading and to identify struggling students. These students are invited to attend weekly after-school tutoring sessions tailored to the individual needs of the students involved, free of charge to their families. A reward system has been established to encourage regular attendance.

The English language curriculum also extends beyond the language arts classrooms at Tinicum School. In an effort to promote reading comprehension across all content areas, the science and social studies teachers are receiving training together with the language arts and special education teachers in the Reading for Understanding program. Through this program, students learn strategies and graphic organizers to help them become active readers in all content areas.

The English language curriculum at Tinicum School is evident across all content areas and addresses the needs of the diverse learners in our community.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

Technology has been an integral part of the curriculum at Tinicum School. In the last five years Tinicum has gone from one computer lab to five. We now have four laptop carts stationed in various classrooms and one stationary computer lab. Teachers are constantly using the laptop carts within their classrooms to maximize technology in the most useful way.

For many years the computer lab was isolated from the library. Approximately four years ago the computer lab was moved next to the library in an effort to streamline the use of both areas. Our school has one SMART Board, and it is located in the computer lab. This SMART Board is shared in the classrooms if teachers want to use it. A desktop projector, a screen and whiteboard are available to use for computer lessons. In the last several years, special education classrooms began receiving laptop computers to use with the students. At the same time our school received our first laptop cart with twenty computers that were used for middle school classes. The following year we received another laptop cart, and finally two more laptop carts this year (one with thirty computers). Tinicum now has four laptop carts that are used in the elementary and middle school classrooms. All of the new hardware has enabled five classrooms to utilize the computers at the same time, dramatically increasing our hardware capacity. This has allowed our students to work on exciting projects, including website development, Power Point presentations, making brochures in Microsoft Publisher, and creating story webs in Kidspiration and Inspiration.

Last year teachers began receiving Promethean boards in their classrooms and LCD projectors. This year wireless access was provided throughout the school. Next, Tinicum plans to modernize our hardware, with the goal of replacing existing desktop computers with laptop computers.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

Tinicum School is committed to providing a positive learning environment for all students. Focusing on the standards while monitoring student progress allows our data teams to design intervention effectively and differentiate instruction as needed. Our district's fall benchmark assessments are the first step to identifying the diverse needs of our subgroups. Students who fall below the benchmark are identified, areas of need are targeted and intervention plans are put into place.

The Response to Intervention program (RtI) supports students who are struggling to succeed in school. Although the data meetings are the core of our referral process, teachers and parents can also recommend students for RtI support. Child study meetings take place on a weekly basis to discuss student progress and fine-tune intervention plans.

Tier I, classroom-based interventions, are the first step. Teachers use the Literacy Framework previously discussed to differentiate instruction while staying consistent with grade partners across the district. Title I services are considered Tier II or Tier III depending on the amount of intervention provided. These interventions supplement good classroom instruction.

Special Education services are Tinicum School's highest level of support when a student qualifies for an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). The level of service is contingent on the student's needs. We look for the least restrictive environment and encourage our students to participate with their peers as much as possible with accommodations and modifications to the curriculum.

There are a variety ways our teachers differentiate instruction effectively. Students may be part of a flexible group for the purpose of remediation or review. Our reading program, Harcourt Trophies includes a below-level and intervention text. Fundations (phonological awareness) and Leveled Literacy Intervention (guided reading) are research-based programs used in first and second grades. Quick Reads is used for fluency and Making Connections is our comprehension intervention for intermediate and middle school students. Corrective Reading is implemented in our Special Education classrooms in fourth through eighth grade. Tinicum School uses technology to remediate students using computer-based programs such as Lexia, Read Naturally and Successmaker.

5. **Professional Development:**

Supported by Interboro School District, Tinicum School has ample opportunities for teachers to develop their craft as educators. During the school year, the last Wednesday of every month is devoted to professional development. Students have an early dismissal and teachers participate in a two hour professional development session. This time is thoroughly planned by department leaders. Therefore, teachers are working within their departments on improving standards-based curriculum, programs, and pedagogy skills to enhance student achievement.

Teachers also complete fourteen hours of Contracted Staff Development throughout every school year. Professional development opportunities are offered to teachers through the Interboro School District, colleges, educational agencies, Delaware County Intermediate Unit, etc. For example, Interboro school District is committed to technology infusion within the general curriculum. Therefore, Tinicum Schools' teachers have acquired extensive training with the use of promethean boards, internet, and computer software, which directly benefits the students' education.

Pennsylvania is committed to professional development of administrators, teachers, and special education assistants. Educators must complete a specific number of professional development hours that are connected to the staff members' certification. For example, every five year cycle, teachers must complete a total number of one hundred and eighty hours of professional development in the area of their certification.

Educating students to be life-long learners is a goal of the Tinicum School's staff. Staff members are encouraged and required by the school, district, and the state to be life-long learners as educators.

6.   **School Leadership:**

Our principal is a hands-on leader. He is constantly listening to and communicating with staff, parents and students, to ensure that the best decisions are made for everyone - academically, socially and emotionally. He has created various avenues for discussion on how to improve student achievement, including weekly faculty meetings, and quarterly data team meetings. Discussions during those meetings revolve around how students are performing in class and on state assessments, and what changes need to be implemented to improve current achievement levels.   When individual students are having academic difficulties, he will head meetings with faculty, parents, and/or students to discuss and brainstorm ways to support that student on all levels. The discussions may include emotional and behavioral concerns, but all topics have the focus of helping each student be academically successful.

Our elementary and middle school after-school homework clubs and tutoring programs continue to be a success with high student participation for the second year running. We also have begun the process of becoming a school that follows a Positive Behavior Support model, with Character Educational facets incorporated into our school climate, both initiated by our Vice-Principal and School Counselor, and supported by our Principal. His understanding that academic achievement will not happen without socially and emotionally sound students is evident through the support of such endeavors. Our leadership team inspires those who work in the building to want to make it a better learning environment for our students and enables teachers and staff to develop and implement programs for the good of the students through their constant example and support.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics   Grade: 3   Test: PA System of School Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009   Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	76	64	84	79
% Advanced	37	31	29	60	50
Number of students tested	46	41	42	37	34
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	69	50		
% Advanced	32	8	19		
Number of students tested	19	13	16		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60	50			40
% Advanced	20	0			10
Number of students tested	10	14			10
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

DRC was the publisher for the 2008-2009 school year.

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: PA System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009 Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	74	73	71	87	68
% Advanced	17	10	14	62	44
Number of students tested	46	41	42	37	34
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63	62	50		
% Advanced	0	0	6		
Number of students tested	19	13	16		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	40	43			
% Advanced	10	0			
Number of students tested	10	14			
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

DRC was the publisher for the 2008-2009 school year.

Subject: Mathematics   Grade: 4   Test: PA System of School Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009   Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	75	82	66	
% Advanced	66	52	27	34	
Number of students tested	41	44	34	35	
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	60			
% Advanced	43	40			
Number of students tested	14	15			
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	52			
% Advanced	39	24			
Number of students tested	13	21			
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The state of Pennsylvania did not test 4th grade in Reading and Math in the 2004-2005 school year.

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: PA System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009 Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	71	82	54	
% Advanced	32	25	27	29	
Number of students tested	41	44	34	35	
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	47			
% Advanced	14	0			
Number of students tested	14	15		0	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	48			
% Advanced	8	14			
Number of students tested	13	21			
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
The state of Pennsylvania did not test 4th grade in Reading and Math in the 2004-2005 school year.

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Mathematics   Grade: 5   Test: PA System of School Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009   Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	84	72	68	63
% Advanced	63	60	50	40	34
Number of students tested	43	37	32	38	38
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	71	92			55
% Advanced	53	75			36
Number of students tested	17	12			11
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63	60		15	
% Advanced	37	47		0	
Number of students tested	19	15		13	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Reading   Grade: 5   Test: PA System Of School Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009   Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	75	84	44	53	55
% Advanced	33	38	13	13	16
Number of students tested	43	37	32	38	38
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	58	92			46
% Advanced	18	33			9
Number of students tested	17	12			11
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	53	60		23	
% Advanced	21	27		0	
Number of students tested	19	15		13	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Mathematics   Grade: 6   Test: PA System of School Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009   Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	79	50	65	48	
% Advanced	34	32	25	17	
Number of students tested	38	34	40	42	
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80	54	54		
% Advanced	35	31	15		
Number of students tested	20	13	13		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	58	9	60		
% Advanced	25	9	40		
Number of students tested	12	11	15		
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The state of Pennsylvania did not test 6th grade in Reading and Math in the 2004-2005 school year.

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Reading   Grade: 6   Test: PA System of School Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009   Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	63	53	60	64	
% Advanced	37	21	18	29	
Number of students tested	38	34	40	42	
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	65	46	46		
% Advanced	35	31	8		
Number of students tested	20	13	13		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	18	27		
% Advanced	8	18	7		
Number of students tested	12	11	15		
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

The state of Pennsylvania did not test 6th grade in Reading and Math in the 2004-2005 school year.

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Mathematics   Grade: 7   Test: PA System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009   Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	78	50	34	
% Advanced	22	33	15	9	
Number of students tested	32	40	40	64	
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	50	64		
% Advanced	14	25	18		
Number of students tested	14	12	11		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		56	39	10	
% Advanced		28	8	0	
Number of students tested		18	13	21	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
The state of Pennsylvania did not test 7th grade in Reading and Math in the 2004-2005 school year.

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Reading Grade: 7 Test: PA System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009 Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	66	73	68	52	
% Advanced	38	23	25	22	
Number of students tested	32	40	40	64	
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	64	50	82		
% Advanced	43	8	36		
Number of students tested	14	12	11		
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		39	23	10	
% Advanced		11	0	0	
Number of students tested		18	13	21	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
The state of Pennsylvania did not test 7th grade in Reading and Math in the 2004-2005 school year.

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Mathematics   Grade: 8   Test: PA System of School Assessment

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009   Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	71	42	33	52
% Advanced	35	19	11	7	15
Number of students tested	40	52	64	45	66
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	64	27		50
% Advanced	25	14	0		14
Number of students tested	16	22	11		22
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	53	35	23	36
% Advanced	33	0	4	15	4
Number of students tested	18	17	26	13	25
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.

Subject: Reading   Grade: 8   Test: PA System of School Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2009   Publisher: DRC

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Apr	Mar	Mar	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	73	63	60	52
% Advanced	50	33	25	27	11
Number of students tested	40	52	64	45	66
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. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	73	73		64
% Advanced	31	23	18		9
Number of students tested	16	22	11		22
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	67	41	54	23	16
% Advanced	17	0	4	8	0
Number of students tested	18	17	26	13	25
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
No Economically Disadvantaged Data available on emetric.net web site for the 2005-2006 school year.