

U.S. Department of Education
2013 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program
A Public School - 13PA2

School Type (Public Schools): Charter Title 1 Magnet Choice

Name of Principal: Mr. John Lee Jr.

Official School Name: Southmoreland Elementary School

School Mailing Address: 100 Scottie Way
Scottdale, PA 15683-1048

County: Westmoreland State School Code Number*: 6932

Telephone: (724) 887-2021 E-mail: leej@southmoreland.net

Fax: (724) 887-2025 Web site/URL: http://www.southmoreland.net

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

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Dr. John Molnar Superintendent e-mail: molnarj@southmoreland.net

District Name: Southmoreland District Phone: (724) 887-2000

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

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Levi Miller

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)

**Non-Public 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, Director, National Blue Ribbon Schools (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, National 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 configuration 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 (AYP) or its equivalent 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 AYP requirement or its equivalent in the 2012-2013 school year. Meeting AYP or its equivalent must be certified by the state. Any AYP status appeals must be 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 foreign language courses.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2007 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for that period.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 or 2012.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. 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.
11. 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

1. Number of schools in the district 2 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
1 Middle/Junior high schools
1 High schools
0 K-12 schools
4 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 11573

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Small city or town in a rural area
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 15
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2012 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|----------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 82 | 72 | 154 |
| 3 | 60 | 67 | 127 |
| 4 | 78 | 81 | 159 |
| 5 | 66 | 85 | 151 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total in Applying School: | | | 591 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
1 % Asian
2 % Black or African American
1 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
96 % White
0 % 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 2011-2012 school year: 17%

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

| Step | Description | Value |
|------|---|-------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year. | 33 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year. | 61 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]. | 94 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2011 | 568 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4). | 0.17 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100. | 17 |

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school: 0%

Total number of ELL students in the school: 3

Number of non-English languages represented: 2

Specify non-English languages:

Chinese, Spanish

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 49%

Total number of students who qualify: 290

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-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 20%

Total number of students served: 117

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

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>14</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>14</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>28</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>3</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>45</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>4</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>6</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed |

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

| | <u>Full-Time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Administrator(s) | <u>1</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Classroom teachers | <u>25</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Resource teachers/specialists (e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.) | <u>9</u> | <u>10</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>6</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Support staff (e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.) | <u>11</u> | <u>3</u> |
| Total number | <u>52</u> | <u>13</u> |

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

24:1

13. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| High school graduation rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

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

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2012.

Graduating class size: _____

Enrolled in a 4-year college or university _____%

Enrolled in a community college _____%

Enrolled in vocational training _____%

Found employment _____%

Military service _____%

Other _____%

Total _____**0%**

15. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award:

No

Yes

If yes, what was the year of the award?

PART III - SUMMARY

The mission of Southmoreland Elementary School is simply High Quality Learning for All. This five-word statement was greatly reduced in length from the one previous, yet it holds more power in terms of the potential it yields for defining who we are and from where we have come as a district.

Located 49 miles southeast of Pittsburgh, Southmoreland School District was formed by the 1964 jointure of the Scottdale and East Huntingdon School Districts. The District is comprised of four small political subdivisions in two separate counties: East Huntingdon Township and Scottdale Borough in southern Westmoreland County and Everson Borough and Upper Tyrone Township in northern Fayette County. The total area of the school district is 42 square miles, and the 2010 census population was 15,199. Fayette County is one of the poorest counties in the state, and the different measures of income (median household, per capita, and mean earnings) are all below the state and national numbers. Although the District compares favorably for percentages of high school graduates to the state and nation, it is significantly below all the areas of comparison for bachelor's degrees and higher.

This rural community has been heavily influenced throughout its history by the agricultural, coal, railroad, and manufacturing industries. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Scottdale, Pennsylvania was the center of the Henry Clay Frick coke interests. This fuel derivative of coal, used in the steel-making process, provided the region with a brief period of affluence. Approximately 30,000 coke ovens in southwestern Pennsylvania were surrounded by hundreds of coal mines, and Scottdale was considered the financial center of the county. The area's economy declined, however, prior to the Great Depression and has never recovered. The town's population decreased to just over 4,000 since reaching its peak of over 6,000 in 1940.

Southmoreland Elementary School, located in Scottdale, is comprised of grades two through five with a population of 600 students, 49% of whom are economically disadvantaged. The school fell into School Improvement in 2008 under No Child Left Behind because of low student achievement in reading and math. In 2008-2009, SES implemented Dr. Richard DuFour's Professional Learning Community model and began to build a collaborative culture with a focus on learning for everyone within the organization. Dr. DuFour defines a PLC as "an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve" (*Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work*, DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Many, p. 11, 2010). Teachers embrace high levels of learning for all students as our fundamental mission. To this end, team meetings consisting of teachers, administrators, and guidance counselors occur as a routine, regular way of conducting business. This way of behaving is now embedded in our culture. These team meetings are the engine that drives the improvement process at Southmoreland Elementary School. Teachers adhere to the "Big Ideas" of a Professional Learning Community with fidelity. The essence of the process is threefold: 1) Belief that the purpose of our school is to ensure that all students learn at high levels; 2) ensuring high levels of learning requires a collaborative effort; and 3) using results — evidence of student learning — to inform and improve our professional practice and identify students who need intervention or enrichment.

In 2008, 73% of Southmoreland Elementary students were proficient or advanced in math, 61% in reading, and 82% in science. Today, SES is one of the most improved schools in the Commonwealth. In 2012, 93% of students were proficient or advanced in math, 82% in reading, and 98% in science. Additionally, when examined against other schools, SES compares very favorably. For example, Southmoreland's fourth grade students rank 48th in achievement out of 306 elementary schools in the five-county Pittsburgh region (*Pittsburgh Business Times' 2012 Guide to Western Pennsylvania Schools*). This is an improvement from 120th the previous year.

The notion that socioeconomic status was a predictor of student learning went largely unchallenged throughout most of American history. Robert Marzano's research concludes, however, that not only do schools have significant impact on student achievement, but "schools that are highly effective produce results that almost entirely overcome the effects of student backgrounds" (What works in schools: Translating research into action. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. 2003, p. 7). Although 49% of the students are economically disadvantaged, SES still outperformed 81% of all schools in the Commonwealth last year.

The culture of Southmoreland Elementary School has changed drastically over the past five years, from a school characterized by teacher isolation to a school where constant collaboration is the norm today. Teachers have embraced this transformation toward shared leadership and have enthusiastically accepted the challenge of becoming a true learning organization dedicated to high student achievement.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

A. Southmoreland Elementary School has established itself as one of the most improved schools in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as determined by the accountability measure that is the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA). Areas tested include Reading and Mathematics in grades 3-5, Science in grade 4, and Writing in grade 5. There are four levels of performance that students can achieve on each test: advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic. The state determines whether a school makes Adequate Yearly Progress based on the percentage of students that are proficient/advanced on the yearly assessment. Included in the AYP determination is the yearly average attendance rate of the school. Over the past five years, SES has exceeded the benchmark scores in each of the tested grades. Additionally, our school has consistently scored significantly above the state testing average for each subject and grade level. The school's yearly attendance average has consistently been in the 96% range while the state requires schools to have a minimum average of 90% attendance. Within both Fayette and Westmoreland Counties, we outperform many of the surrounding districts and outperform all with similar socioeconomic characteristics.

Within the school, several other assessments are utilized to measure student learning. The 4Sight test in Reading and Mathematics is administered several times a year to evaluate our students' progress in each subject area. Teachers analyze the data from the 4Sight and PSSA to determine intervention strategies based upon student learning needs.

B. In 2007-2008, Southmoreland Elementary was placed in School Improvement, meaning that adequate yearly progress was not achieved in consecutive years. During 2008-2009, Dr. Richard DuFour's Professional Learning Community model of school improvement through collective capacity building was implemented.

For the past five years, student achievement as measured by the PSSA has increased dramatically. The percentage of advanced and proficient readers in Grade 5 increased from 50% in 2008 to 81% in 2012. Similarly, in Grade 4, reading proficiency increased from 57% in 2008 to 82% in 2012 and in Grade 3, reading proficiency increased from 79% in 2008 to 84% in 2012.

In mathematics, a similar pattern of improvement is evident. The percentage of advanced and proficient math students in Grade 5 increased from 57% in 2008 to 91% in 2012. Similarly, in Grade 4, math proficiency increased from 80% in 2008 to 95% in 2012 and in Grade 3, math proficiency increased from 87% in 2008 to 92% in 2012.

Since 2008, SES has strong evidence that students are learning at higher levels. In reading, from 2008-2012, the percentage of advanced readers in Grade 5 increased from 12% to 41%. Grade 4 showed improvement from 22% to 43%, and Grade 3 increased from 13% to 34%. A comparable pattern exists in Math. In 5th grade Math, from 2008-2012, the percentage of advanced math students increased from 31% to 64%. Grade 4 showed improvement from 41% to 74%, and Grade 3 improved from 36% to 67%.

Lastly, a shared goal of both Southmoreland School District and Southmoreland Elementary School is to eliminate the gap in student achievement that is connected to socioeconomic status. In 2012, mathematics proficiency for all students at SES was 93% versus 89% for our economically disadvantaged students. In reading, the proficiency levels for those two groups are 82% and 73%, respectively. These figures represent both an improvement from our percentages in 2008 and show an overall reduction in the achievement gap from 2008.

There are many factors that contribute to our significant gains in student achievement. During the past five years, the implementation of Dr. Richard DuFour's Professional Learning Communities model has significantly impacted the culture of Southmoreland Elementary School. In 2008, all teachers were organized into teams that focus on learning and results in collaborative settings. Team meetings are a regular and routine part of the school day and are the foundation of Southmoreland Elementary School. Within those collaborative structures, teachers engage in Dr. DuFour's "Team Learning Process" with beautiful redundancy. Teams collectively establish essential learnings for each course, map curriculum, and develop multiple common assessments with specific benchmarks. They then analyze the results of those assessments so they may identify struggling learners and develop programmatic improvement strategies. Finally, teams collaboratively create SMART goals that reflect their current realities and results.

Additionally, in 2011, a daily 30-minute Intervention/Enrichment period was established school wide. No new instruction is provided during this time, but rather students are regrouped among all the team's teachers to receive skill intervention and/or enrichment depending on present levels of learning. In 2012, Individual Student Learning Plans were created to assist non-proficient readers. Each grade level team works collaboratively in developing the ISLPs. These plans include longitudinal data on individual student growth, learning strategies to address skill deficits, and appropriate assessments that measure improved student learning and the effectiveness of the interventions. Also, in 2012, to align with the district's vision of enhancing the focus on learning for all, principal-led professional development occurs as a means of enhancing collective capacity. This year, the principal engages in book discussions at the team level. At present, the SES faculty is completing Carol Dweck's *Mindset*, and will soon begin Rick DuFour's *Learning by Doing*.

2. Using Assessment Results:

The team learning process provides the structure needed for teachers to identify curricular "big ideas," to develop common formative and summative assessments and to evaluate the data to make decisions on student readiness and program effectiveness. Dr. Richard DuFour writes that collaborative teams are "the primary engine of [our] school improvement efforts" (Schmoker, 2004). This is the hallmark of successful schools and the bedrock of Southmoreland Elementary School's tremendous growth over the past five years.

Teachers on grade level teams begin the team learning process annually by identifying the essential outcomes for each of the content areas. They select several "power standards" from our current state standards which are then unpacked, reviewed, and established as benchmarks for student growth and learning during the semester or school year. The teams map the curriculum and pacing for those skills is established and followed to allow for reliability and comparison in results. Based upon those power standards, teachers write common formative and summative assessments together and then share their student results data with their peers during weekly curriculum meetings. It is here that teachers can share best practice, select students for Intervention and Enrichment (I/E), and discuss how nonproficient students will be supported and evaluated using our Individual Student Learning Plans (ISLPs). This process ensures that students receive the guaranteed, viable curriculum that our teachers agree all students must have to be successful in their coursework going forward.

Teams use their teacher-developed item analysis tools to identify gaps in understanding or concepts that may not have been fully understood by students. Again, working collaboratively, teachers complete the item analyses and share them in their curriculum meetings. In this way, teachers may discuss how a concept might better be taught to all of our students or a collective decision will be made on the validity of a test question that students across the board might not have answered correctly. Assessments are only useful if they accurately reflect student learning, and teams routinely discuss the efficacy of their team-built assessments. Additionally, the teachers at Southmoreland Elementary discuss and create intervention strategies that will be tracked and recorded on ISLPs. Over time, those intervention strategies are incorporated into instruction as they have been proven to be high leverage techniques for increased

student learning. In our Student Support meetings, counselors and teachers discuss students in broader contexts, considering the antecedents to student behaviors and creating plans to address those issues.

The teachers at Southmoreland Elementary School are well trained in the application of Pennsylvania Value-Added Assessment System (PVAAS) data. Our teams use that data to identify from the outset of the year the at-risk learners and to structure interventions to close those gaps found in the formal data provided by the PSSA. Students at SES take the 4Sight tests quarterly, and those results are disseminated to the teams for their review as well. 4Sight data walls are found throughout the school, and these representations promote student awareness of each student's growth over time. During conferences, teachers share benchmark, value added and summative assessment data with parents as they review the student's current progress and achievement together. Parents also see our data walls and can observe the growth of the classrooms as they visit our school throughout the year.

It is important to note that our team learning process is cyclical and ongoing. It is fluid and permits the team to make adjustments within the structure of the standards. As teachers move through the cycle, new approaches are considered and implemented while less successful techniques may be modified or eliminated. In this way, we can truly be prescriptive in our approach to delivering curriculum, assessing learning, and monitoring our system's efficacy.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

With the amazing success in improving student learning at Southmoreland Elementary School and throughout the district, we have been called upon frequently to provide professional development to others. Southmoreland is one of the few schools and districts in America whose students perform at a level much higher than our key demographic indicators would suggest and we accept as a duty the responsibility to share our journey with others.

Vertical alignment is a critical component in sharing lessons learned. Our focus on collaboration requires that grade level teams work together but also requires that teams across grade levels conduct action research and share best practices. Transition grades (1-2 and 5-6) also collaborate to discuss learning progressions and curricular alignment.

In 2011-12, district administrators presented Southmoreland's implementation of the PLC model at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. These presentations occurred at the Title I-Improving School Performance Conference, PASA-PSBA School Leadership Conference, and the PA Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Conference. Regionally, we have presented at the Westmoreland County Education Summit, Westmoreland Intermediate Unit Curriculum Council, Westmoreland County Science Curriculum Council, North Allegheny School District, and Franklin Regional School District. Occasionally, school districts from Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the nation contact us to request advice and counsel as they begin their journeys.

All of our presentations have been designed to teach practitioners how the PLC model of system improvement through collective capacity building is established and monitored at the school and district levels. In sharing our results and strategies, we have developed a deep sense of purpose and responsibility for assisting others in their efforts to provide high quality learning for all students.

4. Engaging Families and Communities:

Throughout the course of the year, the collaboration between school, families and the community is also cyclical and ongoing. Programs that bring involvement from our community and from our parents are fundamental to our mission of creating a culture of learning for all. Activities such as our Open House afford our parents the opportunity to meet teachers, visit the school and attend our Book Fair. Providing parents with a user ID for their child allows them to use our online Parent Portal to monitor a

variety of areas involving their children. They are able to see upcoming assignments, completed assignments with grading information, comparisons for individual grades to class averages, attendance, notes from staff, staff lists and email links, school-level calendars, student specific calendars, and more. This access allows involved parents to see real-time data and communicate concerns or positive feedback in a more timely and productive way. Additionally, an active PTA provides continued support in funding annual field trips, assessment incentives, volunteers for programs such as Accelerated Reader, and numerous activities that encourage academic success for SES students. Monthly meetings often include community guest speakers who donate their time and talents.

A long-term partnership forged with Scottdale Bank and Trust has enabled our school to purchase interactive learning technology including electronic student response systems and a newly outfitted computer lab. We reciprocate that investment by honoring the commitment made by the Scottdale Bank and Trust through such experiences as Banking at School and our partnership with the Geyer Performing Arts Center, both of which reflect the values of the bank's board of directors.

Kindergarten students, through a local grant, benefit from visits to the Westmoreland Museum of Art that encourage art appreciation and participation in the museum's primary programs. All elementary students participate in the annual Arts Night and Reflections Programs which invite community artists and musicians to promote, share and display their talents.

Students are also encouraged to help others. The charitable efforts SES students support include the Susan G. Komen Foundation, Alex's Lemonade Stand for Cancer, Hoops for Hearts, Thanksgiving Food Drive, the Salvation Army, a local women's shelter, McTeacher's Night for Autism, and toy donations for Madisyn's Angels, benefiting local children.

Our music department honors veterans by performing patriotic songs and skits, providing a luncheon and photographing veterans with their school-aged relatives on Veterans' Day. The United Way helps to fund the Kindergarten Kickoff in March; this marks the beginning of a collective sense of commitment between families, communities and school. This supportive force continues to enable our students to have a wide variety of social, emotional and academic interactions within the school environment.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Providing a guaranteed and viable curriculum for all students is the standard at Southmoreland Elementary School. By aligning our essential outcomes to the power standards, teachers establish what students are expected to know and do by semester and agree on the assessments that will determine the level of proficiency each student has attained. The team learning process is the backbone of curriculum development, delivery and assessment. It is through that process that we meet our promise of high quality learning for all.

In our team learning process, teachers review the Pennsylvania State Standards and “unpack” them to reveal the essential learnings in all content areas. Reading, Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Art, Physical Education, Technology, and Music teachers engage in the same curriculum development cycle. Teachers decide the order of the learnings, design formative and summative assessments based upon those unpacked standards, and map the curriculum together to ensure that pacing and measurement is done in concert with one another. Teams review the results of those assessments and make decisions on which students will extend their learning and which students will need extra time and support for that skill or content area. In teams, teachers identify the best practices for intervention and enrichment, the students who will be receiving those pieces, and which teachers will work with those groupings. Again, through the team learning process, teachers plan those activities collaboratively and document the effectiveness of those strategies collectively.

At Southmoreland Elementary School, it is important to give extra support to our struggling learners through the Intervention/Enrichment block. Each grade level has a 30-minute block of time built into the daily schedule to work with students who need extra time and assistance in learning essential skills, especially in reading and mathematics. The teachers meet once per cycle to plan strategies for implementing the intervention process for struggling learners and enrichment activities for those who have mastered identified skills. Teachers utilize Individual Student Learning Plans for all non-proficient students. ISLPs allow teachers to see at a glance the skills in need of reteaching and list interventions that have been implemented with the student. These forms are shared within the grade level and with those teachers who work with the students during our after school tutoring sessions.

Our school utilizes technology through devices that include electronic student response systems and Neo carts. Each classroom is equipped with a cart which includes a document camera, laptop, and projector. These devices allow more interaction between students and teacher and encourage equitable response opportunities. SES also uses web-based programs such as First in Math, Study Island, SRA Techknowledge, and Accelerated Reader.

Southmoreland Elementary School proudly supports all special needs students. These students are able to access our curriculum and experience school with their peers while receiving intensive academic, social and emotional support. We are particularly proud of our Autistic Support Program which services both district students and non-resident students from other districts. The program provides these students with both inclusive and small group instruction to effectively maximize their access to our curriculum in mainstream settings.

2. Reading/English:

The Professional Learning Community Model, as implemented at Southmoreland Elementary School, focuses on *learning* rather than the traditional focus on *teaching*. Therefore, the reading curriculum is student centered, data driven and result oriented. Teachers team together by grade level on a weekly basis to review goals, student achievement, and grade level achievement as a whole. In turn, they develop

meaningful lessons and differentiated activities that help increase students' understanding and retention of specific comprehension skills, vocabulary enhancement, and writing performance. Teachers use various informal assessments on a daily basis, as well as weekly common assessments created by the team to analyze students' strengths and weaknesses. Grade 2 administers the Dynamic Indicators of Basal Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessment three times a year, while grades 3 through 5 administer the 4Sight assessment quarterly. Both provide indications of individual and group proficiency levels. From these, the teams monitor and adjust instruction and the intervention and enrichment strategies.

The reading curriculum at Southmoreland Elementary incorporates the Pennsylvania Academic State Standards as well as grade level team goals, and most importantly, student needs. Appropriate literature is selected by teams, including developmental basal literature, grade level novels, leveled readers, poems and picture books. Daily lessons, which include whole group instruction, cooperative group work, and individual application, are developed collaboratively. Media sources such as the Internet, Safari educational videos, audio stories, Neos, and Smart Response Systems, are incorporated to supplement instruction and provide students with differentiated support. Study Island and Accelerated Reader are online incentive programs to motivate and reward students for reading practice outside the school day.

Southmoreland Elementary offers a guaranteed and viable curriculum to all students, thus placing students heterogeneously in classrooms with cooperative team teaching to provide students with the least restrictive and most inclusive environment. Teams differentiate instruction by using leveled stories, modified practice, and cooperative grouping within the classrooms. Student learning is continually assessed in weekly team meetings. Those students who struggle are grouped for intervention, and those who are proficient or beyond in specific goals receive enrichment daily. This period, known as I/E, enables teachers and students the additional time needed to further enhance or reinforce skills. For students who need additional time and support, after school tutoring is assigned twice weekly, and transportation is provided. Teachers use this time to work in smaller group settings with a focus on comprehension and critical thinking skills.

Southmoreland Elementary's reading program provides a dynamic environment, fostering student growth in comprehension, vocabulary development, critical thinking, and writing performance. Through the team learning process, teachers identify and monitor student learning and program efficacy.

3. Mathematics:

Southmoreland Elementary School offers a guaranteed and viable curriculum in mathematics. Teachers collaborate as a regular and routine part of the school day to establish essential outcomes, to develop common formative assessments, to identify struggling learners, and to make program recommendations.

Students use a core math series in grades two through five (MacMillan-McGraw Hill) that begins with the fundamental concepts and builds into higher levels of learning. Our math curriculum provides a coherent scope and sequence with ongoing review and reinforcement of previously learned math skills and concepts. In addition to direct instruction, we provide students with technology such as Neos, the Smart Response System, and web-based computer programs such as Study Island and First in Math. This technology is very effective because it reinforces math vocabulary and concepts. Students can access the web-based programs from home for added practice. Computers can also be utilized in the classroom, library, and computer lab.

Grade level teams collaboratively study state academic standards and research best practice for teaching and assessing student learning. This helps teams determine essential outcomes and pacing for skill building and development. Through consistent progress monitoring and formative common assessments, differentiated instruction is provided in small groups to meet the needs of all students in the intervention/enrichment time built into the daily schedule.

Collaboration between the regular classroom teacher and learning support teacher is a vital part of the instructional program. Peer tutoring and other cooperative experiences reinforce skills and deepen learning. A mini-mall built for counting money and making change, and “pumpkin math,” which covers areas of measurement, prediction, and estimation, are examples of activities that enhance learning. Struggling learners are directed to after school tutoring twice weekly. High-level learners are challenged through enrichment activities which are an extension of the concepts and skills taught at a given grade level.

Southmoreland Elementary School’s math program is highly successful as is evidenced by our dramatic improvement and outstanding performance on Pennsylvania System of School Assessment math scores. Through focused collaboration, we provide high quality learning in mathematics for all students.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Southmoreland Elementary School’s excellent Science PSSA test scores illustrate the continuity of our science program. In 2008, 82% of our students achieved proficiency in Science as measured on the PSSA. In 2012, 98% of our students achieved proficiency, and of that number, 70% of our students scored at the advanced level. In 2011, SES scored a 100% proficiency mark in Science. Consistently, SES has been ranked as the highest performing elementary school in both Westmoreland and Fayette counties. Our state assessment scores are evidence that students are learning. We are proud of this achievement.

Our students begin their science education in kindergarten, studying the life cycle of Monarch butterflies, which are native to southwestern Pennsylvania. They have the opportunity to observe the molting process of the larva stage, marvel at the chrysalis, and then release the adults. This exciting introduction to an organism’s life cycle lays the foundation for Life Science. The procurement of “science vocabulary” in the early grades increases the rate of success for the students as the curriculum builds atop this foundation. Each grade incorporates hands-on scientific investigations that engage students’ curiosity and imagination. Southmoreland has a deep commitment to equip students to become users of the scientific method rather than absorbers of information.

Southmoreland Elementary School has a school-wide recycling program that initiates the students’ awareness of their global footprint. Learning at Southmoreland is extended into the community, as our third grade environmental science unit concludes with a trip to our local landfill. This provides authentic, “real world” reference points and helps students develop a sense of place and identity while learning the values and skills of responsible citizenship.

Following the Professional Learning Communities model, teachers work in collaborative grade level teams to focus on teaching methods that increase student engagement and knowledge retention. Grade level teams develop common assessments. Each student’s attainment of all essential outcomes is monitored on a timely basis through a series of frequent, common formative assessments that are aligned with the state assessments. Furthermore, the teaching staff frequently meets with other grade level teams to ensure the vertical alignment of the curriculum. This teamwork is crucial to the success of our science program.

Student engagement and motivation are key factors in an effective school. Southmoreland Elementary School’s continued success confirms that our science program exemplifies this.

5. Instructional Methods:

In 2008, Southmoreland Elementary School changed its philosophy from a focus on teaching to a focus on learning. This shift has inspired the faculty to rededicate itself to the individual learning needs of the students. All students, including our economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities, are assured of a guaranteed and viable curriculum in a regular classroom setting. We recognize, however,

that in order for all students to learn at the highest levels that they have ever achieved, we must commit to differentiating instruction and assessment as well as to supporting curriculum with appropriate adaptations and technology integration.

Classroom teachers work hand in hand with the learning support professionals to create an environment that promotes the highest levels of learning. Our collaborative meetings give the classroom teachers and the learning support professionals the time to discuss, develop, and modify any and all instruction. Differentiated assessment, individual instruction, peer-guided learning, and a wealth of supportive technology are examples of how instruction is modified to meet each learner's needs. Reading classes utilize student focused learning centers that promote critical and metacognitive thinking. Science and social studies classes use kinesthetic experiments, activities, and games to center learning around the needs of each student. In math, teachers use multiple methods such as rote learning, co-operative grouping, exposition, and guided discovery. First in Math is a web-based program offering comprehensive lessons to master skills in an innovative way. These methods address the differing needs of every student in the classroom.

Instruction can also be differentiated through synchronous and asynchronous technologies. Teachers use the computers to share, manipulate, and create lessons that allow students to access curriculum in 21st Century modes. Accelerated Reader and Study Island supplement core instruction in reading and mathematics. Our Smart Student Response System provides equitable response opportunities, real-time data regarding student understanding, and affords teachers the formative assessment information they need to make decisions about student readiness. The technology integration specialist works with students to develop technology skills and to reinforce core curriculum.

Southmoreland Elementary School is committed to ensuring directed student learning and student engagement. The words "I don't get it," are a thing of the past. Instead, the new mantra has become "I don't get it *yet*." Teachers and students partner together to realize the school's mission of *high quality learning for all*.

6. Professional Development:

Southmoreland Elementary School finds professional development to be most effective and relevant when done in-house. We feel we know best how to meet the needs of all our students through diverse settings—traditional, small group, intensive intervention, enrichment, inclusive, and learning support. Our goal is for each student to reach his/her full potential.

Professional development occurs in several ways. As educators, we have created a professional learning community that is centered on collaboration, not isolation. The faculty of Southmoreland Elementary School has participated in training, led by Rick and Rebecca DuFour, leading practitioners of the Professional Learning Community model.

Our learning communities consist of grade level teams that include a team leader. This gives teachers an opportunity to provide input and receive support from their grade level peers. As a staff, we meet vertically with other grade level teams to ensure continuity of our curriculum. Our administration is fully involved in this process by providing direction and support. In fact, principal-led professional reading and learning is one of the district's administrative priorities for 2012-2013.

We stress that our curriculum must be guaranteed and viable, assuring that no matter which teacher a child has, he/she will be learning the same material throughout the district, which builds collaboration and trust within our teams. We share the responsibility for the learning of all our students.

Our grade levels utilize their team planning times to address curriculum, essential outcomes, intervention/enrichment, and student support. Curriculum, essential outcomes, norms, and related

standards are regularly reviewed. Common assessments are developed which promote conversations about program strengths and weaknesses. Our curriculum is fluid, and we are always looking to make appropriate modifications and improvements. Collaboration with our guidance counselor has proven to be most valuable when discussing student needs. We also develop our intervention and enrichment strategies during this time and regroup students according to their particular needs.

Student achievement and school improvement, through our method of professional development, can be validated by noting the results of our standardized scores on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment. We believe that system improvement through collective capacity building is the most vital element in the improvement and success of Southmoreland Elementary School.

7. School Leadership:

At Southmoreland Elementary School, teachers and administrators continuously collaborate in seeking to answer the four fundamental questions associated with improving student learning: 1) what do we want students to learn?; 2) how will we know when they have learned it?; 3) how will we respond to students who experience difficulty learning?; and 4) how will we respond to students who already know it?

As proponents of Dr. Rick DuFour's Professional Learning Community model, we understand that in order for collaboration to be effective, team meetings must occur as a routine, regular part of the school day. Therefore, at Southmoreland Elementary, each grade level team has three, 40-minute meetings in a six-day cycle, where teachers and principals collaborate in addressing the school's mission of providing *high quality learning for all*.

In an effort to maximize the effectiveness of the teaming structure, each grade level team is led by a team leader, who serves both as a key communication link between the team and the principal, as well as joining with the principal to direct the team's work. The school's team leaders and principal meet on a regular basis to maintain consistency within the school as well as establishing the blueprint for the work that each team will accomplish in the upcoming month. In these meetings, the principal and team leaders are able to discuss progress and plot their course as each individual team engages in the Team Learning Process. This is the process through which each team, as part of an ongoing cycle: 1) develops team norms; 2) clarifies the essential skills that students must know for each unit of instruction; 3) maps curriculum; 4) develops multiple common assessments with benchmarks; 5) analyzes the results and identifies/implements improvement strategies; and 6) develops SMART goals based on assessment results. Careful monitoring of each team's journey as they cycle through the team learning process is the mechanism through which a focus on learning is both maintained and enhanced.

At Southmoreland Elementary School, it is understood that leadership, at its highest level, involves increasing capacity among every individual on a team. To this end, the principal engages the staff in "book talks" where we seek to learn from one another and create new meaning in our professional practice. Currently, the staff is discussing Carol Dweck's *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. This book challenges traditional assumptions about student learning as we explore together the value of effort-based learning.

The Professional Learning Community model, as espoused by Dr. Rick DuFour, is implemented with great fidelity at Southmoreland Elementary School. By increasing the focus on learning and results through building a collaborative culture, SES has progressed from School Improvement status under No Child Left Behind in 2008 to presently being one of the most improved elementary schools in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)
Edition/Publication Year: 2008 Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 92 | 91 | 96 | 94 | 87 |
| Advanced | 67 | 71 | 62 | 63 | 36 |
| Number of students tested | 147 | 136 | 138 | 139 | 150 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 89 | 88 | 95 | 92 | 80 |
| Advanced | 57 | 63 | 55 | 60 | 23 |
| Number of students tested | 70 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 61 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Pennsylvania does not recognize subgroup scores for populations fewer than 10 students. | | | | | |

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)
Edition/Publication Year: 2008 Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 84 | 85 | 83 | 86 | 79 |
| Advanced | 34 | 43 | 42 | 37 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 147 | 136 | 138 | 139 | 150 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 76 | 76 | 82 | 84 | 72 |
| Advanced | 20 | 33 | 36 | 24 | 10 |
| Number of students tested | 70 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 61 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Pennsylvania does not recognize subgroup scores for populations fewer than 10 students | | | | | |

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)
Edition/Publication Year: 2008 Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 95 | 96 | 95 | 92 | 80 |
| Advanced | 74 | 71 | 76 | 55 | 41 |
| Number of students tested | 145 | 132 | 130 | 156 | 147 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 91 | 91 | 91 | 88 | 74 |
| Advanced | 64 | 69 | 63 | 47 | 34 |
| Number of students tested | 66 | 67 | 68 | 73 | 62 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Pennsylvania does not recognize subgroup scores for populations fewer than 10 students | | | | | |

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)

Edition/Publication Year: 2008 Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 82 | 88 | 83 | 76 | 57 |
| Advanced | 43 | 55 | 48 | 33 | 22 |
| Number of students tested | 145 | 129 | 132 | 156 | 147 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 70 | 73 | 77 | 66 | 48 |
| Advanced | 27 | 39 | 37 | 21 | 15 |
| Number of students tested | 66 | 67 | 68 | 73 | 62 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Pennsylvania does not recognize subgroup scores for populations fewer than 10 students | | | | | |

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)
Edition/Publication Year: 2008 Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Mar | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 91 | 91 | 83 | 81 | 57 |
| Advanced | 64 | 66 | 54 | 44 | 31 |
| Number of students tested | 145 | 130 | 142 | 146 | 153 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 82 | 87 | 85 | 82 | 43 |
| Advanced | 45 | 54 | 49 | 49 | 19 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 71 | 72 | 68 | 63 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 7 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Pennsylvania does not recognize subgroup scores for populations fewer than 10 students | | | | | |

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)
Edition/Publication Year: 2008 Publisher: Data Recognition Corporation

| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr | Apr |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 81 | 76 | 54 | 66 | 50 |
| Advanced | 41 | 28 | 19 | 17 | 12 |
| Number of students tested | 145 | 128 | 144 | 146 | 153 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | 66 | 66 | 67 | 63 | 45 |
| Advanced | 26 | 20 | 14 | 13 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 71 | 72 | 68 | 63 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 7 |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Advanced | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked | Masked |
| Number of students tested | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | |
| Proficient/Advanced | | | | | |
| Advanced | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| NOTES: Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. Pennsylvania does not recognize subgroup scores for populations fewer than 10 students | | | | | |