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## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) 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 a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) 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, a public school must meet the state's AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any 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.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.
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 (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):

1 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
$\underline{0}$ Middle/Junior high schools
0 High schools
0 K-12 schools
1 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)
2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
[ ] Urban or large central city
[ ] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
[] Suburban
[ ] Small city or town in a rural area
[X] Rural
3. 12 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | \# of <br> Males | \# of Females | Grade Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{K}$ | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 13 | 10 | 23 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 13 | 11 | 24 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 10 | 12 | 22 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 9 | 11 | 20 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 6 | 14 | 20 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 15 | 14 | 29 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 13 | 18 | 31 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 18 | 11 | 29 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbf{T o t a l}$ | 105 | 109 | 214 |
| Students |  |  |  |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 \% American Indian or Alaska Native<br>0 \% Asian<br>$\underline{2} \%$ Black or African American<br>0 \% Hispanic or Latino<br>0 \% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander<br>98 \% White<br>$\underline{0} \%$ Two or more races 100 \% Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report 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.)
6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012-2013 year: $14 \%$

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

| Steps For Determining Mobility Rate | Answer |
| :--- | :---: |
| (1) Number of students who transferred to <br> the school after October 1, 2012 until the <br> end of the school year | 17 |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <br> from the school after October 1, 2012 until <br> the end of the 2012-2013 school year | 14 |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of <br> rows (1) and (2)] | 31 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as <br> of October 1 | 226 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) <br> divided by total students in row (4) | 0.137 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 14 |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: $\underline{0} \%$ $\underline{0}$ Total number ELL
Number of non-English languages represented: $\underline{0}$
Specify non-English languages: NA
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: $\underline{38 \%}$

Total number students who qualify: $\underline{77}$

If this method is not 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.
NA
9. Students receiving special education services: $14 \%$
$\underline{29}$ Total number of students served
Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.
$\underline{3}$ Autism
$\underline{1}$ Deafness
$\underline{0}$ Deaf-Blindness
$\underline{1}$ Emotional Disturbance
$\underline{0}$ Hearing Impairment
$\underline{1}$ Mental Retardation
$\underline{1}$ Multiple Disabilities
$\underline{0}$ Orthopedic Impairment
1 Other Health Impaired
10 Specific Learning Disability
4 Speech or Language Impairment
$\underline{0}$ Traumatic Brain Injury
1 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
1 Multiple Disabilities
10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

|  | Number of Staff |
| :--- | :---: |
| Administrators | 1 |
| Classroom teachers | 15 |
| Resource teachers/specialists <br> e.g., reading, math, science, special <br> education, enrichment, technology, <br> art, music, physical education, etc. | 7 |
| Paraprofessionals | 12 |
| Student support personnel <br> e.g., guidance counselors, behavior <br> interventionists, mental/physical <br> health service providers, <br> psychologists, family engagement <br> liaisons, career/college attainment <br> coaches, etc. | 1 |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 $\underline{14: 1}$
12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

| Required Information | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Daily student attendance | $96 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| High school graduation rate | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

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

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

| Post-Secondary Status |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Graduating class size | 0 |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | $0 \%$ |
| Enrolled in a community college | $0 \%$ |
| Enrolled in career/technical training program | $0 \%$ |
| Found employment | $0 \%$ |
| Joined the military or other public service | $0 \%$ |
| Other | $0 \%$ |

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award. Yes.

No $\underline{X}$
If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

Located in northern New Hampshire, Thornton is a rural town that sits at the base of the White Mountain National Forest. The town just celebrated their 250th birthday this past summer with a traditional Old Home Day located in the fields across from a well known maple sugaring and breakfast establishment. Although the school is small and quaint, the energy and innovation that takes place inside the school is admirable. Several years ago, the school board made it possible for students in middle school to have one to one devices before many schools even thought about it. The expectations of the school and town are high in which they believe all students should achieve at high levels. Thornton Central School thrives on small class sizes and personalized instruction. The town and school has access to many resources including the ADAPT summer camp program and CADY program for students that encourages healthy life styles as well as prevention of drugs and alcohol. Genesis behavioral health serves students with mental health needs. Plymouth State University is within a short distance of Thornton and provides STEM themed camps for kids, cultural arts activities, and free supplemental tutoring. The Circle Program provides mentors for young girls at risk from elementary school until their high school graduation. There are many opportunities for students although the distance to some of activities and services can sometimes serve as a challenge. The school is creative in trying to provide transportation with other rural towns so students can access activities or services that are beneficial. A dental program and sports physicals are offered to students at the school to assist families as well.

Thornton Central School thrives on small class sizes and individualized instruction for all students.
SAU \#48 and Thornton Central School are committed to education that fosters complete, productive individuals who are challenged by their school environment and to education that recognizes student differences. Embodied in this commitment is the responsibility to provide an educational environment that nurtures students' particular strengths, stimulates their personal growth, and encourages their contributions to the community.

Any programming designed to meet individual needs recognizes differences in learning style, rate, and level of interest. Programming should include flexible but comprehensive curricula of within-discipline and crossdiscipline studies. These studies should allow for both vertical acceleration and require innovative scheduling; grouping that reflects varied ages, sizes, skills, and interests; and multiple teaching strategies implemented by regular staff, mentors, and resource people.

## We believe:

All students should be nurtured.
Nurtured students exhibit strengths in many areas including: visual art, music, dance, drama, math, social studies, science, language, athletics, social interaction, leadership, creativity, intrapersonal skills, communication, and technology education.
Identification and assessment of student strengths should be documented.
Identification and assessment of student strengths should direct instruction.
Strengths are dynamic not static.
Nurturing strengths is more important than labeling.
A variety of learning options are required to meet programming needs.
All students need to be able to analyze, research, and solve problems.
The program should:
Foster problem solving and creative thinking skills
Develop self-directed learning (student-based research)
Encourage development of self-awareness, personal strengths, and social responsibility
Promote students' self-esteem and realistic assessments of individual strengths and weaknesses
Prescribe particular curriculum for individual needs
Allow for peer-grouping interaction both in homogeneous and heterogeneous settings
Help develop future career expectations and skills
Provide opportunities for students to discover their interests and strengths

Better learning opportunities from a variety of sources and areas $\square$.
SAU 48 VISION: GROWTH: Every person, every day, some way.

## SAU 48 MISSION

The mission of SAU 48 is to support an overriding endeavor to improve student achievement through the development of intellectual, social, emotional, and physical strengths to enable students to become lifelong learners and productive citizens.

Overarching Goals
To continuously improve student performance and achievement.
To use multiple forms of assessment to provide data to inform instruction.
To provide support and training in order for all professionals to grow and develop in assessment and instruction.
To ensure a safe and supportive school environment.
To sustain an open environment of collaboration and communication.
Thornton Central School has many traditions and organizations in place that give back to the community and enrich the experience of our students. They include:

Old Home Day - annually by Thornton Historical Society
Sugar on Snow Party - annually with West Thornton Grange and Boy Scouts
Flag Football game - annually with Campton Elementary School
Read-A-Thon - donations given to Plymouth Area Community Closet to assist with fuel assistance
Senior Meals - 3 times a year area seniors are invited to Holiday Luncheons
Care Packages/Stockings for Soldiers
Bell Ringers - visit several nursing homes during the holiday season
Community Basket - students make cards and school donates cookies to Holiday Baskets
Thanksgiving Meal Baskets for community members
Holiday Meal Baskets - Christmas and Easter for community members
Holiday Fund - gifts for students are purchased from donations from staff and community members
National Junior Honor Society
Canes for Caring - proceeds go to NH Humane Society
Canned Food Drive - area Food Pantry
Winter Coat Drive
Rock ' n Race - proceeds benefit the Payson Cancer Center
Pajama Drive
Students also have the opportunity to participate in a seasonal winter activities program, Destination Imagination to incorporate the STEM curriculum, Math Meets to encourage academic competition, and a Cultural Arts night that includes all of SAU 48 school communities.

Thornton Central School is worthy of National Blue Ribbon status for numerous reasons. The culture of this rural school is welcoming and gives students a well balanced education by having high academic standards and integrating the arts. The leader of the school is a veteran administrator who is willing to push forward with best practices with having the impact on students as a priority in all decision making. Teachers are leaders within the school who take initiative in their professional learning and wanting to do what is best for the success of all students. Collaboration is valued and professional conversations directly tie in to student achievement. Assessment is embraced and celebrated rather than a given mandate and the entire community supports students in their efforts. The school board sets goals that encompass the success of students and gives students and teachers access to a number of resources that support the mission and vision of the school.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

## 1. Assessment Results:

a) Several sources of data are used when determining student growth and achievement. The statewide, district, and local common assessments are used in determining baselines for students. School, grade level, and individual growth are expected. When looking at standardized data at all levels the goals and performances that are determined are better than the year before. Goals are measurable and objectives are determined based on certain increments throughout the year. Teachers look at student profiles and analyze their state, district, and local assessment scores to determine areas in need of improvement, strengths, and patterns. The teacher then creates data based interventions coupled with progress monitoring to determine growth. It is Thornton Central Schools goal to perform higher than the average state level to be one of the best schools in New Hampshire.

Thornton believes that proficiency is attainable for all students and the community targets what students need in order to obtain that goal. Student goals and objectives are monitored among all sub groups through state, district, and local assessments. Students who require IEPs have access to the general curriculum to ensure that instructional gaps decrease over time.

In regards to teacher effectiveness, the Principal reviews student data to ensure that students are performing and improving on a continual basis. The community and school board are committed to student achievement and is recognized publicly at board meetings for their high test scores in general. The Thornton community embraces standardized assessments and is proud of the school's accomplishments.
b) Over the past five years and beyond Thornton Central School has believed in professional conversations, data based instruction, and systematic changes that influence academic achievement. Although many of the subgroups are too small to report out on the data table, teachers follow the individual child and personalize education plans to ensure all students achieve high standards. Due to the systemic changes that Thornton Central School follows without wavering, the students and faculty understand that academic achievement is important and are intrinsically motivated to succeed.

When analyzing the third grade data over the past five years, the test scores started out with $88 \%$ proficiency or above in math. There is a dip over the past few years due to the implementation of a new math series: Math In Focus. The series covers only the Common Core State Standards and the state testing covers both the state level grade expectations and some Common Core concepts as well. Thornton understands the risk associated with the transition to the series although the long-term goal is to prepare students with the college and career standards in conjunction with the analytical thinking concepts required with the Smarter Balanced Assessment that will be given in the Spring of 2015. In regards to the achievement gap, students access the general curriculum in grades K-2 and are progress monitored to ensure students are proficient by using the Northwest Evaluation Association assessment for the primary grades. Teachers focus on common pacing and following the series with fidelity. Intervention for students who need it happens above and beyond core math instructional time. The most qualified faculty works with students who need support.

Looking at the third grade reading data table the scores are generally in the proficient and distinction range. There has been little change in proficiency scores due to the high-test scores to start. Thornton has focused more on getting all students to read at high levels and following the Reading Street program for several years. Thornton Central School has a reading specialist that works with the primary grades for students that struggle. The interventions are data based and are part of the reading series called My Sidewalks. There is a strong emphasis on writing, which ensures students' practice reading passages and answering questions with evidence. Thornton has begun to focus on non-fictional texts to assist with implementing some of the new CCSS. The small margin of students with special education services that have done well is due to the scripted intervention and additional reading time. There is also a clear movement from proficient to proficient with distinction, which speaks to moving students at their own pace which includes accelerating the reading curriculum when needed.

When looking at grades four and five math there have been significant gains by doubling the amount of students that moved from proficient to proficient with distinction in grade four in both the 2010-11 and 2011-12 years. This is attributed to third grade teachers that collaborate, implement the math program with fidelity, and address all student needs through differentiation. When looking at subgroups in math in the 2011-12 school year $100 \%$ of the students were proficient and above. In fifth grade, the proficiency scores stayed fairly even although the proficient with distinction scores again increased dramatically. This is due to the focus on the Common Core and addressing individual students strengths and weaknesses.

Reading/ ELA scores in fourth and fifth grade students in the past few years range from $87 \%$ proficient and above to $93 \%$ proficient and above. Again, subgroups are too small to measure although the overall scores speak for the entire population. In fourth and fifth grade Reading Street series is implemented as well as a focus on integrated writing. Novels are selected to supplement and enrich student learning and achievement. Interventions are tied in with the general reading curriculum and are data based with progress monitoring. $83 \%$ of the students identified in the free and reduced- price lunch in 2011-12, which was 10 percentage points below the whole school. Attendance and longevity data points were analyzed to identify any additional social/ emotional supports that may be needed to increase student success.

Lastly, Middle School Language Arts skills are at $100 \%$ proficiency or above as measured by the 2011-12 assessments. This is largely in part to students having both a Language Arts class and an additional Reading class everyday. Students have already made significant gains as measured by formative and summative assessment. Differentiation in conjunction with online intervention assists students who struggle with fluency or the complexity of the application within the math content.

## 2. Using Assessment Results:

Educators at Thornton Central School set high expectations of achievement for every student, using a variety of data to drive instructional methods. We are constantly asking the questions: What do our students know? Where are the gaps in their learning? How do we close those gaps? NWEA testing in Math, Reading and Language Usage produces data teachers use to form instructional groups and which allows them to locate students who need intervention in a core subject area. Staff and administration work collaboratively in a facilitator's group that regularly reviews data from NWEA, the Reading Street series, NECAP testing, and other various summative assessments to determine students who are in need of enrichment or remediation. The Reading Street series' weekly formative and summative assessments generate data crucial to making individualized instructional changes based on skill mastery. Weekly consult meetings with Special Education staff affords educators time to analyze data and collaborate on the best strategies for student success. Teachers engage in numerous vertical discussions between grade levels and content areas, working with their curriculum maps, classroom assessments, and NWEA data to uncover broad gaps or overlaps in instruction. Many classrooms create NWEA folders with each student: conferencing individually on specific strengths and weaknesses and creating a plan for success. Students start the school year crafting one broad academic goal embedding specific concrete steps for the year; using NWEA testing data as their tangible template to show growth. A large component of the goal setting process is teaching students to be advocates for their own academic experience. In the spring, students conference with parents and teachers about their academic progress, using artifacts from a digital portfolio to discuss and display the road they took to achieve their goal. Focusing on formative assessments during the learning process is also key to student success. Teachers employ numerous formal and informal assessment procedures, qualitative feedback that allows students to improve their educational performance. Analyzing data at TCS is a fluid organism, dynamically working to meet the diverse needs of all our learners.

Before all standardized testing, parents are notified with a letter from our school principal. It provides an overview of the assessment including name, purpose and testing dates. We also provide strategies for parents to employ at home to ensure their son or daughter's test results are an accurate representation of their academic abilities. Parents can and have requested additional support for those students who experience test anxiety. Test results are sent home as soon as we receive them, along with, if necessary, a letter explaining those results. School personnel contact information is also included should parents require more information.

There was more than a $10 \%$ achievement gap between the whole school and students who receive special education. The school has put many practices into place to close the achievement gap. For example, students who receive special education must have access to the general curriculum and a data based intervention giving the student more time to target specific skills. Small group instruction has been implemented using a valid and reliable curriculum with appropriate assessments that is closely monitored by administration and the teacher leader team. Response to Instruction is building capacity as a whole school practice by using assessment data to drive instruction, analyzing individual student data to determine the targeted skill intervention, and a consultation model to monitor student progress weekly to ensure growth is made quickly and with urgency for students at risk. Lastly, the general education teacher or specialist provides the intervention as the most highly qualified teacher rather than a paraprofessional providing assistance to the student.

## 3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Thornton Central School collaborates with several other districts in SAU 48 to share best practices and professional development. The Superintendents Administrative Council meets monthly to discuss current trends in testing data, share best practice among administrators, and professional development is provided in the areas that the school may struggle with as determined by testing data.

Teachers from Thornton Central School have always been willing and able to have teachers observe and collaborate with them on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Teachers from other districts have observed the implementation of both a new reading and math series that are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

The SAU shares a professional development day each year where teachers are able to team with other content area teachers to discuss curriculum mapping, targeted instruction to decrease achievement gaps, common assessments, aligning curriculum to Common Core Standards, and school standards to professional development activities.

Technology is used as an integral tool in order to enhance student learning across the curriculum. The technology integrator provides instruction to other teachers on analyzing data, electronic portfolios, curriculum mapping, and My Learning Plan that tracks professional development.

Individual teachers have shared with other teachers within the SAU and state in small groups best practices within a shared leadership team. The guidance counselor collaborates and shares what works best within the culture of testing. Creating an environment that makes assessment fun with incentives, having all teachers proctor the assessment including art, physical education, technology, music, social studies, science, and paraprofessionals. The guidance counselor has shared the actual art of proctoring and setting personal goals with students to improve each year as an individual and overall as a school to improve overall achievement outcomes.

The Principal serves as a mentor to other Principals within the district in which their schools are struggling with curriculum, instruction, and assessment. He is open-minded and understands how to juggle all components of administration within a school that has one administrator. Other Principals look up to Thornton's principal as a successful leader and he candidly shares what works for Thornton with a specific, no nonsense approach to success for all students.

## 4. Engaging Families and Community:

Thornton Central School has a long and proud tradition of supporting our students both in school and out. We enjoy a strong working relationship with community resources which include prevention programs such as the Circle Program (serving girls aged 9 and 10) and Communities for Alcohol and Drug Free Youth (CADY). After school programming includes a homework club and Destination Imagination, part of a gifted and talented programming which has recently been expanded to include younger students. We have a Parent Portal and Homework Hotline to aid parents in supporting their students as they arrive home to continue their learning. Our school website is regularly updated and includes town notices, school board
news and parent resource links.
Add to this our regular schedule of co-curricular activities. This includes a sports program and a music program which plans and presents concerts and plays. These events are well attended by a wide range of community members and serves to strengthen ties within our community. A visitor to Thornton Central School for these events are welcomed by a bulletin board and information center well stocked with informational brochures and notices outlining community and area events. These events range from educational opportunities, parent workshops, state agency information, health notices and internet use tip sheets.
Upon request, we provide referral services and information to our parents. This includes referrals to area agencies for psychological and mental health support, food and fuel assistance, housing needs, health services and legal support.

Over the course of the school year our school is diligent in providing what financial support we can for families in need. A clothing drive, holiday shopping support and funding needy students' participation in winter activities are just a few of the initiatives supported by administration and staff of Thornton Central School.

Our staff also supports families in planning for summer opportunities that include residential and day camps. If requested we work as a team with parents to find sources of funding for these summer camps or academic enrichment programs. In the summer of 2014 we will offer families, free of charge, a lunch program to aid them in meeting their children's nutritional needs.

Thornton has an active membership in the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and with the local Boy and Girls Scout chapters. Our school has been and continues to be a hub for all kinds of family and community events.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

## 1. Curriculum:

Quality instruction and facilitation is the foundation for our students' success at Thornton Central School. TCS has a comprehensive k-8 common core based curriculum for its core subjects: Reading, Math, and Writing. Scope and sequence of skills are clear and teachers use varied, engaging strategies to drive instruction and motivate learners. Skills are introduced, practiced, mastered and applied to various real word applications, with successful engagement of students and tangible results, as evidenced in our NECAP results. The Scott Foresman Reading Street series is aligned to the Common Core Standards, allowing teachers to increase text complexity, balance fiction and informational texts, and emphasize close reading. Primary and middle school students routinely work together in a mentoring capacity. With older students facilitating math and reading activities and integrating technology through the use of I-Pads. At the middle school level, Reading Street transitions into the 6 Traits Writing program, with specific focus on researching and argumentative writing. It is not uncommon to walk into a classroom and see students arguing evidence in the trial of Benedict Arnold, or witness a Greek Mythology writing workshop in action. The Math in Focus program provides Singapore math curriculum, which highlights problem solving as the focus, and learning that lends itself to hands on experiences and the use of manipulatives. Pi Day is an annual event at TCS that celebrates a love for mathematics, as well as pies! During winter months, our 6-8 Mathalon team travels to local school districts to participate in competitions.

The social studies curriculum is deeply rooted in the community itself, with local field trips and guest speakers, providing opportunities for our students to look to the past to provide solutions for the future. For example, recently middle school students petitioned the state of New Hampshire to erect an historical marker at one of the many schoolhouses in the town. Extensive research was done by the students, phone calls and visits were made to local knowledgeable residents.

Science at Thornton has a hands-on lab orientated approach, with outside experiences playing a large part in the learning process. Third graders visit the Quincy Bog yearly to explore its ecosystem: the Squam Lakes Science Center visits with its amazing animals as part of a Second grade science research report on local flora and fauna. Recently middle school students built a nature trail behind the school, labeling species of trees and plants and clearing a walking path through the woods for the community to enjoy and discover.

Art and Music work collaboratively with k-8 teachers to develop enriching activities that tie in to the core curriculum. Our music program puts together two concerts a year; as well as two school wide dramatic productions: K-8 students work together in plays such as Annie and Cinderella. All events and productions: are well attended by the community.

The broad goal of physical education is the development of lifetime skills. The students learn to demonstrate personal and social behavior while being engaged in physical activity. Every student in the building is given the opportunity to participate in our after school sports programs: baseball, softball, basketball and field hockey.

Our guidance program is extensive in our lower grades. Students are supported in developing the skills to locate, evaluate and interpret career information. This includes developing an awareness of personal abilities, skills, interests and motivations they will find useful in the workplace. Beginning in middle school, students identify career goals and are supported in acquiring the knowledge to achieve them. Our ultimate goal is to instill in all of our students an awareness of how interests, abilities and achievement relate to achieving personal, social, educational and career goals.

Technology is the cornerstone to everything we do here at TCS. We are proud to be a leader in the use of technology within our district and enjoy the use of a state of the art computer lab. Classroom computers are available for students, as well as laptop and I-Pad carts. An Apple program allows every 7th and 8th grader to own an iPad. Students use numerous Google apps to increase their knowledge base and communicate effectively with peers and teachers. Teachers use web-based programs such as Google Earth in their
instruction and SmartBoard technology is widespread throughout the building.
The foreign language program is offered in collaboration with the Virtual Learning Academy Charter School in New Hampshire which is an integrated online curriculum that is data based, rigorous, and individualized. Students may enroll in the program with allotted time, teacher assistance, and technology support at the school. French I or Spanish I can be completed in 8th grade giving students access to Spanish II or French II their 9th grade year at the regional high school. There is effective communication between Thornton Central School and the high school world language department.

## 2. Reading/English:

Thornton Central School understands the benefits of providing students with a reading curriculum that teaches reading skills in a logical way where skills spiral through the successive grade levels. More importantly, educators understand the benefits a reading series provides to their instruction, assessment, and professional development.

Within the past few years, Thornton Central School adopted a new reading series. The following criteria were established:

A comprehensive research based program that included reading, writing, and language arts. Supplemental materials to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of all students including those below and above grade level.
A balance between fiction and nonfiction at all grades levels.
Opportunities for educators and students to integrate technology into classroom activities.
After a year- long study, the decision was made to adopt the Pearson Scott Foresman Reading Street program for the 2010 school year.

The Reading Street program provides educators with the essential tools to build foundational reading skills. The five essential components of effective reading instruction are phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. These key pillars are present in everyday instruction in kindergarten through second grade. Students learn these skills while participating in activities surrounding music, poetry, teacher read-alouds, and technology based skills activities. Educators use both formal and informal assessments to monitor student learning and progress. These assessments guide future instruction.

In addition to Reading Street's balanced approach to literacy instruction, fourth and fifth grade educators schedule a daily 30 -minute period where teachers work with students on differentiated skills. During this time, educators work with focus groups on a variety of skills including strategies that proficient readers and writers use. Additionally, educators work with students achieving above grade level on enriching activities.

Middle school students are part of a literate community where they are expected to read in and out of school. In sixth grade, Prentice Hall Literature was adopted as a companion series to Reading Street. Also, sixth through eighth grade students are provided with opportunities to review and strengthen skills identified through NECAP, NWEA and informal assessments. Before standardized testing begins, students review their previous test scores and create individual goals. Additionally, students practice close reading, analysis of craft and structure, main idea, author's purpose, and persuasive techniques through a variety of fiction and nonfiction units of study. Furthermore, all middle school students are expected to read nightly from an independent book. Each marking period, they are asked to share one book they have read. At this time, students give recommendations and make plans for future reading. Finally, middle school comes together yearly for One Book One Middle School. Small, multi-grade groups experience one common book. Culminating activities have included art projects and theater field trips.

## 3. Mathematics:

Thornton Central School and SAU 48 decided on a common math series two years ago with grades K-2 and grades 3-8 implementation for the current school year. Math In Focus/ Singapore Math was the program of
choice among the administrators. The program has assisted teachers in the implementation of the Common Core Math Standards in addition to accessing common formative, summative, and performance assessment to drive instruction.

Math in Focus helps students gain a depth of understanding, fluency with skills, and problem solving to address level 3 and 4 depth of knowledge questions to prepare for higher-level questions on the new Smarter Balanced Assessment. The program includes data based interventions and enrichment for those students who may need remediation or acceleration.

The strengths of the program include that it is aligned with the Common Core State Standards, correlates seamlessly to the Standards for Mathematical Practice, expects mastery through practice and problem solving, and utilizes visual models to balance instruction. Math In Focus integrates technology and engages parents through weekly newsletters on what students are learning and its foundational background.

The teachers at Thornton Central School diary map to ensure common pacing, mastery of skills, and to facilitate vertical and horizontal collaboration among grade levels. The contents of the maps include essential learning, skills taught with a focus on level 3 and 4 depth of knowledge, assessment, and common core alignment.

Multiple measures of assessments determine student baselines and target. Assessments that are used are daily quick checks, unit tests, student interviews, benchmark assessment, NWEA, and NECAP data.

Lesson structures are aligned K-8 focusing on the teaching/ learning of a concept, guided practice, independent practice, and then direct intervention or enrichment. The school schedule has been adjusted K8 in the number of hours per day math instruction is delivered is at least 60 minutes per day with additional time as needed.

Data has shown that these changes have been effective. NWEA and NECAP data has shown school wide improvement in math as well as a close in the achievement gap in sub groups. Students who receive special education have more than a $10 \%$ achievement gap although this has improved during the reported time frame and for students who are economically disadvantaged there is no achievement gap.

## 4. Additional Curriculum Area:

This year has been an exciting one for writing at Thornton Central School as we created a comprehensive K8 writing curriculum and continuum aligned to the common core standards. Our focus: developing 21st century writers that can problem solve, argue salient points, and write effectively for real world applications.

Over the course of the year, teachers collaborated and produced a cohesive writing program that not only addresses the rigor of the common core, but also ignites a passion for the craft of writing. Included in this curriculum are common vocabulary words that increase in complexity for each grade level, common rubrics for assessment, and common editing symbols for use in the revising and editing process. The new curriculum meets student needs at every stage of the writing process and individualizes instruction to target specific writing skills. In addition, the curriculum places new demands on students to write clearly and concisely for a variety of purposes and audiences; technology plays an integral role as the vehicle by which this occurs. The writing curriculum contains an important parent and community piece with its continuum: an informational section detailing how students demonstrate mastery of writing at each grade level with included writing samples. For example, students in first grade research a local animal using I-Pads, assess a website's credibility with the teacher, create notes on their animal, and write a report which is then recorded into their digital portfolios. The writing samples are used to measure growth of the individual student, to show mastery of specific writing skills, and in a larger context, to demonstrate what a typical first grade writing piece looks like.

Research is a key component to the Thornton Writing Curriculum. The Common Core State Standards ask students to develop the capacity to build knowledge by researching and responding analytically to literature and informational texts. Here at Thornton, our students are beginning the research process during the
primary years through the use of short, inquiry based research activities then extending to middle school's larger, project based learning modules. During the fall and spring, 6-8 students are immersed in research and writing through these PBL (project based learning) modules, working in small groups to answer a broad essential question. Students can be observed designing models of wind tunnels to view variables in migration patterns of local birds, researching and writing an informational essay regarding sustainability issues local farms face and arguing the affordability of buying goods locally versus globally. Writing can be evidenced in all facets of academic life here at TCS.

TCS has a comprehensive selection of specials including art, music, additional reading time in middle school, health, guidance, and technology.

## 5. Instructional Methods:

Thornton Central School differentiates instruction on a daily basis by taking into consideration the students baseline, specific area of need, and response to instruction by reflecting on multiple measures of assessment. Teaching strategies such as small groups, access to the general curriculum for all students, and direct instruction and intervention ensure that students make academic progress as measured by local, state, and nationwide assessments.

All students at Thornton Central School participate in core content areas and are given baseline assessments to determine if the student needs additional enrichment or direct intervention/ instruction. Progress monitoring strategies are utilized to track student learning in conjunction with providing evidence of student work on an electronic portfolio. Some of the assessments used include state, district, and local assessments that provide a clear picture of student data. Grade level and vertical teaming occurs at least once a week to review needs of students derived from common assessments.

Students who require a short-term (Tier 2) intervention are given additional time outside the core classroom. Direct instruction is provided by a highly qualified teacher who frequently monitors progress with formative and summative assessments. Data based programming is used for all academic interventions.

Students who qualify for IEPs have academic goals that connect to the Common Core State Standards. A focus on closing the achievement gap is also included by determining the least restrictive environment, appropriate intervention, accommodations, and modifications if needed. Collaboration is key in developing programs for the most challenging students to ensure seamless academic goals.

Technology is used across the curriculum with the support of a full time technology coordinator. Students in grades K-8 have access to IPads on a regular basis to supplement core programs. The middle school program has a lease to own program to ensure a $1: 1$ culture to enhance learning. Students will begin to use the IPads to take the new Smarter Balanced Field test. Technology is used in many other capacities through interactive whiteboards and on going curriculum resources for parents to access at home to reinforce core concepts in the classroom.

## 6. Professional Development:

## Statement of Purpose

SAU \#48 and Thornton Central School acknowledge that teaching is a complex job where knowledge and skills are always in need of refinement. This professional development master plan assists educators in their efforts to improve student performance and achievement, to build greater competence in teaching skills, to collect data that show knowledge of their field and knowledge about learners and learning, and to show evidence of improvement and refinement.

Beliefs About Professional Development
SAU \#48 acknowledges that professional development is a process that fosters growth for individual educators within a supportive, positive, organizational environment. The SAU \#48 professional
development program:
values and promotes collegiality, sharing and dialogue;
improves and enhances the learning experiences and skills of students while preparing them to become productive members of society;
promotes curriculum development aligned with Common Core State Standards (CCSS);
forms a vehicle for continuous improvement and review of teaching strategies and practices while meeting individual school district needs and addressing critical issues;
links growth of individual educators to the local school districts' educational improvement goals, strategies and plans;
supports teachers during the assessment process, with the primary goal being improved teacher quality and student achievement. We are utilizing Curriculum Mapper software as our mapping tool, integrating assessment and instruction in ways that support learning; inclusion of 21st Century learning skills.

## Guidelines for Professional Development Activities

SAU \#48 and Thornton Central School professional development process fully supports teacher choice in pursuing professional growth opportunities which are aligned with professional goals, including jobembedded learning, self-directed learning and formal activities. Professional development activities may include, but are not limited to, collegiate or graduate work, workshops, seminars, institutes, observations, independent study, study groups, professional reading or travel, grant writing, peer coaching, mentoring, and/or curriculum development.

While we recognize the value of work experience and volunteer activities in one's professional growth, these experiences do not in themselves constitute professional growth for recertification purposes. However, if one receives training for such experiences, that training may constitute growth if it relates to improved performance as an educator and improved learning for students.

Professional development is embedded into faculty meetings, teacher in service days, and through allotted time by the Principal to work on school wide initiatives such as aligning curriculum both vertically and horizontally, curriculum mapper development, and consultation time to select reliable and valid curriculum and to analyze data for individual students. A teacher leadership team was formed to focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment as well as to determine specific professional learning that ties into the goals of the school.

Professional learning is developed by individual teachers and is connected to teacher certification, the teacher evaluation model, and to school wide goals. MyLearningPlan software is utilized to ensure that each activity that is requested is clearly aligned to the standards of professional development and directly tied into the teachers' assignment, professional goals, and encompasses what students' need. There is a focus on student need rather than adult wants in order to determine what is best for student achievement.

Collaboration and consultation is encouraged when attending conferences with the expectation that the attendees will provide what they learned to their professional learning team or the entire faculty to ensure best practices are shared.

Reflection is an integral part of professional learning. MyLearningPlan software requires teachers to enter a reflection that is approved by administration to use evidence on how the activity will impact student achievement and improve overall school outcomes.

## 7. School Leadership

## Leadership Style

Thornton Central School has one administrator for grades K-8. The current Principal started as a middle school math teacher at Thornton and then became the Principal and has been in that capacity for several years. Several leadership qualities contribute to the success of the school that include collaboration and clear goals and expectations of the staff, students, and community. Other qualities include utilizing teacher
leaders to assist in professional development and decision-making based on data. The Principal is loyal to his community, dedicated to his work, and is a model for student success for all. The priorities of the Principal include developing children who are academically, socially, and have an integrated arts experience while attending Thornton Central School.

## Curriculum

The Principal has played a vital role in adopting evidenced based programs for all students. Collaboration was a key leadership style that assisted in selecting both math and reading programs that aligned with the common core standards. Literacy, math, and writing are expected to be included across the curriculum so students have a deeper understanding of the content. The Principal performs walkthroughs to ensure common pacing, fidelity of programs, and matching assessments are being completed to progress monitor the student body. Curriculum mapping of classes is an expectation of the Principal to ensure that there are minimal gaps in curriculum.

## Instruction

Core instruction is a high priority when developing the master schedule. The Principal ensures that teachers have enough time to teach their content area. This included core instructional time without interruption as well as additional academic time to personalize the education of students that require direct intervention or accelerated instruction. Data based decision making is reinforced through teacher evaluation by facilitating conversations around instruction and assessment. Vertical and grade level teaming is facilitated by the Principal to ensure common language and expectations.

Assessment
Multiple measures of assessments are used by the Principal to ensure students are all progressing. Staff meetings are spent talking about data and which assessments are quality and match up with learning goals. The administrator values results of assessments by coaching teachers on how to drive instruction with results. The statewide testing is taken seriously and embraced by the school community. This is clearly evident in the Principal by rewarding students who made any type of growth. It is expected that students have personal goals that directly connect to both state and district wide testing. The Principal encourages a variety of assessments to increase student achievement and to address the learning goals of each individual teacher.

The Principal ensures a community of inclusive practices and knows the data of each individual student in the school. He is willing to share best practices with other Principals to assist with school improvement. The Principal provides technology and supports innovation with teachers. He sets high standards and balances a community of caring and personalization for all students and staff. He is a leader within the SAU and always reaches out for help if he needs it. The Principal has a great sense of listening to others needs and always keeps in mind what is best for kids. He celebrates what is good before pointing out deficits.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: $\underline{3}$
Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction | 65 | 63 | 84 | 88 | 68 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 6 | 19 | 20 | 8 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 17 | 16 | 25 | 26 | 25 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |


| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction | 63 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  | 26 |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \%Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and free and reduced lunch/ low socio- economic/ disadvantaged students.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction | 100 | 96 | 88 | 74 | 76 |
| \% Distinction | 53 | 52 | 23 | 26 | 17 |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 29 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction | 100 | 52 |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction | 53 |  | 26 |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 1 . ~ O t h e r ~ 1 : ~ O t h e r ~ 1 ~}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% <br> Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient with Distinction | 89 | 76 | 84 | 72 | 64 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 48 | 20 | 12 | 10 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 27 | 25 | 26 | 29 | 14 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient with Distinction | 75 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 89 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 48 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 27 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch. There is only one year that low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch is reported because the cell size is large enough to report.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: $\underline{6}$

Test: NECAP
Edition/Publication Year: $\underline{2013}$

Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 81 | 80 | 71 | 65 | 83 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 35 | 24 | 14 | 35 | 11 |
| Number of students tested | 26 | 25 | 28 | 17 | 18 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 81 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 35 | 24 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 26 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: $\underline{7}$

Test: NECAP
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 84 | 71 | 50 | 95 | 68 |
| \% Proficient with distinction | 16 | 21 | 6 | 26 | 16 |
| Number of students tested | 25 | 28 | 16 | 19 | 19 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 84 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction | 16 | 19 | 6 |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  | 18 |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: $\underline{8}$
Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 75 | 63 | 84 | 79 | 82 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 18 | 25 | 16 | 32 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 28 | 16 | 19 | 19 | 17 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 77 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 15 | 25 | 17 |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 26 |  |  | 32 |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA All Students Tested/Grade: $\underline{3}$

Test: ELA Reading
Edition/Publication Year: $\underline{2013}$

Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 82 | 69 | 80 | 88 | 76 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 18 | 25 | 12 | 12 | 44 |
| Number of students tested | 17 | 16 | 25 | 26 | 25 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 81 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 19 | 25 | 12 |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Test: NECAP
Edition/Publication Year: $\underline{2013}$

Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 87 | 92 | 77 | 81 | 76 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 40 | 60 | 12 | 37 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 15 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 29 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 87 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 40 | 60 | 12 |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  | 27 |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Test: NECAP
Edition/Publication Year: $\underline{2013}$

Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 93 | 92 | 77 | 76 | 64 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 52 | 40 | 27 | 14 | 7 |
| Number of students tested | 27 | 25 | 26 | 29 | 14 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 83 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 93 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 52 | 40 | 27 |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 27 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/free and reduced lunch. There is only one year to report low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch due to the cell size being large enough.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA All Students Tested/Grade: $\underline{6}$

Test: NECAP
Edition/Publication Year: $\underline{2013}$

Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 88 | 88 | 86 | 76 | 89 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 31 | 48 | 25 | 35 | 39 |
| Number of students tested | 26 | 25 | 28 | 17 | 18 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 88 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 31 | 48 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 26 | 25 |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available. The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA All Students Tested/Grade: 7

Test: NECAP
Edition/Publication Year: $\underline{2013}$

Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 88 | 93 | 75 | 84 | 95 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 36 | 36 | 31 | 32 | 47 |
| Number of students tested | 25 | 28 | 16 | 19 | 19 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 88 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 36 | 35 |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA All Students Tested/Grade: $\underline{8}$

Test: NECAP
Edition/Publication Year: $\underline{2013}$

Publisher: Measured Progress

| School Year | $2012-2013$ | $2011-2012$ | $2010-2011$ | $2009-2010$ | $2008-2009$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Testing month | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct | Oct |
| SCHOOL SCORES* |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 100 | 100 | 89 | 95 | 82 |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 36 | 38 | 47 | 42 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 28 | 16 | 19 | 19 | 17 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of students tested with <br> alternative assessment |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBGROUP SCORES |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price <br> Meals/Socio-Economic/ <br> Disadvantaged Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Students receiving Special <br> Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. English Language Learner <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. African- American <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Asian Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. American Indian or <br> Alaska Native Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other <br> Pacific Islander Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. White Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction | 35 | 38 | 50 |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 26 |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Two or More Races <br> identified Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient plus \% Proficient <br> with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Proficient with Distinction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.

The student cell size is too small to report for students receiving special education and low socio- economic/ disadvantaged/ free and reduced lunch.

