

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

[X] Public or [] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Mr. Jonathan Paul Endelos

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

Official School Name Anna E. Barry Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 44 Connell St

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

City Chicopee State MA Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 01020-1499

County Hampden County State School Code Number* 00610003

Telephone 413-594-3425 Fax 413-594-3468

Web site/URL http://www.chicopeeps.org/Barry E-mail jendelos@chicopeeps.org

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

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*Mr. Richard Rege E-mail: rrege@chicopee.mec.edu
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Chicopee Tel. 413-594-3410

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 Mayor Richard Kos
(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):
- 9 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 3 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 2 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 14 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. 1 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	34	36	70
1	40	29	69
2	40	29	69
3	36	39	75
4	42	44	86
5	41	41	82
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	233	218	451

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 3 % Asian
 - 1 % Black or African American
 - 20 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 73 % White
 - 3 % 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: 7%

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	13
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	20
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	33
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	448
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.074
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	7

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 14 %
62 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 11
 Specify non-English languages: Albanian, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Turkish, Ukranian, Urdu, Vietnamese
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 61 %
 Total number students who qualify: 276

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: 16 %
74 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.

23 Autism	0 Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	8 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	12 Specific Learning Disability
1 Emotional Disturbance	13 Speech or Language Impairment
1 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
0 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0 Multiple Disabilities	16 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	2
Classroom teachers	21
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	19
Paraprofessionals	19
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	95%	96%	95%	95%	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 No X

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

PART III – SUMMARY

The mission of Anna E. Barry School is to educate children. All staff members are dedicated to the proper preparation and instruction of elementary school students as they successfully continue their education, and pursue their aspirations as they eventually become contributing community members who are life-long learners. In assuming our responsibility to achieve these goals and accepting the challenges presented in our classrooms, we must be responsive in addressing all factors which influence the educational, emotional and social development of children in a manner which is appropriate, purposeful and meaningful to each individual.

Anna E. Barry School is a neighborhood elementary school serving approximately 450 students Kindergarten through grade five. The school offers two inclusive district programs: High Functioning Autism Learners, and English Language Learners who account for approximately 16% of the current enrollment. Instruction in each grade level is inclusive, which creates a truly diverse student population.

In 2007, Differentiated Small Group Instruction was identified by the staff at Anna E. Barry School as the single most important academic area which could make the largest impact on student learning. The challenge was led by site-based administration with the goal to minimize whole group instruction and find more time for small groups of learners to work with an adult. We made this a reality through scheduling – and a tremendous amount of trial and error. Once schedules were adapted and dispersed throughout the school (many schedules were volunteered by veteran teachers who mastered the model) the accountability piece kicked-in. Staff members who needed assistance or additional support were supported. Creative scheduling was coined, and soon the schedules at Anna E. Barry School ensured each staff member had enough support for their challenging times and crucial teaching moments.

With scheduling and support behind us, we moved onto bringing student centers to the next level. The buzz word at the time was, and still is "differentiated" — we quickly adopted “Differentiated Centers” as our school-wide language of what we needed to build. Starting small with third grade in 2008, we supported grade level staff members with a networked color printer, laminators, color paper and most importantly – time. The mission and outline of this experiment was to take the old, overused English Language Arts Worksheets and make them manipulative-able partnered activities in which students could reinforce what they already learned in their small instructional group the previous week. The one-size fits all approach of a worksheet was replaced by ‘differentiated centers’ and ‘center activities’ which the teachers made for specific groups of students. The basic worksheet that every child would be responsible for by the end of a seatwork block took on a new form and morphed into a ‘differentiated center’ which a small group of learners would need to complete by the end of the week. “Must do” centers took shape and soon students found that once they completed their ‘must do centers” (and completed them with the high expectations their teacher would expect) they could move on to skill-based centers which assisted teachers by reinforcing material that was presented earlier in the year.

The first month ticked-by and student engagement in each of the three ‘differentiated centers’ classrooms soared – we later found that this initiative translated into assessment gains in every aspect of the school. Word spread of what was taking place in our guinea-pig grade level and then it teachers began requesting materials to build their own grade levels’ differentiated centers. Networked color printers, laminators, color paper all became standard supplies in each grade level and each and every grade level began seeing terrific gains.

Over the past five years Anna E. Barry School has seen student academic success as a direct result of Differentiated Small Group Instruction and Differentiated Centers. The tireless efforts of the staff members at the building have demonstrated by limiting whole class instruction in favor of small group differentiated instruction, and creating differentiated centers and center activities in lieu of worksheets, overall student achievement soars. Only through the hard work of the staff, and their dedication to teaching and learning has Anna E. Barry School reached the milestone of ‘Level One Accountability Status’ upon the scored release of the 2012-2013 MCAS.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) Students in grades 3-5 at Anna E. Barry School take part in the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), which is the standardized assessment for the state. Students are assessed in three subjects in grade five: English Language Arts, mathematics, and science & engineering; Students in grades three and four are assessed in English Language Arts and mathematics.

The MCAS has five scoring categories: Warning, Needs Improvement Low, Needs Improvement High, Proficient, and Advanced. Each category has a corresponding range for scaled scores, as well as a conversion to Composite Performance Index (CPI) in points. Students who achieve a scaled score of 210-218 are considered Warning. Students in the Warning category receive a total of 25 points. Students who achieve a scaled score of 220-228 are considered Needs Improvement Low. Students in the Needs Improvement Low Category receive a total of 50 points. Students who achieve a scaled score of 230-238 are considered Needs Improvement High. Students in the Needs Improvement High Category receive a total of 75 points. Student who achieve a 240 – 258 are considered Proficient in the tested material. Students in grades 3-5 who score 260 – 280 are considered Advanced in the tested material. Students who score in the Proficient or Advanced categories receive 100 points.

The acceptable target for all students in the state and district is a scaled score of 240, or 100 CPI Points, which means they have achieved Proficient status in the state.

b) In the subject of Math over the last 5 years, proficiency scores of all students have equaled those in the Low Income subgroup at all grade levels. Grade 3 students have always been our highest achieving students over the past 5 years. During this span, the teaching staff at grade 3 have done a tremendous job of transitioning students to prepare for high-stakes testing. In addition, this performance trend also points to solid instruction that our students receive at the primary grades to build on foundational skills in math. The enhanced movement of our differentiated small group instructional model, along with the hard work of the staff to incorporate hands-on center activities have contributed to the tremendous growth seen by each grade level, but specifically grade 3 has been able to improve proficiency levels from 55% in 2009 to 95% in 2013. The stability, cohesion, and talent of this teaching team is by far the overwhelming reason for such success in our math scores in Grade 3. During the most recent school year, students in all sub groups in grade 3 scored at least proficient within 3-4 percentage points, with all groups more than 92% of students proficient in math. From the 2013 MCAS testing we are proud to say that 100% of our students with disabilities and ELL students in grade 3 scored at least proficient on MCAS, with 92% of our Hispanic students scoring the same level of performance.

Our students in grade 4 and 5 over the past five years have also shown great gains in our overall proficiency levels in math. Grade 4 students have grown over 20 percentage points during the 5 year span, while grade 5 students have gained 23 percentage points during the same span. During this span, our low-income subgroup has seen similar gains, reaching almost identical levels of proficiency in math. A major contributor to this growth in math has been largely in part due to creation of meaningful math centers, along with supplemental math support from "Go Math" materials. We recognize that in both grade levels our students with disabilities are still proving to be a challenge. To combat this challenge, we have recently instituted regular Intervention Meetings to discuss intervention changes for individual students that are not showing adequate growth in their math skills. We have also incorporated different strategies to meet the different learning styles to help students conceptually understand and apply skills and become successful problem solvers. In addition to regular collaboration among teachers, our school-wide data team analyzes all data points to identify skills that are lacking and addressing these our staff work together to find or develop different interventions to address these deficiencies.

Over the prior 5 years, ELA has also shown some impressive growth in grades 3 and 4. Five years ago, grade 3 had only 38% of students scoring proficient, while in 2013 62% of our students scored proficiency in ELA. Even more impressive in our school has been the growth of grade 4 students during the same span.

Percent of grade 4 students scoring proficient has risen from 42% in 2009 to 82% of students in 2013. During that same span, 2% of students were advanced in 2009, while 16% of our students were advanced in the most recent testing year in 2013. As in Math, our students in grade 4 have kept pace in all subgroups with the exception of students with disabilities for ELA testing. In the most recent year, grade 3 students kept pace within 9 percentage points of proficiency with all students. The struggles in grade 3 seem to be with the Hispanic and ELL subgroups. There is a 17 and 16 percentage point difference respectively that needs to be addressed. To combat these gaps, we have been increasing the amount of "Language for Learning" exposure for our ELL students, while using Intervention Meetings to identify specific skills that our subgroups are struggling with on the ELA testing. Grade 5 students over the five year span have not shown the growth that the other grades have shown, but we have seen a 500% increase in the number of students who score Advanced in ELA testing, while we have consistently had 60% of our students in grade 5 score proficient in ELA. A very similar large gap exists in grade 5 students with disabilities. Since this is a repeated area of concern between ELA and Math, Barry School has instituted Intervention Meetings, a school-wide Leadership/Data Team, and increased technology opportunities for students to gain extra reinforcement and practice with skills in ELA and Math.

2. Using Assessment Results:

At the first faculty meeting in August of 2009, the principal presented to the staff at Anna E. Barry School with the goal to minimize student assessments by eliminating 'whole group testing'. The staff members were puzzled since many of the teachers at Anna E. Barry School themselves had never been taught without having to take a test at the end of presented material.

We no longer shut down instruction to assess the entire class; instead, we recapture that assessment time in small group differentiated instruction, which in some classrooms totals nearly 2.5 hours per week and in some cases requires teachers to redefine their pedagogy. There are no math tests, no chapter tests, no theme tests, or no whole group testing of any kind. Instead, the teacher's small group instructional table became the most important assessment measure for student learning. Teachers moved to 'dip-sticking' how students were comprehending a new math or ELA lesson within the differentiated instructional group.

However, that's not to say that the staff at Anna E. Barry School use no assessment data to aid instructional decision-making. The Dynamic Indicators of Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) are a mainstay in the district and truly an import piece of data which all staff use to assist in student fluency and comprehension. Low achieving students are monitored bi-monthly, whereas students on or above grade level are monitored monthly.

The previous year's MCAS data in grades 3-5 help target specific areas of improvement for both teachers and students. MCAS data are disaggregated over the summer and used as a guide for students in grades 4-5 within the first month of reviewed curriculum. Grade level teachers use their previous year's MCAS data to identify trends or common errors made by students to ensure they covered all of the tested curriculum material and reflect on teaching a targeted lesson/skill differently.

In addition, the district ensures that Anna E. Barry School continue benchmark assessments in writing, DIBELS, and math three times per year (fall, winter, spring).

Within the first couple of months in 2009 the staff was fully on board with no whole class assessments, even though there were a few staff holdouts who would have students take a spelling or comprehension assessment on Fridays (old habits and all). As a whole student instructional time soared. Parents who questioned the lack of corrected assessments coming home were contacted personally, and at the end of the conversation were not only comfortable with the change, but thought it was incredible.

By January the staff at Anna E. Barry School was closer than ever. Classroom teachers, their teaching assistants, and Interventionists work together and share what has been successful with students and what

they will try next for those students who still are not making adequate gains. Removing whole class assessments was a success because of the professionals who refused to let the idea fail.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Although Anna E. Barry School was not strictly affiliated with the Bay State Reading Institute (B.S.R.I.), staff members (the reading specialist, a grade 3 teacher, and the principal) were recruited to lead professional development in the districts and schools where B.S.R.I. was working. As a result, a professional relationship developed and staff members were encouraged to visit Anna E. Barry School to see the professional development presentation in action.

Over the past four years, Anna E. Barry School has hosted a number of local schools and school districts, including: Westfield (Paper Mill Elementary School, and Highland Elementary School), Munson (Crosby Elementary School), Brockton (Baker Elementary School) and Chicopee (Belcher Elementary School, Strieber Elementary School, Lambert-Lavoie Elementary School and Fairview Veterans Memorial Middle School). Classroom teachers, interventionists, reading coaches, vice principals, principals and central office staff all visited the building (often times multiple times) in order to see the ‘instructional model’ Anna E. Barry School was utilizing.

Many, if not all, of the visitors who toured Anna E. Barry School from 2009-2013 were focused on improving their small group differentiated instructional pedagogy. Classroom and staff schedules, student group rotation, differentiated centers, and the building’s professional learning community were highlighted and modeled for our visitors. Visitors who toured the building were always encouraged to take photos, ask questions of teachers (on their prep periods), copy examples of schedules and rotations, and steal every bit of good practice they could; in order to make what they saw their own.

Many of the professional relationships created as a result of having visitors tour Anna E. Barry School have continued well past a visit or two. Teachers move buildings, administrators move districts, however through phone calls, text messages, and E-mails, the staff and administration Anna E. Barry School have stayed in-touch with many of the educators who had toured the building. We share our individual and building-wide successes and challenges, run ideas past each other, and continue to push each other in a professional way to create new and engaging ways to reach our students and staff.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

There have been many successful initiatives and strategies Anna E. Barry School has utilized over the past six years in order to build parent and guardian interest in the success of their children.

At the top of the list is school-wide communication. Classroom teachers and interventionists are encouraged to connect with parents and guardians via phone calls, E-mails, and paper correspondence. A school-wide effort was made to call home for positive things – this included administration. So often the only time a teacher would call home was to report what the child did wrong, and in order to break this stigma, staff were encouraged to build parent/guardian rapport by calling home to relay a good “thing” that happened during the day. This initiative built trust within the school community and through the relationships that developed between home and school our learners saw their parents and teachers working together.

Our monthly newsletter goes home as a hard copy to students the last week of the month, and is also available online through the school web-page. This gives students and parents and guardians an overview of what they can expect the following month – this has worked tremendously, however this was not always the case.

My first year in the building I found that the newsletter was seemingly window-dressing – that is to say after all the hard work assembling what I thought was some great information, many parents would simply put the lunch menu on the fridge and throw the newsletter away. To change this we began focusing more on students. Monthly student work started to make an appearance. More articles and information about the

students and staff were included, and an incredibly popular Behind the Scenes color section was added which included students and staff in candid photographs as they worked through the day. Students were excited to show their parents the funny photos and learn about the staff, and low-and-behold parents began commenting that they liked the newsletter now. Success!

In addition to the monthly newsletter the school also utilized our Blackboard Connect system which allowed school administration to remind parents and guardians about special events or happenings in the building by making mass-calls in the early evening. This was especially important as a reminder for parents to have students in attendance during the MCAS testing days, and to remind students to get plenty of sleep prior to testing and read over vacation.

Although these two examples do not highlight our non-school time programs nor accurately portray all the hard work that went into building parent and guardian trust they give a glimpse into the hard work that each and every teacher put forward in creating a school community.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Anna E. Barry School, as part of the Chicopee Public Schools, has a well defined and established core curriculum for each subject. All subjects have a set scope and sequence aligned with the current State of Massachusetts Common Core Frameworks with corresponding text which aid teachers in meeting the outlined district standards. Supplemental materials are easily accessible through the district's Moodle page (open source web application). The Moodle site is completely interactive, and will hyperlink to pre-loaded examples in electronic and printable paper form. During English Language Arts Instruction classroom teachers and Interventionists use Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Text as the core curriculum, and supplement with Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Level Readers. Houghton Mifflin offers an Extra Support Handbook, English Language Learner Handbook as well as online reference for teachers who need off-level materials in order to differentiate instruction based upon learner need.

Over the summer of 2013 the Chicopee Public Schools changed the district math core from Houghton Mifflin Mathematics to Pearson Envisions. The new Pearson Envisions math core allows teachers to make use of a completely interactive set of materials which includes a tremendous amount of technology for student and staff use, including: animated mini-clips at the beginning of each lesson, sing-a-long style songs for grades K-2, and interactive classwork and homework building options for staff.

In addition to the Houghton Mifflin English Language Arts Core Curriculum and Pearson Envisions math core, teachers at Anna E. Barry School have worked together to develop differentiated centers based upon the Houghton Mifflin Leveled Readers (ELA, Science and Social Studies) and specific skills for Mathematics. These differentiated centers have taken the place of worksheets (and the majority of paper) in the classroom, and are always used to reinforce the skill or presented material for students. For example: this week in grade three students are focusing on main idea -- next week in lieu of worksheets, students will be working together (groups of two and three students who are not at an instructional table with an adult) on playing an interactive main idea themed center. It is important to note that centers are always introduced after a skill has been taught at the small group instructional table. Based upon the overwhelmingly positive student data, out teacher created centers have been a true asset in minimizing student regression in both English Language Arts and math.

All students at Anna E. Barry School take part in a Science, Physical Education or Technology resource period daily. Certified teachers instruct each subject and are held to the state and district curriculum standards. In addition, classroom teachers work closely with the Science, Physical Education, and Technology educators in order to support their presented material, which gives students and staff the flexibility to deliver longer lessons with full staff accountability and buy-in.

The physical education teacher at Anna E. Barry School utilizes the Michigan Model for Health Curriculum which is a comprehensive and sequential K-12 health education curriculum that aims to give school-aged children (ages 5-19 years) the knowledge and skills needed to practice and maintain healthy behaviors and lifestyles. In addition to guided lessons from the Michigan Model for Health Curriculum, Anna E. Barry School has a partnership with the University of Massachusetts-Amherst where graduate students (under the direction of a professor) come to Anna E. Barry School to deliver a full week of comprehensive nutrition and healthy eating lessons to assist students in making healthy choices for foods.

Classroom teachers embed both the social studies and the visual and performing arts curricula in their daily instruction. The English Language Arts Houghton Mifflin core does allow for additional materials to be brought into small group instruction, and depending on the skill and theme, both social studies and visual and performing arts are spiraled-into the English Language Arts and writing instructional blocks. For example, creating a picture of the friendly monster you transformed into at the conclusion of a writing assignment, and performing a scene from a play in grade two, would both be examples of how classroom teachers meet the visual and performing art standards through embedded instruction.

2. Reading/English:

Anna E. Barry School successfully utilizes a Three Tier Model for reading instruction. The Three Tier Instructional Model has Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Textbook and Level Readers as the core for Tier One. Approximately 60 percent of students in the building only receive Tier One for instruction. Approximately Twenty five percent of the students receive Tier Two instruction from an Interventionist. This additional tier of instruction is a supplement to the core in tier one, and typically consists of students who fall below the benchmark levels and are at some risk for academic failure. Tier Three is the final tier for instruction in the building and typically consists of students who are considered to be at high risk for failure, and if not responsive in tier two may qualify for Special Education or specific language learning services.

It is important to note that although the Chicopee Public Schools and Anna E. Barry School has a terrific core curriculum for reading instruction, with guidelines on how to implement a tiered instructional model – at the heart of the school’s success is the dedication and professionalism of its staff. The Tiered Instructional Model was selected by the Chicopee Public Schools because when implemented with fidelity, the results as proven by the data, are tremendous.

The Tiered Instructional Model works well at Anna E. Barry School because all of the educators in the building are stakeholders in assisting students to learn. In order to have successful instruction taking place within each classroom, teachers need to have time to discuss individual student successes and challenges with other educators who can offer assistance and bring forth new ideas or methods on how to reach, or challenge, a learner. This time has been made in grade level classroom teachers schedules by ensuring that educators who teach a specific grade level all have the same preparation period to discuss lessons and plan future material.

In addition to grade level teachers all having the same preparation period, all staff members meet every five weeks (typically on a Friday) to review student data and discuss next steps for individual student instruction. These meetings are invaluable to allow support teachers (Interventionists) an opportunity to discuss specific strengths and challenges with the student’s classroom teachers.

Overall, the Tiered Instructional Model in conjunction with the Off-Schedule Days at Anna E. Barry School have made a tremendous impact on student learning by ensuring that all students are making appropriate gains for their learning styles. When a child needs additional time within an academic area they are moved through the Tiered Instructional Model and given realistic timelines to make appropriate gains.

3. Mathematics:

In September of 2013 the Chicopee Public Schools adopted a new math core for all city elementary schools. As such, Anna E. Barry School moved from the Houghton Mifflin Math Core to Pearson Envisions. Although the textbooks and supporting material have changed this school year, there truly has been very little change in the philosophy behind teaching students mathematics. Again, the reason the school uses this model is because of the strong data which goes along with driving this particular instructional model.

At the heart of math instruction at Anna E. Barry School is small group differentiated instruction. In a typical classroom, students receive one hour and thirty minute of mathematics instruction. During this instructional time classroom teachers are encouraged to minimize whole class instruction, and in many classrooms teachers have eliminated all whole class instruction in favor of breaking students into differentiated instructional groups exclusively. Gone are the days where a classroom teacher would introduce a lesson at the front of the classroom and go over examples on the chalkboard or white board.

If you were to walk into a typical classroom at Anna E. Barry School you would see students working in pairs at their desks or on the carpet, and two groups of approximately six students receiving instruction from an adult at an instructional table. The instructor would be working from the core with students, however in lieu of pencil and paper, students would be working with personal white boards and working out problems with the teacher together.

Much like the Three Tier Model for English Language Arts Instruction, grade level teachers differentiate their math instruction by utilizing small group instruction. In a typical classroom a teacher would have three math groups (high, middle, low) made up of approximately six students in each group. Each group would rotate around the room and have thirty minutes with their classroom teacher, while having additional periods of time to meet with an interventionist or work on center activities. Instances where a teacher has over 18 students (3 groups of 6 students) classroom teachers would be encouraged to 'roll' an additional group and typically the middle and high group would be shortened by ten minutes to account for the additional time needed.

Students in the middle and low groups would be eligible for additional instructional time in the classroom with a support teacher or paraprofessional. These teachers (much like during the English Language Arts Instructional Times) would be available to re-teach skills or challenge top performing learners.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

As has the Common Core Standards has shifted the paradigm, so has the role of technology skills with the development of new Common Core Assessments (SBAC and PARCC). The District Technology Curriculum is implemented at our school with enhanced awareness of social responsibility and ethical use of social networking skills for our students. Students receive weekly Technology class as a Special throughout the school year either once or twice per week. Moving forward over the next 2-3 years will be a crucial phase of ensuring that our Technology classes teach the basic knowledge of hardware, software, productivity tools, and the importance of ethical use of technology in our society. However, there will be a heightened importance of the use of one's ability to apply these technology skills to navigate through online high-stakes assessments. To address these concerns, Barry School is integrating Technology skills throughout every classroom.

Our technology plan starts with our Instructional technology teacher providing well-planned instruction in the computer lab on a weekly basis for all students. With the use of a state-of-the-art Smartboard, she is able to model skills needed but also to have up to 4 students interact at one time to during the modeling of lessons. The Technology curriculum used in Chicopee is consistent with the MA DESE Tech Standards. The increased use of iPads as instructional tools in all classrooms demands the need for constant instruction of how to manipulate through tablets as well as computers. Students are asked to perform formative assessments and benchmarks online through the use of the iPads, laptops, and desktop computers. We will be completing our first full year of using online testing and benchmarking for students in the entire district. This has placed more importance of the quality of technology instruction and the interaction between the technology teacher and the classroom teacher. Regular communication has been a vital part between teachers so that not only are technology skills taught in a lab setting and practiced in the classrooms, but the feedback is regularly communicated back to the technology teacher so that she continually spirals back to all skills during the course of the year. The role of technology is becoming more important and its up to us to ensure that future assessments are able to truly assess the content of the tests without a lack of technology skills depressing a student's ability to accurately portray learning that has occurred. The role of technology as a class in our school will continue to be front and center as our world is increasingly becoming dependent upon technology as a way to communicate.

5. Instructional Methods:

Barry School has been using a small group model of instruction over the last 8-9 years. Over the years, the school has added paraprofessional support in every classroom in the building. We have 3 ELL Interventionists, 2 Reading Interventionists, and 3 Special Education Inclusion teachers. All support is using the push-in model, with very little pull-out support for Speech and OT. Each classroom has Interventionists that are scheduled into classrooms based upon data analysis over the summer based on student needs. With this level of support, often times there could be a classroom teacher, a paraprofessional, and an interventionist in the classroom for a period of time.

In each grade level, students are placed heterogeneously, a group of lows, middles, and highs in all classrooms. Once students are placed, classroom teachers and interventionists work together to group students at different instructional levels. Also, over the last 3-4 years, the school has been able to support each classroom with 3 iPads in every classroom for reinforcement of the curriculum. For example of this model of support, 4th grade has two classrooms that are designated as inclusion classrooms, one class as housing the ELL cluster, and one classroom that has a cluster of at risk students. However, each of those classrooms is made up of a portion of students that are high, middle, and low. We have an ELL interventionist who goes into the ELL cluster for an hour and 45 minutes daily, and a paraprofessional that is scheduled throughout the day to implement Read Naturally, Language for Learning, or Quick Reads for struggling readers. During both ELA and math blocks, whole group instruction is limited to 20-30 minutes, with a bulk of the instructional blocks devoted to small group rotations. As the different groups rotate through to the teacher, the paraprofessional and/or interventionist, all students will participate in differentiated centers weekly, based upon the skills being reviewed from the prior week. An integral part of centers is the use of the iPads and Smart Clicker Response systems. Students will visit the technology center during the course of the week and get reinforcement from an assigned iPad app or take a quick assessment using the clicker response systems for formative reports for the classroom teacher. Throughout the year, each classroom teacher uses his/her Classroom Data Sheet to guide groupings and instructional decisions for students.

Aside from the classroom instruction, we also have Technology as a Specials class for every class in the school throughout the year. The technology teacher houses the Study Island program for students to practice ELA, Science, and math all year. She will regularly provide classroom teachers classroom reports that detail performance based on standards. Classroom teachers, in turn will use this information to individualize reinforcement activities for students based on need. During the year, we have 5-6 Intervention Meetings where classroom teachers have an opportunity to meet with specific interventionists to discuss student progress. At the end of the school year, a final data sheet serves as a foundation for the teacher that will be receiving the student the following school year.

6. Professional Development:

Each year, the district provides the entire teaching staff for all schools with a professional development survey to drive professional development needs for the following school year. Each year, prior to students coming to school, the district provides professional development based on new initiatives that are being implemented or new core programs being purchased by the district. Recently, the elementary schools have purchased a new math series, Pearson Envision. This year, we spent two days in August, one day in January, and one day in March to provide teachers with on going support to implement new math program. During the past few years, with the shift to the Common Core, the district has been supporting all staff at all schools with professional development opportunities throughout the school year to become more comfortable with unpacking the standards that are more teacher-friendly. Chicopee, being an RTTT district, was involved in the early stages of adoption of the New Educator Evaluation System for Massachusetts. All administrators and teachers have received regular training from an outside consultant while implementing the new system of educator evaluation. These training sessions are ongoing during the school year for administrators and faculty as the process becomes more routine for all involved.

The school, along with the aforementioned professional activities, use the School Improvement Plan as the guide for developing professional development activities. During the past 3 years, professional development has focused on enhancing differentiated centers that are hands-on and engaging to students. The faculty here at Barry School has been our best resource for enhancing classroom instruction across all grades. During the current school year, the focus on professional development has shifted to enhancing our teacher lessons and differentiated centers by incorporating common language and vocabulary that are in the Common Core Standards. As we have seen over the past 5 years our MCAS scores increase across all subgroups, we are now planning to focus on three areas professional development: 1) Working to enhance the rigor of common language and vocabulary within and across all grade levels, 2) Incorporating targeted usage of iPads and other technology that reinforces prior concepts that our students need, and 3) Integrating 21st century technology skills into our daily student-centered lessons/centers.

These areas of professional development have been and are aligned with the District Improvement Plan and School Improvement Plan to continue meeting and exceeding our annual targets for student learning, as measured in MCAS and Discovery Benchmarks.

7. School Leadership

The leadership structure at Anna E. Barry School is one where teachers feel confident to raise questions, and the administration is willing to assist with every aspect of student need. However, this staff openness does not happen overnight. There is no wand you wave and ‘presto’ you have a school which is full of incredibly gifted teachers who all give 100 percent. As an administrator it takes long hours, visibility, willingness to praise, and an equal willingness to have the difficult conversations with staff members in order to facilitate a community of professional educators – which ultimately builds a teaching and learning environment instilling high standards for students and staff alike.

The leadership philosophy of the principal at Anna E. Barry School is to give everything you have to create an environment where the staff and students enjoy showing up to work and school every day. At the heart of the principal’s leadership philosophy is the belief that all students, parents and staff deserve the same level of respect I would want extended to my own family. Faced with a difficult situation (as we all have), the principal would reflect on what is best for the child, how and what he would want to have happen if the roles were reversed.

Instructional conversations are another important area of the administrative philosophy. The can vividly remember walking into a grade two classroom last year and greeting a teacher on her preparation period. This particular teacher does an outstanding job, but she is incredibly quiet and certainly not one who would seek out the principal or vice principal for anything. The principal engaged her by saying, “Tell me about your lowest three students.” With this one question, the principal learned a great deal about her students – this personal contact is truly what the principal believes all educators crave, and by walking into her room and asking a passing question the principal learned about how her students were progressing, and was able to connect the teacher with the reading specialist in order to look at additional targeted instructional opportunities.

This example truly defines the management style and the role of the principal at Anna E. Barry School. By being visible, having formal and informal conversations with staff members and facilitating what students and staff need in order to continue being successful, the principal becomes part of the pulse of the building.

Another area that is important is the principal’s ability to make informed decisions and to listen to others in the process. Successful school administrators do not make decisions in a vacuum, and surround themselves with strong, efficient and professional educators who don’t always agree with what they are saying. There is no question that the principal makes the ultimate decision, but in order to make informed decisions the administrator often needs to ask questions and listen – something that in my experience good administrators at every level, do quite well.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Measured Progress

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	89	79	84	55
% Advanced	63	38	20	30	17
Number of students tested	72	76	64	71	63
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 % Advanced	93	87	79	80	38
% Advanced	55	30	14	30	5
Number of students tested	47	30	37	40	39
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100		73		
% Advanced	73		0		
Number of students tested	15		11		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100		70	69	33
% Advanced	64		30	31	6
Number of students tested	11		10	16	18
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	80	61		
% Advanced	46	20	15		
Number of students tested	13	10	13		
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	93	85	82	58
% Advanced	67	45	23	32	17
Number of students tested	54	56	47	56	52
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: High Needs Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	89	77	82	43
% Advanced	57	29	11	29	7
Number of students tested	53	35	44	45	44
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The High Needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELL) and former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) does not calculate or report achievement level percentages for groups with fewer than 10 students.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Measured Progress

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	53	60	55	53
% Advanced	29	10	25	16	19
Number of students tested	78	72	71	61	62
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	99
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 % Advanced	77	44	53	56	45
% Advanced	20	7	24	13	14
Number of students tested	30	43	38	40	29
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	20	15	30		25
% Advanced	0	0	10		0
Number of students tested	10	13	10		12
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		41	71	47	
% Advanced		8	21	12	
Number of students tested		12	14	17	
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	70	60			
% Advanced	0	20			
Number of students tested	10	15			
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	77	51	61	55	54
% Advanced	34	8	23	16	22
Number of students tested	58	53	56	51	50
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: High Needs Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	42	54	56	43
% Advanced	21	6	24	13	11
Number of students tested	38	50	46	45	35
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The High Needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELL) and former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) does not calculate or report achievement level percentages for groups with fewer than 10 students.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Measured Progress

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	May	May	May	May	May
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	67	70	63	45
% Advanced	33	29	27	30	18
Number of students tested	75	73	63	64	66
Percent of total students tested	99	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 % Advanced	60	68	70	54	38
% Advanced	29	30	20	24	6
Number of students tested	45	40	40	37	32
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	44	36	27	42	
% Advanced	13	18	9	25	
Number of students tested	16	11	11	12	
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		80	67		
% Advanced		47	25		
Number of students tested		15	12		
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	66				
% Advanced	53				
Number of students tested	15				
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	62	70	62	46
% Advanced	31	28	28	34	20
Number of students tested	55	58	50	53	54
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: High Needs Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60	68	66	53	35
% Advanced	28	29	21	26	5
Number of students tested	53	49	47	43	37
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The High Needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELL) and former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) does not calculate or report achievement level percentages for groups with fewer than 10 students.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Measured Progress

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	90	70	74	38
% Advanced	11	14	5	13	8
Number of students tested	72	76	65	71	63
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 % Advanced	45	93	55	72	23
% Advanced	2	10	3	20	3
Number of students tested	47	30	38	40	39
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	54		64		
% Advanced	7		0		
Number of students tested	15		11		
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	45		36	50	11
% Advanced	9		9	12	0
Number of students tested	11		11	16	18
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	46	90	69		
% Advanced	0	30	0		
Number of students tested	13	10	13		
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	69	91	69	73	38
% Advanced	15	14	4	14	8
Number of students tested	54	56	48	56	52
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: High Needs Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	51	89	60	69	25
% Advanced	6	9	2	18	2
Number of students tested	53	35	45	45	44
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The High Needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELL) and former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) does not calculate or report achievement level percentages for groups with fewer than 10 students.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Measured Progress

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	82	64	58	42	42
% Advanced	16	8	7	3	2
Number of students tested	79	73	72	61	63
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 % Advanced	83	64	56	35	33
% Advanced	3	5	5	0	0
Number of students tested	30	44	39	40	30
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	30	31	30		8
% Advanced	0	0	0		0
Number of students tested	10	13	10		13
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		54	40	29	
% Advanced		15	0	0	
Number of students tested		13	15	17	
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60	73			
% Advanced	10	0			
Number of students tested	10	15			
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	63	61	41	41
% Advanced	14	9	7	4	2
Number of students tested	59	54	57	51	51
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: High Needs Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	59	49	36	25
% Advanced	8	4	4	0	2
Number of students tested	38	51	47	45	44
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The High Needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELL) and former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) does not calculate or report achievement level percentages for groups with fewer than 10 students.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Measured Progress

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	62	68	65	63	58
% Advanced	11	12	14	19	2
Number of students tested	76	73	63	64	66
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 % Advanced	54	66	55	63	56
% Advanced	2	13	10	14	0
Number of students tested	46	40	40	37	32
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	35	45	36	41	
% Advanced	6	9	0	8	
Number of students tested	17	11	11	12	
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		60	33		
% Advanced		7	8		
Number of students tested		15	12		
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	60				
% Advanced	7				
Number of students tested	15				
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					

% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	66	71	66	58	61
% Advanced	11	14	16	15	2
Number of students tested	56	58	50	53	54
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: High Needs Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	52	61	58	63	49
% Advanced	4	10	9	12	0
Number of students tested	54	49	47	43	37
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: The High Needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELL) and former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) does not calculate or report achievement level percentages for groups with fewer than 10 students.