

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 Ms. Marie DeGroot

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

Official School Name Jamestown Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 3291 Lincoln Ct.

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

City Hudsonville State MI Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 49426-7671

County Ottawa County State School Code Number* 01886

Telephone 616-896-9375 Fax 616-896-1375

Web site/URL http://hudsonville.k12.mi.us E-mail kakins@hpseagles.net

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ jdeleeuw@hpseagles.net

YouTube/URL _____ Blog http://jamestownelementary.edublogs.org/ 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. Nicholas Ceglarek E-mail: nceglar@hpseagles.net

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Hudsonville Public School District Tel. 616-669-1740

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. Ken Hall

(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):
- 7 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 2 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 2 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. 13 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	36	42	78
1	59	44	103
2	51	51	102
3	45	58	103
4	49	40	89
5	44	41	85
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	284	276	560

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 2 % Asian
 - 4 % Black or African American
 - 4 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 89 % White
 - 1 % 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: 4%

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	10
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	23
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	565
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.041
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	4

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 2%
11 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 6
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish, Ukranian, Ahmanic, Japanese, Vietmanese, Korean
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 31%
 Total number students who qualify: 174

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: 7 %
42 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.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <u>1</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>3</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>16</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>19</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>2</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> 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.	8
Paraprofessionals	10
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	0

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 26:1

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	97%	96%	95%	97%	91%
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

Jamestown Elementary School is located in West Michigan and provides high quality instruction for approximately 565 students K-5. Jamestown serves a predominately caucasian community with over 35% of our families participating in free/reduced lunch programming. Although we continue to grow at a rapid pace, we strive to maintain that “small town” feeling amongst our community and families. Many families choose to re-locate to our community based upon our reputation, values and the success of our students. Statistically, Great Schools.com gives Jamestown a perfect rating and parents have commented upon this as one way they have made decisions to enroll their children at Jamestown.

At Jamestown Elementary our mission is to educate, challenge and inspire all learners to become contributing, responsible members of a global society. Through our instruction every day, we believe:

- All students can and will learn.
- We are committed to providing challenging and engaging curriculum, effective instruction and a positive, supportive environment.
- We realize that this can only be accomplished through a cooperative partnership of students, teachers, support staff, administrators, board members, parents and our community.

Every year, Jamestown Elementary reviews its curriculum practices and makes adjustments based upon data from both district and state assessments. For example, best practices based upon Marzano's strategies for effective instruction are used each day and monitored by principal. Differentiated groups are used to best meet the needs of all students and provide an engaging, challenging curriculum. Capturing Kids Hearts strategies are used daily to build community and relationships for a safe and supportive environment. Each person on our staff embraces the mindset that with the right instruction, support and classroom environment that every students at Jamestown is capable of learning at high levels. We have an active Parent-Teacher Organization that provides volunteers for many students events as well as additional funding to support activities as well as financial support for instructional supplies and technology. Parents at Jamestown volunteer thousands of hours each year to work in our classrooms and school.

Students at Jamestown Elementary continue to perform at high levels on local, state and national assessments. Hudsonville Public Schools is one of the leading districts in West Michigan for academic performance, with Jamestown Elementary leading our district in standardized achievement results for many years in a row. Our students continue to lead our district in both state and national assessment performance. Many of our resources are used to help our at-risk students achieve at higher levels. This has been a challenge for Jamestown as we continue to grow. After school content review programs provide extra support for economically disadvantaged students as well as students who scored in the bottom thirty percent on our state assessment data. This content review has proven valuable in allowing students to gain confidence and be successful in their classroom. Tutors work closely with classroom teachers to plan specific content skills based upon individual student performance.

For the past three years, Jamestown has been recognized by the Michigan Department of Education as a "Beating the Odds" school. Jamestown has also been recognized as a Rewards School, in addition to being ranked the #1 rural school in Michigan for the 2012-2013 school year. We feel these awards and areas of recognition are a direct result of the collaboration regarding instructional practices, data review that is done frequently (minimally every 6 weeks), consistency amongst our grade levels in assuring an effective spiral of curriculum as well as the concentration on our school improvement practices. These improvement strategies are implemented with validity and monitored. Philosophically, we believe "What gets measured, gets done"!

To help support students success, we embrace many opportunities to help our students achieve high levels of success both academically and socially. Some of these activities include: A school wide character program and anti-bullying campaign, after school tutoring, a summer reading program for at-risk students, open library times during the summer for all students, an intervention program that has been observed and

presented to other schools in our area and district, Girls on the Run (GOTR) program to promote good choices and self esteem for girls in grades 3-5, a well received WatchDOGS program in which we had over 200 participants, school wide celebrations of learning, Kids Hope USA mentoring program for at-risk students, multi-age school families to promote citizenship and community amongst all our staff and students.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Throughout the past 5 years, our students at Jamestown Elementary have performed exceptionally well on standardized assessments. They have consistently scored significantly above the state average scores on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) assessment in the areas of math, reading, writing, and science. These state assessments given in 3rd-5th grade are based on state standards and expectations. The MEAP performance levels are: (1) Advanced, (2) Proficient, (3) Partially Proficient, and (4) Not Proficient. Our passing scores reflect students who have performed at levels 1 and 2. The students at these levels show a strong understanding of state content expectations.

The five year data trend shows the results of the high expectations set for every student as well as the effective instruction that occurs at Jamestown. In general, across grade levels and content areas, our students have either maintained or improved in performance. For example, in the content area of reading from 2008/09-2012/13 our scores have remained above 92% of students meeting or exceeding proficiency. Each of these years our students' reading scores were an average of 32% higher than the Michigan state average reading scores. In math, our students have also performed consistently very high, averaging above 83% of students meeting or exceeding proficiency. This has been an average of 54% higher than the state average scores for math.

With consistently high scores, we have not seen many significant gains or losses, with the exception of 2011/12 when the state of Michigan changed the cut scores in both math and ELA. Although this resulted in a decrease in scores our students still scored 26% higher in reading and 44% higher in math than the state average. Other factors that may have contributed to the minimal losses include district curriculum changes that required realigning new curriculum to state expectations. Factors that may have contributed to gains and maintenance of high performance include the implementation of a school-wide intervention block, continued common planning time to review data and make instructional decisions based on student needs, and a focus on consistent and high quality instruction such as communication of clear learning objectives.

Our challenge at Jamestown has been to maintain these high levels of achievement by all students. However, our staff has risen to the challenge. Teachers, leaders, and staff meet on a regular basis to analyze data and track trends or adjust instruction. School improvement is a major focus in our building. Each individual teacher plays an integral role on one of three school improvement teams (Academic Excellence, Home-School Relations, and School Climate). The sole purpose of these teams is to focus on enhancing student achievement while building character and developing a sense of community.

Up to the 2010-2011 school year, there has not been a significant achievement gap in any subgroup in any content area. More recently, we have noticed an achievement gap in the area of writing with our economically disadvantaged students. However, we have already been proactive in closing this gap. Our teams have addressed this in our school improvement plan and have created school-wide and specific, individual teacher goals. These goals are tracked with classroom and state student achievement data. On the 2013-14 MEAP Assessment, data has shown improvement in closing the gap for this sub group.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Jamestown staff uses research-based instruction consistently by reviewing data, compiled from state, district, and classroom assessments. Through this review process and use of assessment results, staff is able to help all students reach their highest potential.

In the beginning of the year, teachers are provided assessment data from the end of the previous year. Teachers meet across grade levels to discuss student needs based on assessment results and student profiles. Students are also assessed to evaluate current performance in reading and math. For reading, we use district provided assessments such as the Fountas Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System, DRA Benchmark Assessment, Rigby Reading Assessment, and Michigan Literacy Progress Profile. In math, the previous

grade's end-of-year district interim assessments is given at the beginning of the new year to assess students' knowledge of prior year's standards. The InQwizit computerized math screener is another tool used to alert staff of any unmastered standards. Results are also used to formulate groups of students needing additional support during the math RtI block. The InQwizit screener is revisited multiple times throughout the year to track student growth and progress. Groups are flexible and differentiated in order to meet all students' needs.

As students are assessed throughout the year, grade level teams and building specialists review the data to monitor progress, ensuring that classroom-based instruction (Tier 1) meets all students' needs. If it is determined that a student has not yet mastered the intended objectives, our school's RtI team is consulted for a Tier 2 intervention planning meeting. This team is comprised of a psychologist, social worker, speech pathologist, special education teacher, reading specialist, principal and the grade level teachers. Ideas for more intensive/specific interventions are generated, and the logistics of implementing those strategies are formulated. As interventions are implemented, the student's progress is monitored and shared with the team. Follow-up meetings are scheduled to review progress and readjust interventions as needed every 4-6 weeks. At these meetings, it may be determined that the student needs more intensive intervention resulting in a Tier 3 referral and possible further testing.

Once MEAP data is shared by the state to our school, second through fifth grade teachers analyze the results and assess how this will impact their teaching for the remainder of the year. They specifically focus on items where 25% or more of students scored less than proficient. These areas are compiled and shared among grade levels to guide teachers in modifying their instruction to assure secure learning for our students. This item analysis information is also used to adjust our school improvement plan in order to focus on areas of weakness.

This information is communicated to stakeholders through a variety of means. We use newsletters, emails, phone calls, report cards, conferences, parent curriculum nights (by grade level), Title 1 Parent Information night, and our annual report. Parents and the community also have access to the Jamestown (<http://jamestownelementary.edublogs.org>) and district (<http://www.hudsonville.k12.mi.us/HPS/>) websites.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Jamestown Elementary School has shared its successes within Hudsonville Public Schools, as well as other area districts on a continuous basis. Examples of this include peer observations, instructional rounds, site visits from local administrators and educators, monthly grade level curriculum meetings, staff learning sessions, principal meetings, school district professional learning, and local ISD curriculum workshops. Jamestown Elementary prides itself in sharing new ideas and successful programs being implemented in the school and district.

Peer observations provide opportunities for teachers to learn from and observe their colleagues throughout the district. This allows for sharing of knowledge and ideas in order to grow as professionals. Instructional rounds are a focused way for Jamestown educators to display their knowledge and improve instruction by getting explicit feedback on a specific area. This allows us to share data and inform professional development throughout the district. Several area districts have also visited Jamestown to observe instructional practices in Reading and Writing Workshop. The purpose of these visits has been to learn from the observed instruction so they can in turn implement those practices within classrooms in their own district to increase student achievement.

Jamestown shares creative solutions on how to overcome economic constraints. An example of this, is the sharing of systematic content review practices at grade level meetings with identified Title 1 schools. The purpose of this collaboration was to share our successful content review program, in order to minimize the gap for economically disadvantaged students and to provide further support. Monthly staff learning sessions and principal meetings provide a forum for sharing successes, strengthening pedagogy and expanding content knowledge. Teachers collaborate and share successful learning strategies. Topics we've recently focused on include: best practices, feedback, and conferring. Local ISD workshops and district professional

development have allowed educators at Jamestown to communicate knowledge and expertise.

Jamestown Elementary has been a leader in the local community. We welcome the opportunity to share our lessons learned and we purposefully seek out new opportunities for growth and collaboration with professional learning communities. As educators, we highly value the insight we gain from others, as well as the ability to extend our knowledge to optimize student learning.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Jamestown Elementary has been intentional and proactive about involving family and community members in a variety of ways to enhance student success and school improvement.

Home-School Relations Team: This team is comprised of teachers from each grade level. The sole purpose is encouraging the relationship between home and school by planning purposeful events to bridge the gap between school and home; empowering parents to take an active role in their child's success. Research shows this has a direct impact on achievement.

Community Outreach Programs: Students participate in local, state, and global service projects. An example is food drives for: Hand2Hand, Kids Food Basket, and His Harvest Stand. Students learn the importance of serving others and thinking beyond themselves. They also learn that it is important to contributing to a global society in a manner that promotes citizenship.

Parent Advisory Team: This team is comprised of parents and school leaders. The purpose is to provide a forum to discuss curriculum changes, school climate, assessments, and various school improvement initiatives that drive student achievement. Jamestown values the input of parents!

Summer Reading Program: A targeted program for economically disadvantaged students to maintain reading achievement over the summer and minimize regression.

Celebration of Learning Nights: This provides an opportunity for students to showcase their content knowledge to families and the community. Purposeful activities are designed to provide a venue for parents to be a partner in their student's achievement. Jamestown also partners with Grand Valley State University to provide parents and students with current, research-based activities that use manipulatives and other math practices.

Grade Level Parent Nights: Parents are invited into the classroom to learn specific tools in content areas to aid student academic success at home.

Parent Communications: Blogs, newsletters, conferences and other medium keep parents informed about current curriculum standards and academic/behavioral progress of each student. Parent-Teacher conferences are scheduled at least twice per school year for each student. Our school strives for 100% attendance for all students to continue high levels of communication on each child's progress.

be nice.: A partnership with the Kent County Mental Health Foundation to educate students and community members on effective ways to promote a safe and civil school and community environment. This in turn positively impacts student achievement.

Girls on the Run: A positive youth development program, that promotes confidence emotionally, socially, physically, and academically.

Watch D.O.G.S (Dads Of Great Students): Positive male role models interact with students academically as well as socially.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Jamestown Elementary has adopted the Common Core curriculum for ELA and math. All of our curriculum areas are designed to meet the diverse needs of students. This follows a scope and sequence from kindergarten through high school, allowing students to progress along a continuum of learning.

English Language Arts instruction is aligned to Common Core standards. There are building wide expectations for time spent on both reading and writing, with the majority of time reserved for students' independent practice. Students are assessed in reading every six weeks, beginning the first week of school, to determine their levels of proficiency. This information is used to guide daily instruction during our readers' workshop model of reading instruction. Students are given learning targets which they will then implement in their reading at their own independent reading levels. Many opportunities are given during workshops for students to talk and listen with peers to strengthen speaking and listening skills. Writing also follows a workshop model. Writing instruction aims to give students strategies that they can use independently. Both reading and writing workshops follow Lucy Calkins' work with the Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project. Skills/genres are revisited multiple times per year. Narrative, informational and opinion writing are the focus of all grades (K-5) to better prepare students for college readiness.

The math program is aligned to the Common Core and follows the Math Expressions curriculum. This curriculum relies heavily on picture representation to teach skills. Lower elementary focuses on number sense while upper elementary focuses on a problem solving methodology more than rote memorization of computation. There is a greater emphasis on the ability of students to explain their reasoning. Our math program is structured to allow support for students that are not meeting grade level standards. In addition, we have programming to challenge advanced upper elementary students who have already demonstrated knowledge of current grade level standards.

Science instruction is aligned to the Michigan Science Grade Level Content Expectations and uses inquiry-based learning. Many units start with a guiding question that becomes the focus of the unit. Jamestown also has an increased focus on teaching the scientific method in all grade levels and uses it to develop a greater understanding of scientific concepts. Informational reading and writing are integrated within this content area.

Our social studies curriculum is aligned to the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations. Each grade level focuses on the social studies strands of history, geography, civics, economics, and public discourse within their particular focus. Kindergartners focus on their relationship with others; first grade expands that to their families and school; second grade moves beyond that to their local community; third grade focuses on Michigan studies; fourth grade takes a regional look at the modern United States; all leading to fifth grade and a historical focus of the United States.

Our music, art and physical education programs focus on skills to help students be well-rounded people. Music and art standards are based on Michigan standards (Michigan Standards, Benchmarks, and Grade Level Content Expectations for Visual Arts, Music, Dance, and Theater). Physical Education standards are based on the Michigan Physical Education Standards and Benchmarks. At the district level, each subject has developed a sequential curriculum within the state framework.

The technology standards are currently taught by classroom teachers during scheduled computer classes. These are state standards divided into K-2 and 3-5 strands. Students use technology to collaborate and communicate, as well as for reinforcing basic skills, research, problem solving, and critical thinking.

One unique area in our instruction is our focus on character education. This is taught through our "school families," which are multi-age groups (K-5) assigned to each staff member. Students are instructed about topics like anti-bullying and appropriate social skills. School families meet monthly and support our school

wide “be nice” curriculum from the West Michigan Community Mental Health Foundation. Behavior expectations are also reinforced through class meetings.

2. Reading/English:

Utilizing a researched based approach, our staff’s instructional methods include guided reading within a workshop model. In grades K-2, at least 90 minutes each day is dedicated for reading instruction while in grades 3-5 at least 60 minutes is reserved. Reading workshop begins with a short, focused mini-lesson including a clear learning objective based on grade level standards. Mini-lessons, based on Common Core Standards, incorporate authentic texts from a variety of genres, feature modeling by the teacher, and provide active engagement for students to practice a skill or strategy before independent reading. The majority of time is used for students to apply the specific skill or strategy during independent reading time with books at their independent reading level.

Teachers confer with students during independent reading to formatively assess understanding of the learning objective as well as to provide individualized instruction as needed. For example, students are often divided into skills-based groups using assessment data. Additional skills such as sight words, decoding strategies, phonics, comprehension, and fluency are also taught in flexible groups. In addition, one of our goals is to integrate reading into several academic areas (math, science, and social studies) with a conscious effort given to balance fiction and nonfiction texts.

Teachers use the Fountas-Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System and Rigby Benchmark Assessment System to assess independent reading levels for all students. These assessments provide information on students’ ability to comprehend, decode text and read fluently. Michigan Literacy Progress Profile (MLPP) is also used to assess phonemic awareness. For students who are below grade level expectations, progress is closely monitored every 4-6 weeks to determine effectiveness of interventions and adjust instruction as needed.

As part of our Tier 2 interventions, students in grades 1-3 not achieving grade level expectations meet with the reading specialist. Students at or above grade level benchmark expectations will be assessed minimally three times each year. For accelerated readers, instruction is differentiated in the classroom. Students are provided texts at their level, and a variety of genres are used to practice the skills (comprehension, inferring, characterization) taught during the mini-lessons. Additionally, our Scholastic Reading Counts program is offered in grades 3-5. This program is designed to encourage intrinsic motivation amongst our students.

3. Mathematics:

Our daily math instruction is a 60-90 minute block of time. This time includes a lesson, guided practice, independent practice, fact fluency practice, progress monitoring (RtI), and assessments. We use the Math Expressions curriculum, which is aligned to Common Core standards. Students in the lower grades use concrete manipulatives to understand math concepts. This helps solidify number sense and allows transition to more abstract thinking. There is a greater emphasis on student ability to explain their reasoning. This is taught through math conversations with partners and as a whole class. At times, students are also asked to explain their reasoning through written constructed responses.

As a way to emphasize important math vocabulary, all grades are now compiling grade specific math vocabulary into a binder that will follow students from grade to grade. Each student maintains his/her own binder, which includes a student-friendly definition of key math vocabulary, as well as a visual representation of the term. It is our expectation that students will utilize and revise these words as they move through grade levels and increase their depth of knowledge. We expect that they apply these words in their written explanations.

Assessment is an important part of our math curriculum, both formatively and summatively. On a daily basis, teachers utilize strategies to assess student understanding of math learning objectives. Quick checks, unit quizzes, and unit tests are frequently used to monitor progress. Interim math assessments are also

administered three times each year. Often these assessments determine flexible groupings and allow for further differentiation.

These assessment results are frequently reviewed by teams to help all students succeed. Those students struggling with math concepts are re-taught and provided additional practice during core math instruction as well as during a separate math intervention block. Progress is monitored closely when intervention is provided.

We also have a program to challenge advanced upper elementary students who have already demonstrated knowledge of current grade level standards. Programming is differentiated based on students' knowledge of core math skills. Extension opportunities are provided for these students.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Jamestown's mission statement focuses on academic success that includes high expectations for all. Our exemplary writing program is a vital component in achieving this mission. Daily, teachers dedicate non-negotiable time to writing workshop that follows a district calendar and exposes students to all writing genres. This subject was specifically highlighted as a focus area to improve writing skills that were noted as a relatively weak area, especially for students who are economically disadvantaged. A comparison between state and school writing scores showcases our solid performance in this academic area, justifying the rationale.

All teachers follow a writing workshop model that includes the following components:

- Learning Target: Conveys to students what they will be learning and connects to prior learning. These learning targets are based on Common Core State Standards.
- Mini-Lesson: Teaches strategies, concepts, or techniques using direct instruction and modeling.
- Guided Practice: Checks for understanding specific to learning target before students are expected to practice independently.
- Independent Practice: Provides students with time to practice strategies.
- Conferring: Provides an opportunity for deeper conversation between teacher and student to guide instruction and assess learning.
- Sharing/Closure: Closes the workshop by synthesizing learning. Revisits key lesson components, checks for understanding, and assesses progress toward the learning target.

For each genre unit, students complete a pre and post assessment writing piece. These assessments are scored using a comprehensive writing rubric provided by the district. The data from these assessments is used to tailor mini-lessons and conferences to address identified areas of weakness. Conferences with individuals and small groups are differentiated to instruct students at their current writing level.

The writing workshop is unique because it allows for integration across the curriculum. Students become proficient in narrative, opinion, and informational writing skills that will prepare them for career and college readiness expectations in the 21st century.

5. Instructional Methods:

Jamestown Elementary has high expectations for all learners and differentiates instruction frequently. Given the diverse population of our learning community, we seek out new approaches to offer the best tailored instruction for each individual student.

Our staff is committed to differentiate instruction based on formative and summative assessment data. Continuous progress monitoring and flexible groups are utilized and allow us to offer optimal instruction across content areas. Based on student needs, various grouping options are used for instruction: one to one, small group, flexible groups, whole group, like ability and mixed ability.

The workshop model for reading and writing lends itself to differentiation for all learners. For example, conferencing with students allows teachers to reteach and/or provide enrichment opportunities based on where they are functioning as a reader and writer. In addition to core curriculum, reading support services are offered for students in grades K-3. In math, differentiation is approached in many different ways to accommodate the needs for each grade level. Some examples across the grade levels include leveled math groups, leveled exit tickets, leveled activities, independent practice tasks, and small groups. For grades 1-5, a block of time is set aside for math intervention. During this time, concepts are re-taught and/or reviewed to solidify students' understanding. This time can also be used to enrich current math concepts. Students have also been able to advance into higher math grades. Due to recent budget constraints, our gifted and talented consultant positions have been eliminated.

Teachers incorporate technology in various formats (Apple TV, iPads, blogs, laptops, iPods) and provide a variety of different learning opportunities. Students use technology to create projects, assimilate information, present skills, conduct research, and foster communication.

At Jamestown we recognize and appreciate that students come to us with different knowledge, readiness skills, and learning styles which encourage us to continue to evolve our differentiation opportunities.

6. Professional Development:

At Jamestown Elementary, we pride ourselves in the ongoing professional development provided by the district to help cultivate highly effective teachers. Each school year, a minimum of five days are devoted to staff development. Each professional development day is focused around student learning and achievement strategies.

The district surveys the staff to assist in targeting professional development activities that will be most meaningful and relevant to teachers in their quest to support student achievement. Using research-based best practices is also a priority when addressing school improvement. Examples of professional development include: Common Core alignment, monthly grade level collaboration meetings across the district, and math, reading, and writing workshops provided by our local intermediate school district. Staff learning sessions are centered around Common Core State Standards. Staff members actively participate in researching and presenting the latest practices for highly effective teaching. Each year we are flexible in identifying different challenges, and utilize professional development opportunities to address, research, and implement teaching strategies to improve the area of focus.

Two years ago it was noted that there was a discrepancy in our MEAP scores when comparing our fraction scores to the rest of the math scores. As a result, our building focused on enhancing fraction instruction throughout the year with each grade level identifying a specific fraction objective. Each grade levels' objective spiraled and built upon the previous grade level's objective. Due to this extra focus, there was a definite increase in the following year's MEAP fraction scores, demonstrating a correlation between the professional development and student achievement.

Currently, our building professional development is focused on math vocabulary. It has been noted that economically disadvantaged students have shown challenges in acquiring the necessary math vocabulary needed to be successful. Although our focus is on economically disadvantaged students, each learner will benefit from this extra support. In order to achieve this goal, we have implemented math vocabulary binders in grades K-5. Grade levels are adding math vocabulary words, descriptions, and pictures to the binder. Each student's vocabulary binder will travel with them through the grades. Subsequent grade levels will add new math vocabulary, and revise old definitions as students explore these concepts at a deeper level. Another purpose of these binders is to use common math vocabulary language across grade levels.

Jamestown Elementary is invested in growing life-long learners in a professional learning community that draws from many resources.

7. School Leadership

Jamestown Elementary prides itself in being a true professional learning community (PLC). We embrace a shared leadership philosophy, which has a greater impact on student success. Members of the teaching staff are involved in the school improvement process being trifurcated into the following teams: Academic Excellence, Home School Relations, and School Climate. These teams are comprised of grade level and department representatives who are then responsible to disseminate information back to their colleagues.

The Academic Excellence Team evaluates yearly performance data and utilizes this information to guide instruction, monitor Title I compliance data, and create our annual School Improvement Plan, which is submitted to the Michigan Department of Education. The Home School Relations team organizes and coordinates curriculum nights that involve our families and community. These events take place both during and outside of the school day. The School Climate team coordinates programs such as character education (be nice/anti-bullying), our school-wide behavior plan, School Families (monthly multi-age small groups), Watch D.O.G.S. and community outreach service projects.

The principal views his role as an educational leader and supports teachers, students, and parents to help children achieve high levels of success. School leadership is not a top down structure, but a collaborative approach. However, staff understands there are times in which decisions must be made and support the principal knowing decisions are based upon what is best for students. Professional development is an expectation that is facilitated by the school principal and shared amongst colleagues. The principal provides current research-based practices in the form of articles, presentations, book studies, team presentations relating to current educational practice (Common Core) above and beyond district expectation. Staff implement these practices in a timely manner to stay current in strategies that impact student achievement.

Teachers understand the importance of working collaboratively to evaluate student data and determine flexible groups, provide fidelity/validity in assessments, and provide consistency in what they teach. Teachers are expected to utilize common planning time to achieve these goals.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP)

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	79	100	99	100
% Advanced	20	9	95	88	95
Number of students tested	91	81	79	76	56
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99	100	96
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	1	2	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	1	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	76	50	100	100	100
% Advanced	4	5	100	83	95
Number of students tested	25	20	14	30	15
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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	86	78	100	98	100
% Advanced	19	9	94	88	95
Number of students tested	83	74	72	64	47
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: Number of students assessed alternatively in 2008-2009 not available.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	88	91	100	100	100
% Advanced	30	26	95	93	96
Number of students tested	83	81	76	59	81
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99	100	99
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	3	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	4	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	68	85	100	100	100
% Advanced	27	15	83	83	85
Number of students tested	22	13	36	23	25
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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	91	92	100	100	100
% Advanced	42	27	88	93	98
Number of students tested	73	74	64	56	73
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	79	95	99	100
% Advanced	21	21	74	71	79
Number of students tested	83	73	66	77	58
Percent of total students tested	100	99	99	99	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	3	0	0	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	4	0	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	78	93	95	80
% Advanced	25	17	70	55	40
Number of students tested	16	23	27	22	15
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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	90	79	95	99	93
% Advanced	22	16	75	71	40
Number of students tested	73	62	63	69	51
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	90	99	99	98
% Advanced	26	16	76	63	63
Number of students tested	90	80	79	75	56
Percent of total students tested	100	100	98	98	96
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	3	1	2	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	4	1	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	80	100	97	98
% Advanced	21	0	79	48	66
Number of students tested	24	20	14	29	15
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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	90	89	99	100	96
% Advanced	26	16	78	65	70
Number of students tested	82	73	72	63	45
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: Number of students assessed alternatively in 2008-2009 not available.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	96	89	90	89
% Advanced	14	25	17	22	7
Number of students tested	83	81	76	59	81
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99	100	99
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	3	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	4	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	100	89	83	80
% Advanced	9	23	19	17	0
Number of students tested	22	13	36	23	25
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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	99	96	89	90	93
% Advanced	14	27	20	20	7
Number of students tested	73	74	64	56	73
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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:

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Michigan Department of Education

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	91	100	100	100
% Advanced	34	15	71	73	64
Number of students tested	83	74	66	74	58
Percent of total students tested	100	99	99	99	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	3	0	0	1
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	4	0	0	1
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	94	96	100	100	100
% Advanced	38	8	67	55	60
Number of students tested	16	24	27	20	15
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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	90	100	100	100
% Advanced	34	15	71	73	74
Number of students tested	74	62	63	66	51
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
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: