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

Official School Name Chichester Central School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 219 Main St
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Chichester State NH Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 03258-6513

County Merrimack County State School Code Number* 22590

Telephone 603-798-5651 Fax 603-798-3230

Web site/URL http://www.sau53.org/ccs E-mail bbeaverstock@sau53.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* Mrs. Helene Bickford E-mail: hbickford@sau53.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Chichester School District Tel. 603-798-5651

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 Mrs. Sally Kelly
(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):

   1 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
   0 Middle/Junior high schools
   0 High schools
   0 K-12 schools

   1 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

   [ ] Urban or large central city
   [ ] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [ ] Suburban
   [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
   [X] Rural

3. 16 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	8	10	18
1	8	11	19
2	17	11	28
3	17	6	23
4	13	12	25
5	21	18	39
6	16	18	34
7	15	12	27
8	19	14	33
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	134	112	246

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
0 % Asian
1 % Black or African American
2 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
97 % White
0 % Two or more races
100 % Total

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 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 ***to*** the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	7
(2) Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	3
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	10
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	246
(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: 0 %
0 Total number ELL

Number of non-English languages represented: 0
Specify non-English languages:

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 19 %

Total number students who qualify: 46

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: 12 %
33 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.

0 Autism	0 Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	12 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	18 Specific Learning Disability
0 Emotional Disturbance	0 Speech or Language Impairment
0 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
0 Mental Retardation	0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
0 Multiple Disabilities	1 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	14
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	12
Paraprofessionals	12
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	3

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 17:1

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%	97%	96%	97%	97%
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

Traveling across the Main Street and back roads of Chichester, New Hampshire, one might not expect to find a school that has achieved state recognition for innovation and excellence. Although physically small in size, there is no problem so large we will not tackle or any idea so grand we will not consider. The community of approximately 3500 enjoys the quiet of family farms and neighborhoods undisturbed by bustling businesses. Diversity is recognized by one's interests, customs, and strengths, rather than color or creed. Fifteen years ago, the Chichester Central School pocketed islands of teachers making their way through what they believed were important and necessary skills, with little use of data. Resources, supported primarily by local property taxes, sustained the status quo, but provided little to advance cutting edge practices.

Unsatisfied with "adequate", the school's administration and teachers began to map out a plan that would create a learning environment focused on excellence for all. Beginning by creating a mission statement, a committee of staff and parents crafted a summary expressing their view of a successful education: "Chichester Central School will foster a learning community in which academic excellence is promoted, respect for self and others shared, and childhood memories created that lead to a happy, successful adulthood."

With clarity of purpose, deliberate steps were put in place. A systems approach to school-wide success was established, providing the necessary scaffolding to address the needs of the whole school to the whole child. A newly formed data team promoted the importance of using both horizontal and vertical information to identify where best to target materials and professional development. Using student data, curriculum committees began to evaluate the effectiveness of materials and instructional practices in math, reading, science, and social studies. Associated professional development opportunities gave staff new insights into areas that were identified as weak. Whether contracting with a math consultant to model strengthening student number sense, on-site graduate courses examining student engagement, using questioning as a method to broaden depth of knowledge, or professional reading groups discussing multiple intelligences or autism, teachers and staff worked together to make improvements. Cross grade level teams shifted their discussions from "housekeeping" concerns to sharing successful strategies and calling on the expertise of one another.

With an organizational structure in place, attention shifted to meeting the needs of each individual student. The first step was to create an Individual Student Plan (ISP) for every child. By bringing together the teacher, parent, and child, there was a meeting of the minds regarding individual need. To further support this laser focus, a Response to Intervention (RtI) Program was developed, requiring the incorporation of data into discussions to determine success. Every five weeks, the classroom teacher, principal, school psychologist, and interventionists met together to review student progress and adjust tiers and instruction. Not only did the program positively impact student learning, but it transformed the school into a professional learning community. Educators began to understand and appreciate the unique strength that each brought to the table and the wall between special and regular education fell. Chichester's RtI Program quickly gained recognition around the state of New Hampshire for enjoining regular education, special education, and interventionists in an effort to provide targeted and intensive interventions to all children in an immediate and meaningful way. Student success soared, special education numbers dropped and behavioral referrals to the office saw a 27% decline. Chichester's RtI Program was selected as a "Showcase RtI Site" by NH's Department of Education, and now regularly welcomes schools from around the state; we have also been visited by the National RtI Center in Washington, DC.

Now, fifteen years later, our students have benefitted in so many ways from our transformation. Throughout the many years of NCLB testing, Chichester Central has never been identified as a school in need of improvement; always surpassing state performance guidelines. Winning a National Association of Elementary School Principals "Sharing the Dream" grant (25 awarded nationally), students blogged with others from around the world investigating the impact of geography on nutrition. The use of google docs and skyping, iPads and electronic management tools have become standard operating practices. Additionally, Chichester was named to the "Commissioner's Circle of Excellence for Innovation in

Education".

What makes Chichester Central a strong candidate for the National Blue Ribbon Award? We see problems….we solve them. We keep an eye focused on excellence…we have the ability to achieve results. Consistently and steadily, moving upward and getting stronger, our students have climbed from 102nd in the state in reading to now 21st , and from 118th in math to 13th. The school's Essential Question: "How Can I Take Responsibility For My Own Learning?" is asked often by students, staff, and administration. We all continually strive to be the very best "us" we can be.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

Chichester Central School utilizes a number of different assessment tools which establish target goals for proficiency using national norms. Generally, students who perform at the 70% or above on standardized tests (such as NWEA or Star) are considered to be in the proficient category. The NH State NECAP assessment (NCLB), which rates students from 00-80, generally uses 40-45 and above as proficient. The universal screener used for literacy and math benchmarking (Aimsweb), tiers children using national norms. Interventions that measure student growth, such as Lexia, Quick Reads, and Read Naturally, use 80% as a delineation of mastery. While these standards act as guidelines, staff and administration also take into consideration other mitigating factors that may influence the success of a student (a specific family situation, health issues, etc.). For the purpose of this section, data from NECAP and NWEA will be referenced.

The State Testing (NECAP) has shown Chichester growing in both math and reading over the last five years. Moving in math from 73.25% proficient in 2008 to 84.18% in 2012, this 15% increase reflects targeted work addressing number sense, application of concepts, and the ability to write/communicate about processes. Not only did the general population see an increase in this area, the special education population grew from 46.43% to 52.38% proficiency, a change of 13%. Quite remarkably, this same cohort of students experienced a 233% increase in the area of "distinction", going from 7.14% in 2008 to 23.81% in 2012. The economically disadvantaged group grew from 6.67% in the proficient/proficient with distinction category to 36%. Targeted instruction, strategies used that were recommended by consultants, and professional development workshops are all credited with the overall advancement and subgroup gap closure. During scheduled meetings throughout the year (every 5 weeks), staff meet to review, discuss and react to student response to instruction. With a focus on "children with challenges" (subgroups), this PLC scrutinizes data that reflects individual growth and determines the most appropriate and meaningful intervention to be delivered. Daily, these children in subgroups work individually or in small clusters using tools (for reading and math) such as Lexia, IXL, Sumdog, Reading A-Z, and/or Star Fall along with direct instruction provided by certified staff. Using data as a guide along with close communication between professionals, our subgroups continue to advance and close the gap as compared to the whole school. The growth and gap closure in math experienced by the subgroup cohorts was mirrored in reading. In reading, the whole school trended up from 81.53% proficient in 2008 to 89.83% in 2012, a 10% growth. In special education, like math, the change was dramatic—from 57.14% proficient to 71.43%, a 25% increase. The economically disadvantaged subgroup rose to 80% proficient/proficient with distinction from 73.3%. With professional development aimed at areas such as analytical and informational texts, determining main idea, and vocabulary, Chichester students reaped the benefit of strengthening their comprehension and analysis skills. Not only do we look at a certain grade level over time (which is comparing "apples and oranges"), but our data team also considers the growth of a specific group overtime. During the course of their education in Chichester, the 2012 graduating 8th graders experienced the full scope of curriculum changes to math instruction, the use of new reading strategies, and the implementation of a Response to Intervention Program. Examining their growth from grade 3 to 8 was remarkable and illustrated the success taking place school-wide. As third graders in 2007, they had a 67% proficiency rate in math; by 2012, this same class was at 91% proficiency, a 26% growth. In reading, this group of students was at 67% proficiency; by 2012, they were at 94% proficient, a growth of 29%. Students are having a solid value added impact to their education.

The NWEA MAP test validated the results of the NECAP. The success of Chichester students, measured against RIT national standards shows consistently high achievement from year to year. In mathematics, on the average nationally, there is an 8.45 RIT increase from one year to the next. In Chichester, our classes, on the average see an 11.25 RIT increase each year; our students perform at the average of 9.19 RIT points above the national standards in grades 3-8. This growth has been steady since 2007. When looking at trends over time, nationally the value added to a student from grades 3 to 8 in math is 42.20 RIT points. During that same time period in Chichester, our students saw a 60.5 RIT growth. In reading, we enjoy the same level of success. On the average nationally, there is a 6.4 RIT increase from one year to the next. In Chichester, our students, on the average see a 7.4 RIT increase each year; our students perform at the

average of 6.44 RIT points above the national standards in grades 3-8. And, looking at the value added measurement nationally, students see a 32 point RIT increase in reading; in Chichester that number is 43.

Finally, there is one last piece of data that is a reflection of the success of a school. Since the institutionalization of RtI and using professional development targeted at reading and math, the instruction provided in the classroom has better matched student need, resulting in engagement and success. Happy children equal a positive school climate; the office has recorded a 27% decrease in behavioral referrals over the last several years.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Using the systems approach to school-wide success which provides oversight from the whole school to the whole child, a determination had to be made as to which types of assessments would provide meaningful and specific feedback for different purposes.

The data team relies on NWEA and the New England Common Assessment Program (NH NCLB test) to show patterns and progress over time. These tests are administered once a year, used summatively, and show where changes to the curriculum may be needed. Reviewed and analyzed by the data team, conclusions are shared with the staff and used as agenda items at vertical team meetings. Topics brought forward to the teams have included such areas as note taking, spelling, math word problem solving, the use of technology, and writing. As a result of these meetings, there has been an increase in the use of effective iPad apps, consistency with note taking, and hands-on math problem solving.

Classroom teachers use Star Math and Reading (Renaissance Learning) and Mastery Connect to show trends within the classroom as they are related to the Common Core standards. These tools show which students have mastered skills and how best to create re-teach or enrichment groups. Teachers also use in-house assessments which have been created for math critical response and writing as these are two relative weaknesses as determined by testing. Classroom schedules have been restructured to include an increase of time in these two areas.

The Response to Intervention teams use Aimsweb, Fontas and Pinnell, Lexia, Quick Reads, IXL math, and classroom assessments to target individual children and their growth in math and reading. All students in the school are benchmarked using the universal screening tool, Aimsweb , in reading and math three times a year. Those who are placed in tier two are additionally progress monitored every other week; tier three students are progress monitored every week. Then, every five weeks the RtI team consisting of the classroom teacher, principal, school psychologist, and interventionists, meet together at a CASES (Childrens' Academic, Social, Emotional Standing) meeting to review student progress. If a student is not making advancements that are expected, a decision is made to change the intervention or approach; for example, a child may need the Wilson Reading Program, or a student could be moved to Tier 1 where there is enrichment and enhancement. Minutes are taken at the meeting regarding the actions that need to be taken and the results of those actions are reviewed at the next meeting—nothing falls through the cracks.

The analysis of data is not limited to school personnel. On a regular basis, assessment information is shared with students, parents, and the community. Individually, parents are presented with a clear picture of their child's mastery levels and achievement. On a global level, the school board and community garner an understanding of patterns and trends through presentations, newsletters, and from our website.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

We aspire to inspire not only our students, but other schools and educators. Whether presenting at conferences, uploading lesson plans, or inviting teachers into our own classrooms, Chichester teachers and the principal freely share their successes with others from around the state.

Last January, in a very unique move, the staff presented a day-long conference entitled, "Learning and Living with Technology in the 21st Century". Seventeen sessions were presented during the day to parents, teachers, and the community on topics including parental safeguards, electronic organizational tools, using

google documents, exploring educational apps, and how to use technology-based assessments in the classroom. The feedback from those in attendance was very positive and the staff came away with a new awareness that their practices are truly exceptional.

Keeping our parents aware of the educational trends in the school is of paramount importance. Last year, the PTO hosted a "Teacher Spotlight" session each month, during which time a teacher demonstrated an activity or lesson taking place in their classroom that incorporated technology. Although the classrooms all have interactive boards and projectors, teachers were in need of document cameras. So impressed with the presentations, the PTO decided to purchase a document camera for every classroom teacher.

On the state level, Chichester teachers have been leading contributors to the NH Digital Resources Consortium site. A database of Common Core lessons was created for teachers in grades K-8 in both reading and math. The Chichester principal, who spearheaded the project, asked for volunteers to contribute their lessons to this new site—the response was overwhelming! The number of lessons added helped to make this new resource a valuable one for teachers around the state.

The administration and staff have made a number of presentations at the state and national level on topics such as "Assessing Common Core Standards in Mathematics", "Keys to Literacy and Student Achievement", "The 6+1 Traits of Writing", "Implementing the Common Core Standards", "Creating a School-wide System for Student Achievement" and "Creating an RtI schoolwide program" (podcast for the Department of Education). On the average, one school a month visits Chichester Central to learn about instruction and interventions in the primary grades, middle school integration and scheduling, and the use of data.

We are proud to be able to share with others the practices that have proven to be successful for our students and school.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

We recognize that we do not teach in a vacuum. Our students are successful because there is a strong partnership between the school and families. Teachers and parents communicate often regarding concerns that arise or questions that need to be answered. Visitors and volunteers are treated respectfully and professionally as they add a layer of support for our students.

Providing opportunities where families can show their support is of primary importance. School events such as the Back to School Barbecue (sponsored by the PTO), Grandparents' Day, Multicultural Night, school concerts and the spring musical bring in hundreds of friends and family members. Although we are a small school with an enrollment of 250, it is not unusual for our building to swell to 500-600 when there is an event taking place. This show of support creates a pride and self-confidence that has helped to cement a positive school climate.

Our parents also have a sense that they are part of the educational process. Workshops have been presented by staff and outside agencies to families on the emergent learner, internet safety, multiple intelligences, reading strategies, and homework tips. Parents and community members serve on committees such as wellness and facilities management. Forums on policies such as Student Safety (bullying) are held for input and surveys are sent out when gathering data on topics such as kindergarten programming and the effectiveness of electronic communication.

The inclusionary bond between the school and community has had a direct impact on the financial support that is asked for each year. In true New Hampshire town meeting style, members of the School Board present the request from the school to the town for funding. Members of the community have an opportunity to ask questions, offer comments, and vote on the bottom line. For the past 10+ years, the town of Chichester has supported the school budget in total—a true showing that there is an understanding of and appreciation for the work taking place. This has an incredible impact on the students and has made it possible for technology to be purchased, research-based materials to be brought into the classroom, and professional development to be provided to advance innovation and 21st century teaching.

We do not take for granted the community that we are a part of. Our students are strong because we all work together for the common good. It all comes down to relationships.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The Chichester staff considered several different aspects when embarking on curriculum design, including: content and skill development, differentiation, research-based teaching methods, the student population, and standards. The foundational component of the Chichester curriculum rests squarely on the Common Core standards—while this provides for what must be taught our work continued to determine how best to teach it. The staff (100% designated as Highly Qualified) and administration began the work through curriculum committees, each focused on a particular content area: math, reading, writing, science, social studies, music, art, physical education, health, technology, and foreign language. There are common threads that run throughout: skills build upon each other and are developmentally appropriate, skill building is balanced with discovery and exploration, effective research-based practices are utilized, instruction is inclusive, and there is continuous monitoring and evaluation. An integrated approach to instruction provides students with an opportunity to immediately apply lessons learned, making it easier to understand and appreciate why it is important to memorize math facts or spelling rules. Recognizing that there is a need for students to master foundational skills, reading and math often incorporate games of all kinds. It is not unusual to see the 2nd grade on the playground engaged in a relay spelling game, sixth graders engrossed in a technology based word scramble game, or middle schoolers enjoying a "round robin" when displaying math fluency skills. There is an inclusiveness to games that boosts self-confidence and requires cooperation to be utilized and mastered. Furthering the integration model with science and social studies, teachers are given the common core standards for reading and math formatted in such a way that they can record how they "folded together" content subjects. Essential Questions provide the springboard for discovery and inquiry: How are humans similar and yet unique from other living things? How has technology advanced man's understanding of the world around us? How am I connected to those in the past? How does where I live influence how I live? Not only are students expected to master content, they must also show an ability to communicate, collaborate, think critically, and solve problems. Classrooms come alive with historical re-enactments, nature walks, singing, drawing, experimenting, and creating. In the areas of art, music, physical education, technology, and health, our teachers draw on the creative and personal aspect of learning. The curriculum in these areas takes into account each learner's individual social and cognitive development and helps them achieve their potential. When a child has made stained glass for the first time, or been part of a winning volleyball team, performed a drumming composition for the school, or used technology to create the movie magic of claymation, there is a sense of pride that flows over to other classroom experiences. The curriculum is not only focused on the here and now, but on the future as well. Students in grades 6, 7, and 8 are preparing and practicing for the rigors of high school and beyond. Their course work incorporates a strong emphasis on research, technology use, presentation skills, and data analysis. Students are expected to apply new understandings and to adapt to new ways of doing things. Projects are designed to meet the needs of all types of learners, accommodating all multiple intelligences. With an emphasis on the use of informational and non-fiction texts, teachers have created lessons that call for higher order thinking, creativity, and the complex problem solving of real world scenarios, such as science fair, outdoor classroom design, and "living" the Underground Railroad experience. For students who wish to engage in on-line learning, foreign language (Latin, Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, or French) is available. The success of the curriculum is measured in a number of ways. Quarterly, students receive a skills based report card, aligned to Common Core. This new accounting system created last year, provides parents with a clear breakdown of specific strengths and weaknesses within a general content area. More globally, the curriculum committees meet monthly to review data, discuss professional need, and suggest direction for the future. Curriculum improvements are school-wide, research-based, rigorous, and measured. There is a strong sense of collegiality that makes the change process possible.

2. Reading/English:

The cornerstone of the reading program at Chichester Central is the exceptional professional development that has been enjoyed by our teachers. Knowledge and practice of Project Read, LiPS, the Wilson Reading Program, 6+1 Traits of Writing, Lively Letters, Keys to Literacy, and computer aided interventions have made for instruction that is solidly cemented in research-based practices. Emergent readers begin learning

the most basic of skills, such as phonological awareness and letter names/sounds, with much time dedicated to practicing for fluency and comprehension development. Using iPad apps for letter formation, technology games for word identification, and daily life activities (such as naming the days of the week, colors, student names, etc), our students quickly become comfortable and proficient in reading. Writing and spelling enhance reading in grades one, two, and three; this inclusive approach builds both receptive and expressive language. In grades 4-8, the philosophy changes; we move from "Learning to Read" to "Reading to Learn". This slight shift of language promotes the thought that we are all teachers of reading. To understand science vocabulary or social studies terminology—we must all teach how to comprehend and apply the specifics of language to content. And, reading isn't only practiced in the classroom—there are occasions when we celebrate reading as a whole school. During Read Across America week, students take part in activities that highlight their favorite books, the principal dresses as "Cat in the Hat" and reads stories to the primary children, and the cafeteria cooks up a special serving of Green Eggs and Ham. A dog sled team visited the school, an event prompted by the students in grade five who were reading a story about this exciting mode of travel. Special Literacy Nights are planned when parents can play reading games with their children, read special books with them, or learn strategies for improving reading at home. Every Friday, older children read with those in the primary grades during "Reading Buddy" time—when favorite stories are shared and friendships created. Finally, a summer reading program was promoted for children of all ages with meeting sessions during the summer months. This activity culminated with a visit from the First Gentleman, Mr. Tom Hassen. Reading is the gateway to learning—something we take very seriously.

3. Mathematics:

With the implementation of the Common Core standards, Chichester re-evaluated the math instruction taking place in grades K-8. Recognizing that an emphasis must rest on the depth of understanding of content rather than algorithmic memorization, a shift in instructional practices began to take place. As a general practice, teachers now use questioning to elicit from students their rationale for and understanding of math applications. Math manipulatives and technology resources are used as tools to clarify and cement concepts. Whether using Cuisenaire rods or 3D technology models, teachers match supplemental resources to instruction to address the needs of all. Daily instruction includes whole class exploration of a given topic, problem solving, peer-to-peer discussions/ explanations, and writing. Interventions are addressed during the scheduled math block; students who have shown an understanding of a skill are given practice time while those less sure receive small group, directed instruction. If children continue to struggle, computerized math interventions that can zero in on a discrete skill are used, giving students practice and teachers a measure of attainment. At the conclusion of the lesson, the whole group reconvenes to summarize what has been learned. At grades 7 and 8, in addition to the general math class, students have the opportunity to elect an additional course that targets instruction at both the higher and lower levels. The "Challenge Math" class is a fast paced, pre-algebra class preparing students for the high honors high school track while those who need support and practice enroll in the "Math Skill Building" course. This system of scheduling gives our students an extra year of math within their middle school experience. In the classroom, teachers are using technology management assessments, online resources, and textbook summaries to regularly measure student mastery of skills. As a school, students in grades 2-8 complete the Star Math assessment quarterly and the AIMSweb benchmarking 3 times a year. This regular standardized testing provides an accurate accounting of progress and clearly shows where additional attention is needed.

The K-8 curriculum in Chichester is vertically aligned with the new Common Core standards which allows for a comprehensive progression of topics throughout the grade levels. The goal of our math program is to foster an understanding of mathematics so that the application of skills can be utilized in any given situation.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

With a well defined set of standards and the expectation that integration of content is predominant, science has lead the way in teaching by discovery. The Chichester science curriculum is focused and coherent and provides students an opportunity to explore and examine while using their deductive and creative skills. Developmentally appropriate standards are outlined for grades K-8, beginning with activities such as assessing the variables that impact how seeds sprout to drawing conclusions about the impact of weather on ecology and how diet affects health. Because research has shown that greater achievement is associated

with covering fewer topics in greater depth, the Chichester science curriculum has a limited topic scope per grade level. These topics capitalize on students' early interests and experiences, identifies and builds on what they know, and provides opportunities for the application of math and writing skills. Students investigate questions about the world they come across in daily life and work to solve problems through exploration and discovery. For example, teachers in the 4th grade pose questions and encourage students to work together in groups regarding electricity and magnetism. This allows for on-the-spot reasoning and discussion, and prompts students to test their own understanding. At the middle school level, students gather water samples from the outdoor classroom, grow cultures, and compare and contrast findings using Elmo microscopes. Students in grade six, become student "physicians" inviting in other classes who pose "symptoms" which need to be diagnosed and evaluated. In kindergarten, the science of cooking asks children to consider what would happen if substitution of ingredients were used and charting of favorite flavors are displayed. These STEM-like activities are moving Chichester forward to incorporating more building and refining of models, collecting and analyzing data from observations and experiments; constructing and critiquing arguments; and drawing conclusions based on deductive and inductive reasoning. There is no question that there are strong educational advantages to inquiry learning; in Chichester, science is providing that model for all other areas of the curriculum. Using the Common Core Standards, the NH Grade Level Expectations, and the acknowledgement that businesses are looking for employees who are intellectually curious and confident, we continue to provide experiences for our students to practice and develop problem solving skills.

5. Instructional Methods:

Instructional methods in Chichester are varied and wide ranging. Focusing first on the individual student, targeted and intensive interventions are provided for reading and math during the daily designated Response to Intervention Block. Students at the tier two and three levels may use programs such as Lexia, Quick Reads, or IXL math to help build skills. Used along with those programs are teacher directed small group lessons that incorporate technology, manipulatives, and games. It would not be unusual to see students at an interactive white board trying to "beat the buzzer" by correctly identifying letter names and sounds; or, playing "Mother, May I" when working on vowel groupings; or, middle school students engaged in creating an electronically generated news article using vocabulary in a create way. Our tier one students have the option of taking a foreign language class on-line, or may take part in book discussions that call for the use of analytical or inferencing skills, or solving math problems that require an understanding of applications and theorems. In the classroom, the teacher is required to know and address the diverse nature of all of their students. Whether creating a number of different levels of activities that occur simultaneously within the room, group "jobs" that match student ability/interests, or offering a variety of options when assigning projects, teachers regularly differentiate their instruction based on each student's ability. The fifth grade was "a-buzz" of activity as individuals and small groups of students were following designated tasks around the study of South America—some researching using computers, others on iPad apps, and still others creating maps and charts; each task was assigned based on student ability. Children in the lower grades take part in classroom plays that teach cooperation, kindness, and friendship. Creativity and ingenuity are called upon in the 8th grade when students are required to make paper cars using only certain types of materials to test Newton's laws of motion. Interpretation of directions and an inventive spirit leads to final products that are as individual as the students who made them.

The staff at Chichester Central continues to examine and broaden the types of experiences that are offered in the classroom so that interests are sparked, curiosity is peaked, and success is secured.

6. Professional Development:

Our strength comes from careful and tireless analysis of data, committee-determined professional development, shared leadership, focused and immediate response to deficits, and a commitment to research-based instruction that is measured for effectiveness in a meaningful and timely way. The school year calendar includes four whole and five half day time allotments for professional development. Using information retrieved from the Data Team and Curriculum Coordinators, decisions are made regarding a year-long direction for professional growth. In the last few years, the focus areas have included: using technology to enhance instruction, math strategies that build understanding, writing, and inquiry learning.

Whether a consultant is hired to model teaching strategies in math concepts, our own teachers bringing forward their expertise in specific types of interventions, or professional reading groups learning about and discussing the various approaches of differentiation, the sustained professional development model has enabled us to keep a spotlight on an area of need for a solid length of time. The approach to and engagement in professional activities vary. At staff meetings it is not uncommon for time to be dedicated to groups sharing their successes in the area of technology use or content integration. When the drilling down of data revealed that our students were having difficulty with writing math responses, our time was spent examining the format of the test questions and discussing how best to approach the thinking process behind math understanding. An in-house test was created and administered quarterly, in an effort to keep attention on this skill and measure our effectiveness. What resulted was an 11% increase each year for the past three years in student proficiency on math critical responses on the NECAP test and each domain strand has become stronger. With new common core testing on the horizon, the staff did a "scavenger hunt" of the new performance tasks to gain a better understanding of what will be required of our students. That exploration lead to further work concentrating on inquiry learning and developing 21st century skills. Whether working in small groups or as an entire staff, the direction of need for any given year is clearly defined and communicated.

Our professional community has exemplified the power of collaboration, expertise, and staying focused on school-wide and individual student needs. School improvement is most surely and thoroughly achieved when teachers engage in frequent, continuous and increasingly concrete talk about teaching practices (J. Warren).

7. School Leadership

The staff and administration are committed to supporting an atmosphere that fosters excellence and allows children to learn in the manner that best suits them. The school climate is one of caring, respect, encouragement, and developing one's personal best. The philosophy that encapsulates the practice of leadership is "let's solve the problem". There is nothing so great that cannot be resolved when dedicated, focus driven professionals come together to do what is right for children. Lead by a principal who articulates and models a vision of excellence and is visible and actively engaged in teaching and learning, she encourages staff to take part in shared decision making. Teacher leaders for committees such as Wellness, Technology, Risk Management, Data Team, Curriculum Coordinators, and Teacher Effectiveness, play a critical role in determining need and direction of the school. Whether working together as curriculum leaders, teams of teachers, committee members, or in professional development groups, respect and trust run deep in the culture which promotes innovation and risk taking. Committee decisions rest largely on data analysis. Relying on a number of different sources such as information from assessments, polls, and surveys, groups discuss, refine, review, and re-do instruction and programming decisions. Recently, questions were raised regarding the need for better and new writing strategies. Several teachers who had specific concerns approached the principal, sharing the struggles they were having meeting student needs in writing. A plan was put into place that was multifaceted: the principal approached staff and earmarked funds for professional development for those willing to become teacher leaders in this area, the language arts committee took a lead role in bringing this topic to the vertical team meetings to get input from the entire staff, data about writing was disseminated, and the Curriculum Coordinators began discussions about how best to promote writing as an integrated subject. Currently, teacher leaders have begun to present new strategies to the staff and consideration is being given to the purchase of supplemental materials. As a matter of practice, professional development and mentoring are provided when embarking on new or unchartered advancements; support, whether for students, parents, or teachers is critical for success.

Academically and socially our students are strong. They thrive in an environment where they feel safe, respected and supported while developing a personal sense of pride for who they are and for the school community of which they are a part.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	86	78	77	95	70
% Proficient with Distinction	24	16	32	15	20
Number of students tested	21	32	31	20	30
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	85	78	80	95	72
% Proficient with Distinction	25	16	33	15	21
Number of students tested	20	32	30	20	29
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

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

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	82	81	96	74	71
% Proficient with Distinction	26	38	42	16	7
Number of students tested	34	32	24	31	28
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	82	84	96	77	71
% Proficient with Distinction	26	39	42	17	7
Number of students tested	34	31	24	30	28
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

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

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	78	88	71	88	65
% Proficient with Distinction	34	54	29	13	26
Number of students tested	32	26	31	32	23
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	81	88	70	88	65
% Proficient with Distinction	35	54	30	13	26
Number of students tested	31	26	30	32	23
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	88	81	93	88	94
% Proficient with Distinction	63	45	40	29	53
Number of students tested	24	31	30	24	17
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	88	80	93	88	94
% Proficient with Distinction	63	47	40	29	53
Number of students tested	24	30	30	24	17
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 7
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	82	94	65	76	78
% Proficient with Distinction	42	42	31	41	30
Number of students tested	33	31	26	17	27
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	81	93	68	76	78
% Proficient with Distinction	44	40	32	41	30
Number of students tested	3	30	25	17	27
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 8
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	91	86	82	86	69
% Proficient with Distinction	48	50	53	29	19
Number of students tested	33	22	17	28	32
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	90	86	82	86	68
% Proficient with Distinction	48	50	53	29	16
Number of students tested	31	22	17	28	31
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	100	88	81	100	87
% Proficient with Distinction	33	28	26	45	47
Number of students tested	21	32	31	20	30
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	100	88	80	100	86
% Proficient with Distinction	30	28	27	45	48
Number of students tested	20	32	30	20	29
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	91	91	92	87	79
% Proficient with Distinction	26	44	29	32	14
Number of students tested	34	32	24	31	28
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	91	90	92	87	79
% Proficient with Distinction	26	45	29	33	14
Number of students tested	34	31	24	30	28
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	84	92	87	72	78
% Proficient with Distinction	25	50	35	6	13
Number of students tested	32	26	31	32	23
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	84	92	87	72	78
% Proficient with Distinction	26	50	37	6	13
Number of students tested	31	26	30	32	23
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 6
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	83	90	93	83	88
% Proficient with Distinction	17	26	13	8	35
Number of students tested	24	31	30	24	17
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	83	90	93	83	88
% Proficient with Distinction	17	27	13	8	35
Number of students tested	24	30	30	24	17
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 7
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	88	91	81	88	93
% Proficient with Distinction	15	13	0	35	15
Number of students tested	33	32	26	17	27
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	88	90	80	88	93
% Proficient with Distinction	16	13	0	35	15
Number of students tested	32	31	25	17	27
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 8
Publisher: Measured Progress

Test: New England Common Assessment
Edition/Publication Year: 2012

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	94	86	88	89	69
% Proficient with Distinction	33	23	41	25	9
Number of students tested	33	22	17	28	32
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					

% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction	94	86	88	89	68
% Proficient with Distinction	35	22	41	25	10
Number of students tested	31	22	17	28	31
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Proficient plus % Proficient with Distinction					
% Proficient with Distinction					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: New Hampshire is a fall testing state. For the nomination process Fall 2012 NECAP data combined with Spring 2012 alternately assessed students was used. This is the most recent data available. This data is aggregated to the 2011-2012 teaching school and is the most recent data reported in the application. Data for Fall 2013 NECAP combined with Spring 2013 NHAlps data is not yet available.
It is not possible to upload data for the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and special education for this grade because the state will not provide information for clusters that are too small and do not meet the definition of subgroup.