

U.S. Department of Education
2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [] Title I [] Charter [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal Mr. Derek Arlo Straight

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Barbara B. Rose Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 61 West Penny Road

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City South Barrington State IL Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 60010-9127

County Cook County State School Code Number* _____

Telephone 847-844-1200 Fax 847-844-1443

Web site/URL http://www.barrington220.org/Domain/801 E-mail dstraight@barrington220.org

Twitter Handle https://twitter.com/barbararose220 Facebook Page https://www.facebook.com/RoseSchoo
1220 Google+ N/A

YouTube/URL http://www.youtube.com/user/Barrington220 Other Social Media Link N/A
Blog N/A

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

Date _____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Thomas Leonard E-mail: tleonard@barrington220.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Barrington CUSD 220 Tel. 847-381-6300

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

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mr. Brian Battle
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

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

Date _____

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

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):
- 8 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 1 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 11 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
 - Rural
3. 6 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 Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 26 | 24 | 50 |
| 1 | 25 | 18 | 43 |
| 2 | 51 | 45 | 96 |
| 3 | 56 | 52 | 108 |
| 4 | 50 | 49 | 99 |
| 5 | 60 | 38 | 98 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Students | 268 | 226 | 494 |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 41 % Asian
 - 1 % Black or African American
 - 3 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 50 % White
 - 5 % 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: 5%

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 <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year | 14 |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year | 12 |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)] | 26 |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1 | 503 |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4) | 0.052 |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100 | 5 |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 5 %
27 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 13
 Specify non-English languages: Telugu, Turkish, Polish, Korean, Urdu, Malayalam, Gujarati, Arabic, Italian, Spanish, Hindi, Farsi, and Mandarin
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 12 %
 Total number students who qualify: 59

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.

9. Students receiving special education services: 14 %
69 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.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 4 Autism | 1 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 0 Deafness | 5 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 8 Specific Learning Disability |
| 2 Emotional Disturbance | 38 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 1 Hearing Impairment | 2 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 3 Mental Retardation | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 0 Multiple Disabilities | 5 Developmentally Delayed |

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 | 22 |
| Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc. | 12 |
| Paraprofessionals | 17 |
| Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment 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 22:1

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% | 97% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| 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_ NoX

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

PART III – SUMMARY

Barbara B. Rose Elementary School (Rose School) is one of eight elementary schools located in the suburban-area of Barrington, Illinois. We are fortunate to have a diverse student body and exceptional parent involvement. The staff is committed to implementing best practice instruction and building a relationship-centered learning community. Our school culture places high expectations on academics and social-emotional competencies. This is reflected in our school motto which states, "Every child has gifts and talents. We accept the challenge to find and nurture these qualities in each child." In our effort to meet these ideals, we nurture the mission statement of Barrington 220, "Inspiring all learners to achieve excellence."

Built in 1998, Rose School is considered a neighborhood school, however, we also house two district-wide programs. In 2010, Rose School piloted the now highly successful Chinese Immersion program. With 90 students spread across two cohorts, Rose has been building a "bridge" to China. In addition, Rose School hosts a district cross-categorical special education program for students in grades 3-5. These students receive core instruction from a specially trained educator and are mainstreamed into our general education classes to the greatest extent possible.

Our traditions bind us as a school community and link us to the community beyond our walls. Parents, teachers, and students come together in a variety of ways. From the initial Back-to-School kickoff event hosted by the PTO to fly-up day at the end of the year in which students move up to meet the team of teachers with whom they will work the following year, our school year is peppered with academic extension and service learning opportunities. Our staff and students run "Miles for the Military 5K" each November and come together in recognition of Veteran's Day where history is acknowledged and personal connections are honored. In addition, Rose students are involved in an active Student Council, a growing Green Group, band, orchestra, Stingray Singers, Compass Learning Club, basketball, cross-country, speech tournament, spelling bee, and after-school mini-courses. Annual grade-level musical performances culminate in a fifth grade Broadway Jr. production. Rose students actively accept leadership opportunities by reading morning announcements, reciting the "Power of One" oath, having social-emotional learning buddies, leading younger students to their buses, and earning Respectful Rays. Our learning community fosters many connections among parents, teachers, and students.

The school improvement team at Rose School guides the staff in challenging the status quo of instruction and cultivating a high-level of passion toward professional learning. Teachers are given choices regarding what and how they learn. Professional curiosity and action research are valued. In turn, it allows teachers to authenticate that learning is a lifelong endeavor.

While Rose School enjoys success in all academic domains, mathematics is an area of relative strength. An emphasis is placed on the Common Core State Standards for Mathematical Practice. Parent Universities are held to inform our families of our instructional methods and philosophy. This partnership promotes independent mathematicians with the skills to problem solve, persevere, and make connections to the patterns in their everyday world.

Social-emotional learning is an important compliment to the academic programming we offer our students. Our district has redefined success as teachers and students have embraced the idea that success is more than just high grades. Rose School embodies the belief in leading students to become strong in character, independent thinkers, and resilient problem-solvers. The Rose staff and parent community collaborate with students to creatively meet the challenges of classroom objectives and push students to be aware of the world beyond our district boundaries. Implementing an inquiry approach to teaching and reaching children, Rose students have tapped into their own curiosity and sense of wonder. As a result of the inquiry process, Rose students passionately pursue action to resolve issues in the local and global community. Service learning projects have included outreach to an adopted school on Chicago's southside, Home of the Sparrow, Barrington Giving Day, F.I.S.H. Food Pantry, and visiting elderly citizens at Alden Estates. Through these experiences, students share their talents and resources while strengthening their sense of compassion and respect.

Rose School is worthy of National Blue Ribbon status because of its consistently high levels of achievement in the Chicagoland area and within the state of Illinois. Rose School students consistently achieve above state and district achievement targets. There is an emphasis on the education of the whole child and a strong partnership between parents and teachers. The significant diversity at Rose School has been successfully leveraged to create a truly vibrant and energetic learning environment. We believe our students are prepared to thrive in a global society.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) The majority of students at Rose School are high-achieving. From 2007 to 2012, greater than 97% of our students met state standards in mathematics and greater than 93% of our students meet state standards in reading. However, our school strives to increase the percentage of students exceeding state standards. Each year, greater than 60% of our students exceed state standards in mathematics. Greater than 50% exceed state standards in reading. We believe this has been achieved through the implementation of rigorous curriculum, targeted student interventions, and high levels of teacher collaboration.

In addition to the Illinois Standard Achievement Test (ISAT), our district benchmarks all students three times a year using a combination of the Northwest Evaluation Association's (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) at grades 2-5 and Pearson's AIMSweb measures at grades K-2. As a building, we expect our students to minimally achieve at, or above, the 50th percentile nationally. For any student falling below the 35th percentile, we analyze results to consider supplementary intervention services. By analyzing the benchmark data three times per year, our grade-level teacher teams determine the focus and intensity of these interventions. Progress monitoring methods are put in place to measure the students' response to that intervention.

b) In 2013, the State of Illinois significantly raised the cut scores on the ISAT, resulting in fewer students meeting the threshold for meeting standards. A district analysis of the revised percentage of students meeting or exceeding indicate an overall stable level of performance in math and reading. More specifically, an increasing trend of approximately 1.3% per year in reading and an increasing trend of approximately 0.8% per year in math. Using the 2013 cut scores, the aggregate seven year average level of performance in reading was 84% meeting standards. In the mathematics, the seven year aggregate average was 87% meeting standards. This trend paints a picture of sustained growth and places Rose School significantly above state and district averages.

A cross-sectional analysis of the performance trends of our subgroup populations revealed a performance gap between regular education and special education students. Specifically, the performance gap was found in the area of reading. However, this performance gap in reading also showed the greatest amount of improvement from 2008 to 2012. From 2008 - 2011, the gap between all general education students and students receiving special education services in the area of reading was greater than 20%. By 2012, this gap was reduced to 11%. This improvement coincides with Rose School's adoption of a problem solving approach or Response to Intervention (RtI). The Rose School special services team and classroom teachers collaborated to identify specific students' needs in an effort to support core literacy instruction through the use of targeted, intensive, research-based reading interventions. Teachers met regularly to review progress monitoring data and consider changes in reading interventions. There was significant collaboration amongst reading resource teachers and learning disability resource teachers. Furthermore, the special educators serving this population received high-quality professional development in the same best practice instruction that our general education teachers received. This more closely aligned special education instruction to that of general education instruction. The Reading and Writing Workshop Model of instruction was transferred to the special education resource classrooms and a greater emphasis was placed on "push in" services. This practice is maintained as our model of instruction throughout the building.

A cross-sectional analysis of the performance trends of our subgroup populations showed the Asian students consistently outperformed the school as a whole. This was especially true when the percentages of students exceeding standards were compared across subgroups. For example, 81% of Asian students exceeded state expectations in mathematics on the 2012 ISAT. This was compared to 57% of White students who exceeded expectations in mathematics. Likewise, 71% of Asian students exceeded state expectation in reading on the 2012 ISAT. This was compared to 51% of White students who exceeded expectations in reading.

2. Using Assessment Results:

The Rose School staff believes that appropriate analysis of data provides a snapshot of what students know, what they should know, and what can be done to meet their academic needs. With ongoing, dynamic interpretation of data, the staff makes informed decisions that positively affect student outcomes. The use of data has drawn more increased attention to accountability requirements related to state and federal mandates. Our belief is that while accountability has increased due to various factors, everyone has an interest in and shares responsibility for high-quality education for all students. This partnership includes teachers, administrators, school board members, students, families, community members, and policy makers/legislators. Rose School has a mindset of continuous improvement. Teachers use a variety of summative and formative assessment tools to make instructional decisions.

Rose School understands that research shows the use of data to inform instructional decisions leads to improved performance. Student and teacher goal setting are important. Teachers believe that no single assessment tells us all that we need to know to make well-informed instructional decisions. Our practice at Rose School is to use multiple data sources including normed measurements, classroom formative assessments, teacher observations, and student reflection along with teacher judgment in the process of data analysis and review. Teachers bring student work samples and formative assessment data (e.g., rubrics, exit slips, reading/writing workshop conference logs) to grade-level data analysis meetings.

Rose School and Barrington 220 employ a local growth model (LGM) for data analysis purposes. This LGM combines the ISAT, NWEA's MAP, and curriculum-based measurements into a single statistic in order to make predictions and determine individual student growth. Universal benchmark assessment data is collected three times per year. Following each benchmark period, grade-level teams, along with members of the Problem Solving Team analyze the quantitative data along with formative assessments (e.g. classroom assessments, teacher, parent and student observations) to determine if the Tier I or core instruction is meeting the needs of the majority of learners. Often times, whole-class interventions or instructional adjustments are made. Next, the PST determines which students might benefit from supplemental or Tier II interventions to accelerate their academic growth and close the gap with students performing at Tier I. Supplemental intervention groups are then planned and a progress monitoring schedule is determined utilizing appropriate outcome measures (e.g. normed curriculum based measures; time on task), along with other teacher formative assessments. This multi-tiered approach provides a comprehensive analysis of all learners relative to our core curriculum. It is our belief that each and every child deserves all of our focused attention to assure he or she is provided with the tools needed to maximize his/her potential. Students do not require an individualized educational program (IEP) in order to receive supplemental interventions. We flexibly use the professional expertise of the entire building to creatively support all learners. An emphasis is placed on early intervention.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

At Rose School, the mindset of our teachers reaches far beyond the task of instructing students. Teachers are always looking for ways to grow as professionals, and take part in professional organizations. They take pride in engaging and sharing our knowledge with colleagues and other education professionals.

The majority of our teachers have advanced degrees and have had unique professional experiences. Teachers at our school have presented at the Illinois Reading Association conference. We are proud that our faculty includes teachers who have authored professional texts in the area of reading instruction, and consult for a nationally recognized author in literacy education.

Rose School has teacher representatives on all district curriculum steering teams. There are teams for all content areas: science, social studies, health, math, social-emotional learning, and English language arts. The teams conduct research into best practice and make decisions about instructional pathways. These opportunities provide an open forum for dialogue around the most successful teaching practices and resources available to our students. Steering team members bring back this knowledge to the staff.

Our teachers are also leaders in Barrington 220. Many have taught summer classes to district employees in a wide range of subjects including literacy, brain development, social and emotional learning, technology, and the Common Core State Standards. Rose School teachers have also been filmed for lesson studies shared at staff development days, which are often shared via social media. They have opened their classrooms to model instructional strategies to our certified and classified staff. We are proud that we bring all adults into the learning process. Teachers come from other buildings in the district to observe and ask us questions about our instructional practices. Round-table discussions are lead with grade level colleagues about our reading and writing units of study.

Barrington 220's comprehensive mentor program encourages collaboration and observation as new teachers study their more experienced counterparts. Novice teachers are paired with experienced teachers in our building. This relationship grows over five years with frequent meetings and open conversation.

At the building level, we approach professional development through teacher inquiry. Teachers work in groups based on interest to research and investigate new teaching practices. This learning is shared with the entire staff throughout the inquiry process and in staff presentations. Our dedication to our professional development has enabled our staff to cohesively promote an effective learning environment.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Rose School prepares students for a productive role in a global society by building a relationship-centered learning community. One factor of our students' success is strong parent-teacher communication. In addition to newsletters, parents have access to current information through email, Facebook, Twitter and classroom web pages. Parent-teacher conferences are a vital component of this team effort for each child to succeed. In the upper grades, parents are able to view their child's grades online. Each spring, families are invited to attend Portfolio Day to view students' academic growth through a collection of their representative work.

Rose School also hosts several curriculum nights each year. At the beginning of the school year, parents are invited to a Back to School Night. The principal provides information about school improvement efforts and guiding instructional themes for the year. Teachers inform parents about grade-level curriculum goals and best practices used in their classrooms. At other points in the school year, families are invited to attend evening presentations on English language arts and mathematics. The staff hosts informational nights to show how parents can support the reading growth of their children. An annual math game night encourages children and parents to have fun with math games, while building numerical reasoning and problem solving skills. Finally, Rose School celebrates its diverse student population and models acceptance of all cultures through PTO sponsored programs, assemblies, and celebrations such as Chinese New Year and Multicultural Nights.

Additionally, Rose School partners with local Barrington community organizations. Students visit with residents of a nearby nursing home, bringing crafts or singing songs to the residents. Once a year, Rose staff and students partner with the park district in hosting a 5K Run for local and national military veterans charities. The building's student council regularly organizes a food drive for a local food pantry. Each holiday season, we participate in Barrington Giving Day, collecting clothing and toys for local families.

Rose School is fortunate to have many community resources available to our students. The Nature Ladies educate our K - 4 students about animals and vegetation found in the Barrington area. Students have hands-on experiences at neighboring Grigsby Prairie, Stillman Nature Center, Barrington Hills Fire Station and the South Barrington Village Hall. Rose School benefits from thousands of books loaned to our classrooms by the Barrington Area Library and had the most students complete their 2013 public library summer reading program.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Rose School has transitioned from Illinois State Standards to the national Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Our English language arts and mathematics curriculum is fully aligned to the CCSS. Barrington 220 is in the process of aligning our science curriculum to the Next Generation Science Standards and our physical education curriculum to the NASPE standards. Social studies and fine arts are aligned with the existing state standards. Rose School takes a differentiated approach to the curriculum, seeking to maximize the growth of each student within and beyond the curriculum.

English Language Arts: Our literacy curriculum follows the reading and writing workshop model. Students gain adequate exposure to a range of increasingly complex literature and informational texts and tasks. Our program includes texts and instructional philosophies from Lucy Calkins' Units of Study in Writing and Reading, Stephanie Harvey's Comprehension Toolkits, Fountas and Pinnell's Phonics Lessons, the Jolly Phonics program, Word Wisdom, and Ganske's Word Study program. Instruction is provided through whole group, small groups, and individual conferencing. A comprehensive leveled literacy library has been developed as a resource for guided reading in both fiction and nonfiction text. There is an effort to incorporate social studies and science content into the literacy block. An emphasis is placed on building students stamina for independent reading and writing. Close reading strategies are used to develop students' ability to pair evidence with an inference.

Mathematics: Students practice the Common Core Standards of Mathematical Practice in conjunction with math content. Instruction follows the Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Math in Focus program which follows the Singapore Math teaching method. There is an emphasis on problem solving and deep understanding of concepts. The program incorporates a Concrete-Pictorial-Abstract methodology and emphasizes mastery and the generalization of skills to novel situations.

Science: The science program is a process inquiry-based program. Students have ample opportunities for hands-on learning preceding abstract lessons. The basic processes taught are observing, communicating, comparing, organizing, relating, measuring, predicting, and inferring. Integrated processes taught include controlling variables, interpreting data, formulating hypotheses, defining operations, and experimenting.

Visual Arts: The art curriculum includes lessons on the elements of design. There is an emphasis during the primary years on the development of observation and fine motor skills as well as acquiring art vocabulary. Intermediate students produce two and three-dimensional art in a more detailed, controlled fashion. There is greater emphasis on techniques, craftsmanship, and the creative process.

Performing Arts: Students receive weekly instruction in music concepts such as rhythm, melody/pitch, harmony, form, tone color, texture, style, and dynamics. A substantial portion of the curriculum consists of singing and listening. Movement is used to reinforce some music elements. Creativity is fostered throughout the program. Students are given opportunities to play, write, or sing music inventively.

Physical Education/Health: The curriculum focuses on fitness and nutritional skills and strategies in developing a healthy lifestyle. Specific objectives include motor skills, fitness, team and individual activity. Students receive P.E. for 125 minutes a week.

Social Studies/Global Awareness: The primary purpose of the social studies program is global citizenship. The curriculum places emphasis on geography, current events, and map skills.

Educational Technology: Students are taught to use computers and technology as a tool to enhance their learning. Classroom instruction reinforces keyboarding, word processing and web 2.0 tools. Technology is used to demonstrate knowledge of content and collaboration. The library-media curriculum builds upon the use of technology for research, critical thinking, and digital citizenship.

Foreign Language: Our Chinese Immersion program (partial model) began in the 2011 school year at both kindergarten and 1st grade. The program is structured on the total language learning approach incorporating content-based instruction, explicit language instruction, and experiential language learning practices. Students learn the simplified Mandarin writing system, or hanzi. Expressive and receptive language development is emphasized in all stages of the program. The goal of the program is for students to be functionally proficient in speaking, reading, and writing in Mandarin and have a strong appreciation for cultural diversity. The native-speaking Chinese teachers deliver Chinese Language Arts. Mathematics, social studies and science content instruction is shared across both the Chinese classroom and the English classroom.

2. Reading/English:

Rose School uses a comprehensive literacy curriculum that is aligned with the CCSS, 21st Century Skills, and PISA. Through the reading workshop model, utilizing Lucy Calkins materials, we focus on a detailed continuum of literacy behaviors. This program provides students with the strategies and skills necessary to become active, skillful, and confident readers, who develop a love of reading.

Teachers access information to intentionally guide instruction based on student needs through a variety of assessment techniques. Developmentally appropriate instruction is thoughtfully scaffolded to allow for the gradual release of skills and strategies. Teachers use the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum, along with Des Cartes, to determine student's instructional needs. Rigorous instruction prepares children for the future.

We understand the inherent interconnection between reading, writing, listening, and speaking. This is imperative when determining instruction. Our curriculum is based on Vygotsky's theory of social development. This approach meets Rose School's broad spectrum of learning needs. Our goal in using strategy based instruction is to guide children toward independence.

Students acquire reading skills and strategies through the components of the literacy block which includes the reading workshop: anchor lessons through interactive read aloud, shared reading, small group instruction (guided reading, literature circles, book clubs, and inquiry circles), independent reading, writing about reading, word study, and group share. Through the use of these best practices students acquire foundational reading skills.

Leveled Literacy Intervention is a small group supplementary intervention designed for children with reading difficulties. This intervention is based on Fountas and Pinnell's gradient of text difficulty. Each level of text makes increasing demands. This intervention is used by our reading resource teachers with children who have been identified through the RtI process. Our reading resource teacher also instructs a social studies content area reading intervention. Other interventions utilized by our classroom teachers include: Phonics for Reading, Read Naturally, and activities from the Stephanie Harvey Comprehension Tool Kit. These interventions are utilized in addition to the core curriculum, with students who have been identified during our Data Analysis Meetings. Third through fifth grade students that are reading over two years above grade level, may also receive support from our extended resource teacher. Students are extended through the use of complex texts and programs like Junior Great Books. Our students in these areas continue to grow due to these targeted interventions.

3. Mathematics:

Rose School's mathematics scope and sequence aligns with Barrington 220's math curriculum, as well as the CCSS. To fully achieve these objectives, Rose School is in the second year of implementing Math in Focus. In accordance with Barrington 220's Mathematics Vision and Belief Statements, daily practices allow students to become active, skillful, and confident mathematicians through purposeful mathematics experiences.

We encourage purposeful practice and goal setting in the areas of: perseverance, problem solving, logical reasoning, modeling, constructing viable arguments, and attending to precision. Students are challenged to

find multiple ways to solve problems, using concrete, pictorial, and abstract models. We recognize the need for students to move fluidly among these three models and vary our teaching methods based on formative assessment. Our goal is to develop students who have a strong foundation in number sense so that they can demonstrate computational fluency and be efficient problem solvers who can apply this mathematical thinking to novel situations.

As a daily practice, teachers differentiate based on student need using a variety of methods. Opportunities for learning come through games, partner work, hands on activities, student presentations, and group projects. Learners are challenged to solve problems and provide evidence for their thinking, as well as support their conclusions.

During the data review process, more significant student needs are discussed and a plan of action is designed. The plan might include the use of specific programs such as Numicon, xtramath.com and Assessing Math Concepts. General education teachers, special education teachers, and support staff work together to meet student needs. Within the classroom, teachers flexibly group students. These groupings may cross classrooms and grade levels and include the math workshop model.

Students working well beyond grade level participate in the Extended Services Program. Students in this program are challenged by a faster pace and more abstract thought processes. Rose School also has hosted a math competition for the top 10% of fourth and fifth graders in the district.

We are committed to mathematics professional development offered by the district, as well as, local and national conferences. The staff has participated in workshops presented by Dr. Yeap Ban Har and Char Forsten, experts in the field. Recognizing the importance of the home-school connection, Rose School hosted a Math Night, where teachers presented workshops to parents on Math in Focus strategies.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Rose School believes that all children have gifts and talents. The parents and teachers believe that every subject area is necessary and beneficial in the teaching of the whole child.

The Fine Arts curriculum at Rose School is dedicated to teaching each student that success in art is not one determined by predisposition, but rather a process of mastery, that one can obtain through practice and dedication. To ensure an appreciation of the arts for all and stretch the talents of the visually inclined, its spiral curriculum is developed through careful consideration of connections to other subject areas, real world application, critical thinking skills, and the interest of the child. Pairing this with a scaffold and gradual release model of teaching, students receive an education in the arts that is all encompassing.

The daily display of student artwork throughout the school, confirms that all Rose School students apply their gifts and demonstrate their appreciation of the artist's process. The student creations visually demonstrate an understanding of the learning objectives and techniques taught in the classroom. However, it is the student's ability to explain the purpose of what they are working on that truly shows the knowledge gained. The reflective process instilled in them through the arts curriculum teaches them that whatever level they are able to achieve is acceptable and makes them successful.

This methodology has proven itself at Rose School to bring forth the artistic capacities of every student. Beyond the daily curriculum, our students have a wealth of opportunity to demonstrate their endowments and appreciation of the Arts. The Fine Arts program is vested in having students participate with local and global audiences of the arts so students do not just make art, but become artists. This is achieved through art fairs, community art displays, small scale exhibitions, community art competitions, online art galleries, portfolio creations and opportunities for extended art classes.

5. Instructional Methods:

Together with our instructional coach and special services team, teachers at Rose School continually collaborate to refine instructional methods so that our pedagogy is rooted in best practice. We utilize formative and summative assessment to help guide instructional decision making. Universal assessment data selected by our district steering committees is collected as a way to gauge student learning needs. As a team, we place students into tiers based on the academic and behavioral needs represented in this data. Appropriate methods and interventions are selected to meet the varied learning requirements of each student. This also includes grouping for extension and even parallel curriculum, where appropriate, to allow students a greater depth of study. Teachers continually assess and adapt instructional practices according to each unique classroom environment.

Teachers often act as facilitators for whole class discussions around an idea, learning strategy, or academic concept. We use careful, deliberate questioning and shared inquiry techniques to encourage children in collaboratively negotiating deeper understanding. This is one way in which teachers lead the whole class on a trajectory toward grade-level expectations, and provide access to higher-level thinking that lifts achievement for all students. Further, flexible, skill-based grouping and one-to-one conferring across academic content areas allow for a diverse makeup of student needs to be met within each classroom. With specific learning targets established, students and teachers work together to set appropriately challenging goals and plan a path towards goal achievement. This differentiation is paramount to our instructional practices in order to meet the diverse needs of all of our students.

Inquiry circles are an example of differentiation within our classrooms and is a vehicle for utilizing the wealth of technology available to students. Students use multimedia, and at times assistive technology, for interest-driven research, collaborating with peers, and ‘going public’ with learning. Presentations may include video, shared or individual digital slideshows, podcasting, and blogging. Questioning, visual/tactile learning, and deep discussion around numerical-based concepts are all tools utilized to facilitate mathematical learning. Children represent these concepts in concrete, pictorial, and abstract ways, which allows all students an entry point to access higher-level thinking skills. This practice encourages students to take risks, persevere in problem-solving, approach math flexibly, and defend their reasoning. In believing that every child at Rose School can learn and grow in this way, our repertoire of instructional methods create students that are passionate, engaged, life-long learners.

6. Professional Development:

Professional development is an integral part of the Rose School culture. We believe it is important as professionals to continue to refine our craft. Many of our staff choose to participate in book clubs and other professional discussions throughout the school year. Some staff are active on social media, such as Twitter, exploring areas of professional interest. Staff meetings are often devoted to the sharing of ideas and strategies, including strengthening our technology skills. In addition, the school district offers a variety of classes for all content areas. Grade-level and department (e.g., job-a-like) meetings are regularly scheduled with other buildings in the district. Recently, these grade-level meetings have focused on the alignment of our instruction with the Common Core State Standards.

Research shows that professional development has the strongest and longest lasting impact when it is job embedded. Given that, Rose School takes full advantage of the building’s instructional coach and the expertise she has to offer our staff. Teachers work with the coach individually or in teams. Collaboration can take the form of professional study, brainstorming, lesson planing, and reflection. The coach will also coordinate lesson studies, either within the building or across the district. This has been a great opportunity for our teachers to refine instruction and examine student work.

Rose School also recognizes the importance of differentiating learning for teachers, just as we differentiate the instruction for our students. Teachers are given staff development time to engage in professional inquiry. This process begins with staff generating questions around topics of professional interest utilizing Web 2.0 tools to organize and coordinate mutual areas of curiosity. The groups, once formed, reveal a

cross-categorical selection of teachers from various domains and grades. Each group takes responsibility in planning their learning by refining the topic, immersing themselves in research, synthesizing relevant information, and finalizing the scope of knowledge that has been gained. This knowledge is then developed into a meaningful presentation that can be shared with the rest of the staff, thus providing a unique level of professional development.

7. School Leadership

The philosophy and structure of the Rose School's leadership team is best described as shared leadership, following many of the practices outlined in Jim Knight's "Partnership Approach" (Unmistakable Impact, 2011). The building principal serves as the "lead learner" engaging in professional learning with teachers, rather than training done to teachers. The principal models professional curiosity and provides the structures and practices needed to encourage action research and shared decision-making. District mandates and curriculum initiatives are balanced with inquiry-based professional learning at the building-level, teacher reflection, reciprocity, and choice on how and what is learned.

The building has a school improvement team that includes broad representation across grade-levels and related service personnel. This team serves to provide focus and coherence around instructional improvement targets. The membership on the team is revolving and strategic. It allows for both the dissemination of school improvement work and the necessary feedback from the classroom level. Learning and behavioral goals are made clear and refined based on student feedback. An emphasis is placed on content planning, formative assessment, instruction, and community building.

In partnership with the building's instructional coach, teachers are encouraged to engage in lesson studies and group instructional inquiries. For example, the Rose School teaching staff regularly takes time to form questions around best practice instruction. Through action research, study of professional literature and peer observation, the staff operates in a mode of continuous growth. Individuals and teaching teams regularly share successes and pitfalls with each other. This has led to the cross-pollination of effective practice and high levels of teacher leadership at both building and district level.

Finally, a concerted effort is made to involve the parents in all aspects of their child's education at Rose School. The school partners with parents through opportunities for classroom involvement, parent universities on specific curriculum topics, informal "second cup of coffees" with the principal, fundraising, and a wide variety of cultural and athletic activities. The school leadership strives to promote an inclusive environment where everyone shares the responsibility for student growth.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Illinois Standards Achievement Test

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 97 | 99 | 98 | 98 | 100 |
| % Exceeds | 50 | 20 | 22 | 26 | 16 |
| Number of students tested | 90 | 89 | 83 | 91 | 77 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 99 | 100 | 98 | 99 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | 93 | 92 | 90 | 100 |
| % Exceeds | | 43 | 33 | 57 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | | 14 | 12 | 21 | 10 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % Exceeds | 42 | 3 | 15 | 14 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 43 | 38 | 27 | 37 | 24 |
| 7. American Indian or | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 95 | 98 | 96 | 96 | 100 |
| % Exceeds | 62 | 27 | 22 | 33 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 42 | 44 | 51 | 45 | 49 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Pearson

Test: Illinois Standards Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 91 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 96 |
| % Exceeds | 47 | 40 | 38 | 34 | 31 |
| Number of students tested | 93 | 86 | 92 | 77 | 100 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 100 | 98 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 77 | | 94 | | 72 |
| % Exceeds | 54 | | 56 | | 29 |
| Number of students tested | 13 | | 16 | | 14 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| % Exceeds | 48 | 21 | 28 | 28 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 42 | 29 | 39 | 25 | 33 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|-----|----|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 84 | 98 | 98 | 100 | 94 |
| % Exceeds | 46 | 44 | 43 | 33 | 38 |
| Number of students tested | 44 | 52 | 44 | 48 | 64 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Pearson

Test: Illinois Standards Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 85 | 99 | 98 | 97 | 98 |
| % Exceeds | 55 | 46 | 48 | 51 | 62 |
| Number of students tested | 91 | 93 | 81 | 99 | 123 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | 92 | 100 | 81 | 92 |
| % Exceeds | | 67 | 70 | 50 | 75 |
| Number of students tested | | 12 | 10 | 16 | 12 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 97 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 98 |
| % Exceeds | 39 | 33 | 33 | 28 | 48 |
| Number of students tested | 31 | 39 | 27 | 32 | 40 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 85 | 98 | 98 | 95 | 99 |
| % Exceeds | 68 | 51 | 54 | 61 | 70 |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 43 | 50 | 64 | 79 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Pearson

Test: Illinois Standards Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 92 | 96 | 94 | 91 | 91 |
| % Exceeds | 33 | 35 | 51 | 47 | 37 |
| Number of students tested | 90 | 89 | 83 | 92 | 78 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 99 | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | 86 | 75 | 67 | 80 |
| % Exceeds | | 71 | 58 | 38 | 40 |
| Number of students tested | | 14 | 12 | 21 | 10 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 91 | 97 | 96 | 95 | 96 |
| % Exceeds | 23 | 24 | 33 | 34 | 38 |
| Number of students tested | 43 | 38 | 27 | 38 | 24 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 93 | 96 | 92 | 89 | 90 |
| % Exceeds | 43 | 43 | 57 | 58 | 38 |
| Number of students tested | 42 | 44 | 51 | 45 | 50 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

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

Test: Illinois Standards Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 90 | 99 | 94 | 92 | 95 |
| % Exceeds | 53 | 40 | 36 | 37 | 35 |
| Number of students tested | 94 | 86 | 92 | 76 | 100 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 98 | 99 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 62 | | 69 | | 64 |
| % Exceeds | 23 | | 31 | | 36 |
| Number of students tested | 13 | | 16 | | 14 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 95 | 100 | 97 | 96 | 100 |
| % Exceeds | 52 | 24 | 36 | 33 | 27 |
| Number of students tested | 42 | 29 | 39 | 24 | 33 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 85 | 98 | 89 | 92 | 94 |
| % Exceeds | 49 | 46 | 36 | 38 | 41 |
| Number of students tested | 45 | 52 | 44 | 48 | 64 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

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

Test: Illinois Standards Achievement Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

| School Year | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| SCHOOL SCORES* | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 88 | 95 | 96 | 94 | 96 |
| % Exceeds | 53 | 40 | 40 | 33 | 37 |
| Number of students tested | 91 | 91 | 83 | 99 | 123 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 2. Students receiving Special Education | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | 73 | 80 | 69 | 75 |
| % Exceeds | | 46 | 50 | 19 | 50 |
| Number of students tested | | 11 | 10 | 16 | 12 |
| 3. English Language Learner Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. African- American Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Asian Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 97 | 97 | 100 | 97 | 100 |
| % Exceeds | 55 | 32 | 33 | 19 | 30 |
| Number of students tested | 31 | 38 | 27 | 32 | 40 |
| 7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 9. White Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | 85 | 95 | 96 | 94 | 94 |
| % Exceeds | 51 | 47 | 45 | 41 | 38 |
| Number of students tested | 53 | 43 | 51 | 64 | 79 |
| 10. Two or More Races identified Students | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 11. Other 1: Other 1 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 12. Other 2: Other 2 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 13. Other 3: Other 3 | | | | | |
| % Meets plus % Exceeds | | | | | |
| % Exceeds | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

NOTES: