

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2012 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program**  
**A Public School - 12CT4**

School Type (Public Schools):  Charter  Title 1  Magnet  Choice  
(Check all that apply, if any)

Name of Principal: Ms. Melony Brady

Official School Name: STEM Magnet at Annie Fisher School

School Mailing Address: 280 Plainfield Street  
Hartford, CT 06112-1740

County: Hartford State School Code Number\*: 64

Telephone: (860) 695-3500 E-mail: bradm002@hartfordschools.org

Fax: (860) 722-8443 Web site/URL: http://www.hartfordschools.org/schools/Annie-Fisher-School.php

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent\*: Dr. Christina Kishimoto Superintendent e-mail: kishc001@hartfordschools.org

District Name: Hartford District Phone: (860) 695-8000

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

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Matthew Poland

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge 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.*

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

## **PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

12CT4

The signatures on the first page of this application 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 has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress 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, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2011-2012 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals 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 and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take foreign language courses.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2006.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 or 2011.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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

1. Number of schools in the district 29 Elementary schools (includes K-8)  
 (per district designation): 2 Middle/Junior high schools  
17 High schools  
0 K-12 schools  
48 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 15238

## SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Urban or large central city
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 2
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2011 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total			# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0		<b>6</b>	28	21	49
K	26	17	43		<b>7</b>	29	10	39
1	25	13	38		<b>8</b>	16	10	26
2	16	10	26		<b>9</b>	0	0	0
3	21	18	39		<b>10</b>	0	0	0
4	27	13	40		<b>11</b>	0	0	0
5	31	19	50		<b>12</b>	0	0	0
<b>Total in Applying School:</b>								350

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
12 % Asian  
47 % Black or African American  
12 % Hispanic or Latino  
1 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
25 % White  
2 % Two or more races  
100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting 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.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2010-2011 school year: 1%

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2010 until the end of the school year.	0
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2010 until the end of the school year.	5
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	5
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2010	350
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.01
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	1

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school: 4%

Total number of ELL students in the school: 15

Number of non-English languages represented: 8

Specify non-English languages:

Polish, Urdu, Spanish, Tulugu, Tamil, Hindi, Marahi, Albanian

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 59%  
 Total number of students who qualify: 207

If this method does not produce 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.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 12%  
 Total number of students served: 42

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>7</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>9</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>17</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>2</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>4</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>2</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>1</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>19</u>	<u>0</u>
Resource teachers/specialists (e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.)	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
Support staff (e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.)	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
Total number	<u>41</u>	<u>13</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:

18:1

13. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Daily student attendance	96%	95%	95%	95%	94%
High school graduation rate	%	%	%	%	%

14. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools):**

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2011 are doing as of Fall 2011.

Graduating class size:	_____
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____ %
Enrolled in a community college	_____ %
Enrolled in vocational training	_____ %
Found employment	_____ %
Military service	_____ %
Other	_____ %
<b>Total</b>	_____ <b>0%</b>

15. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award:

No

Yes

If yes, what was the year of the award?

The STEM Magnet School at Annie Fisher is located in urban Hartford, Connecticut and serves a diverse student body of 350 in grades Kindergarten through eight. The student body is comprised of 50% Hartford and 50% suburban students representing 34 surrounding towns. The mission of the school is to create a rigorous learning environment rich in advanced academics through the integration of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics in all classes. As we continue to grow in experience and expertise, our vision is to ensure that our students receive a well-rounded, state-of-the-art learning experience that prepares them for successful entrance into a college-level curriculum at the University High School of Science and Engineering. Additionally, our school is Connecticut's first official K-12 feeder pathway, allotting our 8th grade students the opportunity to attend a STEM high school to further their interest within the fields.

Our neighborhood community has experienced multiple school changes over the past seven years. The community has transitioned from a neighborhood school, to a magnet, back to a neighborhood school, and then re-designed into a high performing STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) school. Consistency in educational experience has been a challenge for our particular neighborhood community, one prone to violence, low socio-economic standards, low graduation rates. Our drive and dedication to ensuring that students achieve and succeed has paved the way for dramatic improvements in education and closure of a wide achievement gap. In the past two years, 100% of the staff have been trained in the Inquiry teaching model, completing over 220 hours of direct professional development by the Connecticut Science Center. The Science Center is our official partner and has been instrumental in developing our theme and instructional model.

Students have made dramatic improvements in standardized test scores under the new theme and instructional model. The hands-on approach to learning has supported our students' empirical love of learning. Recently, the school was recognized and featured in an educational documentary called "Great Expectations: Raising Student Achievement" supported by the Connecticut Council for Educational Reform. Our students won first place in the City of Hartford Science Fair, and we have earned "autonomous" school status per Hartford Public Schools for exemplary performance on the Connecticut Mastery Test. Hartford Public Schools uses a Managed Performance Empowerment Model to support schools that perform at high levels and to encourage independence and theme implementation. STEM has been identified as a "Turn Around Model" of redesign success.

Performance and improvement have been key components of our school development and improvement. Establishing trust, creating community, and honoring tradition has enabled our families, students and staff to become "one." Engineering and science are the driving force behind our core instructional program and every decision we make is with fidelity to our theme. Throughout the school year, students look forward to hands-on, experiential learning opportunities such as: Connecticut Science Center Sleepover Night, Egg Drop Competition, Connecticut Pre-Engineering Competition, Odyssey of the Mind, Invention Convention, our In-House Engineering Gingerbread Competition, and LEGO Robotics. Events and opportunities such as these allow for our students to find themselves within our theme and focus their intrinsic interest in STEM.

As a dynamically changing community and school, the STEM Magnet School at Annie Fisher has not only paved the way for local educational success but has been a significant figure in shaping STEM education at the regional and national level. The school is committed to sharing best practices, STEM development, and its instructional philosophy with all stakeholders. In October, 2011, the school served as the instructional "site" model for inquiry-based education for the National Science Teacher Association Conference. Opportunities such as this are a weekly occurrences at the school, allowing us to give back to other educators, leaders and students and to continue to drive the closing of the achievement gap, making us worthy of being a National Blue Ribbon School for Exemplary Improvement.

### 1. Assessment Results:

A. There are five performance levels on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) and three performance levels on the Modified Assessment System (MAS - alternative special education version of the Connecticut Mastery Test). The five levels on the CMT are Advanced, Goal, Proficient, Basic and Below. Our school and district currently sets its goals from the proficiency level and higher as does the Connecticut State Department of Education. The Goal and Advanced categories are used as target markers for success. The Basic and Below Basic categories are used to identify student performance that is not at target and typically are indicators of below grade level performance. On the Modified Assessment System, students work on a three level system. Students can score Proficient, Basic, or Below Basic. This test is traditionally given to students that receive special education services where the traditional Connecticut Mastery Test would be inappropriate to administer. Students that score Proficient on the MAS test are considered to be performing at acceptable levels given their service profile.

B. Over the past 5 years, the school has consistently increased academic performance. As a neighborhood school, the school consistently performed at the basic and below basic level in reading. The 2006-2007 data in both mathematics and reading indicate that students were only 38% proficient in reading and 39% proficient in mathematics. This is vastly different from the 2011 scores which indicate students are 79% proficient in reading and 83% proficient in mathematics. Over the past five years, the school has increased academic proficiency by 41% in reading and 44% in mathematics. In the past two years alone, reading scores at all grade levels have increased significantly since increase the school was redesigned into STEM. The reading scores in the most recent year of testing have increased at every grade level and within all subgroups. The subgroup data for five years ago indicated that students performed well below grade level with the vast majority of the students performing at the below basic level. The third grade reading data revealed that over 80% of students were not performing at proficient and above in 2006-2007. The academic achievement gap was wide. In the past two years, the school underwent the redesign process allowing for new curriculum, staff, and administration. The community has embraced the new found academic success. The current trend has closed the achievement gap between our urban students and their suburban counterparts in both reading and mathematics. Although mathematics, was the stronger performance area five years ago, scores were still unacceptable due to a strong number of students (61%) performing at the basic and below basic levels. In the past three years, the trend of academic improvement has continued. Mathematics scores have increased dramatically in all grade levels and subgroups on a consistent basis. In reading and mathematics there are currently no subgroups that have an “achievement gap.” The school, however, plans individual learning programs for each student to ensure that each student continues to grow into the goal or advanced range (higher performance targets than proficient).

In 2009-2010 the State of Connecticut administered the first Modified Assessment System to allow for an appropriately leveled assessment for our special education students. In the two years that the test has been administered, we have had strong performance and have been able to support several of our students no longer needing to access the alternative assessment. Our goal is to continue the academic success and be a model of a high performing urban school.

### 2. Using Assessment Results:

Collecting and analyzing student achievement data is at the core of our instructional practice at STEM. The data we amass from district benchmark testing, classroom summative assessments, common formative assessments and anecdotal note taking drive all of the instructional decisions made by teachers.



District-wide assessments, given in the Fall and Winter to all students in grades 3-8, are designed to mirror the standardized testing given every March across the State. Scores on these tests are predictors of how students will perform on the Connecticut Mastery Tests.

Benchmark testing occurs in literacy across all grade levels. Students in Kindergarten through grade 4 are given the DRA2 three times per year. Groupings for Guided Reading instruction are based on the DRA2 scores, as well as the progress monitoring done by teachers every 2-3 weeks.

For students who fall below proficiency levels in reading, several scientifically based research interventions are provided. In addition to small group instruction in the classroom and computer-based literacy programs, Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is a Tier II and Tier III intervention available to students in grades K-3 who are struggling to read. LLI students work in groups of 2-4 students with a highly trained early literacy teacher. In this accelerated program, typical students move from reading below proficiency to reading at or above grade level in a short amount of time.

In order to best analyze and apply the information gleaned from data, grade level teams meet weekly with instructional coaches and the principal. Additionally, cross-grade level data teams meet monthly to ensure vertical articulation and scaffolding of instruction. These meetings enable teachers to drill down to the specific learning objectives which are most challenging for students. Lesson planning and small group instruction are then planned based on the identified needs of students.

Another goal of team data planning is to identify individual students who are in need of additional support. These students are brought to the attention of the Student Assistance Team (SAT). This team consists of the Principal, Literacy Coach, School Social Worker, School Psychologist, classroom teacher and the student's family. Together, the team strives to identify issues which impact the student's success in school and to implement strategies which meet the individual's needs. The SAT process is a very proactive and powerful forum for assisting students and families when they reach "bumps" in their road to success. If, after careful monitoring and repeated meetings of the Student Assistance Team, a student continues to struggle, the child may be referred to the PPT process. As an additional support, students can participate in the vertical movement of classes. This is used for those students that "fall" outside the typical grade level range.

All data used to drive instruction is shared with families and the greater STEM community. The leadership team believes in transparency and the principal readily shares successes and challenges at PTO meetings, School Governance Council meetings, parent-teacher conferences and other appropriate forums. Progress reports are sent home bi-weekly, keeping all family members in the loop about academic performance. During the past school year, STEM created our district first Common Core Aligned Standards -based Report Card. The design of the report card was to support true communication of student understanding based on content knowledge and implementation. Parents were explicitly trained in understanding the new report card. This helps with the clear and consistent communication between home and school.

Data is also readily shared with students who are old enough to comprehend it. Even students in our youngest grades are aware of their strengths and weaknesses in school - they know their DRA2 level and can articulate the strategies and skills they are working hard to master. All students at STEM participate in goal-setting and learn the intrinsic rewards of working hard to reach and exceed goals. The expectations for our learners are very high. The rigorous academics, coupled with the extended school day, results in many rich learning experiences which STEM students are very proud to share and celebrate.

### **3. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

Sharing learning opportunities, best practices, and helping to transform other schools has been a key mission of our program.

At the heart of our program, is the training and enrollment of our parents. A key component of any theme-based school is that parents and school speak the same “language.” As families join our program, they are trained in our core inquiry philosophy. They are then able to support our educational focus from the home.

Within our local school district, our school serves as a model for science and inquiry-based instruction. Teachers and administration hold seminars, observational class-time, walk-through observations, and professional development sessions on successful implementation of STEM. Several science-themed schools within the district are now adopting similar curricula, instructional models, and professional development sequences.

Regionally, our school has participated in the National Science Teachers Association Conference that was held in Hartford, Connecticut in October 2011. The school served as the site visit school for inquiry-based educational practice. Educators, administrators, district and higher education officials, and industry leaders attended the event at our school. During this event, individuals learned about longitudinal instructional planning, professional development and the key role partnerships play in a successful “turn-around” model. Our core belief that reform does not happen without a plan that covers multiple years, was shared. The school also shared its three year implementation plan during the event.

Nationally, our school serves as a model for best practices within STEM education. Our model of programming has become nationally recognized and respected. Schools throughout the country visit STEM to look at the opening process, instructional program, STEM themed integrations, and methods for “enrolling” a community and staff into the reform process. To date, we have had over 50 school visits ranging from schools in Texas to suburban towns in Connecticut.

Opportunities to share our school, community, and staff are priceless for all involved. They are clear reminders of the impact we have on our students everyday and the "gift" reform is for communities that have achievement gaps. Opportunities to share our program push us to continue to improve the academic success of children.

#### **4. Engaging Families and Communities:**

At STEM we have implemented some unique programs and forums for families to come together on behalf of the children and the school. One such forum is the monthly Principal's Breakfast and PTO meeting. Held on the first Saturday of the month, these meetings include a fully catered hot breakfast and babysitting by students from our partner high school. These parent forums are very well attended and serve to provide parents and staff members the opportunity to share ideas and implement programs that benefit the entire school community. From the parent body, the School Governance Council is formed. This is a monthly meeting of various stakeholders with strong teacher and parent collaboration (this is explicitly explained under "Leadership").

In addition to the monthly family breakfasts, STEM hosts a variety of theme-related events which draw families from both Hartford and suburban communities. Monthly Family Literacy Nights provide parents of children in grades K-2 with tips and strategies for increasing literacy at home. Each Literacy Night includes a theme-based discussion with families, modeling of literacy techniques, time for families to read together in the library, and a new book for every child to take home.

STEM Saturdays, which occur one or two times per year, showcase the school's partnerships with local industry and provide families the opportunity to engage together in science, technology, engineering and mathematics activities. These school-wide events are popular throughout the community and have resulted in very positive exposure for our school and our community partnerships.

Other programs which have successfully brought families together include school-sponsored trips to the Connecticut Science Center, Kindergarten Literacy celebrations, family days at the Connecticut Children's Museum, Engineering Nights, field studies of Long Island Sound, Inquiry training for families, Invention

Convention, Science Fairs, Odyssey of the Mind, and many other STEM related activities. Our families have been very supportive of all efforts to engage them in these activities and attendance is always high at these events.

Engaging parents, community and family is the core foundation of a positive learning environment. Families have open access to our school learning environment. We have made school a safe, fun, and most importantly welcoming environment.

## 1. Curriculum:

Connecticut has adopted the Common Core State Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics. At STEM we have aligned all of our teaching in these areas with the Common Core.

The curriculum in English/Language Arts is based on the Reading /Writing Workshop model of instruction. All students in grades K-6 have two hour literacy blocks each day. The literacy blocks are scheduled simultaneously across the grades to allow for the vertical movement of children between grade levels. Teachers work collaboratively with interns, reading specialists and the literacy coach to deliver rigorous literacy instruction that takes children from beyond simply “proficient” to a target of either “goal” or “advanced” level performance. Using the Common Core State Standards as a guide, Social Studies instruction is integrated into the Reading/Writing Workshop, with a focus on the geographic and historical context of the State of Connecticut.

Our high quality, comprehensive Mathematics curriculum is aligned with the Common Core. It focuses on a balanced approach that emphasizes the understanding of major concepts, computational fluency and the application of problem solving skills. The core instructional model differentiates to meet the needs of all students and holds all students to high expectations, which is necessary for today’s data-driven society.

At STEM, at least one hour per day is dedicated to Science instruction at all grade levels, even in Kindergarten. The curriculum is aligned to the Connecticut State Science Standards and addresses the Scientific and Engineering Practices found in the Framework for K-12 Science Education. Our teachers work collaboratively with the STEM coach to plan and implement the inquiry-based units. Students develop their own questions, design their own investigations, conduct their own experiments, and share their findings with others.

Unique to STEM is the teaching of engineering starting in kindergarten. The K-8 Engineering is Elementary (EIE) begins with the building of structures and continues right through to eighth graders printing their 3-D models using CAD programming. The entire staff utilizes the same Engineering Design Process, which applies knowledge of mathematics and science found in the State Standards and Common Core to create, design, redesign and solve problems.

Our unified arts program is highly supportive of integration of both STEM and inquiry. The physical education, music, art and technology teachers meet and plan lessons with classroom teachers to highlight core instruction within the specials area. The integration of units across disciplines aligns with our mission of an integrated approach to STEM education. Our physical education classes have a strong integration model with a consistent implementation of inquiry-based instruction. Lessons taught within the physical education class are to highlight the academic instruction happening within the core classes. As for foreign language, we offer Mandarin Chinese as part of the STEM+ program aligned with the national engineering language. Student participate in the program on a self-selection basis and participate for 45 minutes per day, five days per week.

Social studies is an integrated approach throughout the building with a strong focus on Connecticut historical and geographic happenings. Social Studies is integrated primarily in K-6, into the literacy curriculum and we tie writing into the curriculum. The 7th and 8th grade students have content course they participate in Geography and US History.

During the last 45 minutes of every school day our entire student population participates in enrichment clusters called STEM+ classes. Students self- select from over 29 unique STEM-related courses, including

Forensics, Robotics, Structural Engineering through LEGOS, and K'nex. The courses run for 6-8 weeks and are all taught by STEM staff members. Emphasis in both course development and course implementation is placed STEM fields and STEM careers.

STEM integration and mapping units -STEM is the bridge between the disciplines. Allows students to make sense of the whole verses disciplines taught in isolation. It makes connections between, school, community, and the world.

Career readiness is a new focus at STEM, our eighth grade students are participating in Capstone course for the first time this year. This course is designed to keep fidelity to our theme and also prepare them entrance into University of High School of Science and Engineering.

## **2. Reading/English:**

Literacy is taught throughout the school day at STEM. It is integrated with other curricular areas to increase opportunities for students to practice and apply their literacy skills. Additionally, explicit reading and writing instruction occurs for 90 – 120 minutes per day in every grade level.

The core instructional model is the Reading/Writing Workshop. This method was selected because it allows for the high level of differentiation needed to ensure all readers grow. Through the Workshop model, teachers collaborate with reading specialists and the Literacy Coach to deliver high-quality, small group reading instruction. Using data from benchmark and common formative assessments, teachers group students by reading levels and create guided reading schedules which meet all learners' needs.

During guided reading groups, students read books at their targeted instructional levels. Classroom libraries are plentiful, with leveled fiction and non-fiction text that satisfy a variety of interest levels. A large book room houses an entire library of sets of leveled books for use with guided reading groups.

The consistent, targeted, small group instruction that occurs in every classroom is at the heart of our literacy initiative at STEM. The district's mission to ensure that all children "read on or above grade level by the end of Grade 3" drives our philosophy of early intervention. Every K-3 classroom has an additional certified teacher who provides Tier I and Tier II support to children. Additionally, teachers utilize whole group shared reading practices, individual reading conferences, sustained silent reading time, and mini-lessons to teach reading skills and strategies.

For students performing significantly above or below grade level in reading, our building schedule allows for them to move to another, more appropriate grade level for reading instruction. This may occur for a 20-minute guided reading group or an entire literacy block, depending on the needs of the student. The structure of our school and the culture of our community makes this movement seamless, where students travel among grade levels without disruption or confusion.

Expectations are extremely high at STEM and within our district. Kindergarten students are expected to exit with a DRA2 level 8. In order to ensure this success for all students, Kindergarten teachers place significant emphasis on foundational literacy skills, oral language skills and early writing skills. These 3 areas are critical components toward building fluent readers who comprehend a variety of complex text structures. Once the foundational skills are in place, the curriculum scaffolds through the grades to build upon what has been learned and to apply skills and strategies in meaningful, real-life contexts.

## **3. Mathematics:**

For Kindergarten through fifth grade, STEM uses enVisions Math as the resource to support the mathematics curriculum. The program is designed to have daily problem-based interactive math learning, followed by visual learning strategies that deepen conceptual understanding. Students are able to explore and discover mathematical ideas. Meaningful connections are made for students through this visual

learning. Students also develop strong, sequential visual/verbal skills. Ongoing interventions are provided for struggling learners. Daily data-driven differentiation allows for all students to succeed in math. Each lesson provides differentiated class and homework assignments for students. The math program is aligned with the Common Core, where mathematical practices are integrated in the curriculum. It is designed for understanding using Wiggins UbD model. Each topic in enVisions has connections to the real world. Multiple content areas are incorporated into the curriculum through literature books.

Connected Math is used for grades six through eight as the resources to support the mathematics curriculum. It is a comprehensive, problem-based curriculum designed for all students. In each grade level, there are topics that cover numbers, algebra, geometry-measurement, probability and statistics. Connections are made between mathematics and other subject areas and the real world. Each unit contains investigations and problems for students to explore. Classroom instruction focuses on inquiry and investigating mathematical ideas. Students explore mathematical situations, and reflect on solution methods, and examine and compare the methods that work. Students learn concepts through more in-depth study ideas. Students are given opportunities to practice, apply, connect and extend their understanding through the various problem sets in each lesson. Both content and process standards are addressed in Connected Math. Multiple kinds of assessments are available to assess student learning. To assist teachers with differentiating instruction, the program comes with a Special Needs Handbook, information on ELL learners and information on modifications for gifted students.

As a result of rigorous, comprehensive math instruction, 75% of eighth grade Algebra 1 students passed the high school credit exam and received three high school credits in May, 2011.

#### **4. Additional Curriculum Area:**

At STEM, science is taught every day for at least an hour, starting in Kindergarten. Students actively explore, ask questions, conduct their own investigations, and communicate their new learning to others. This is not a vision. This is a reality at our school. At STEM, we feel that science education is important for every child, not just those who may be heading towards a career in STEM. From watching the daily weather report to using our smart phones, almost everything we do on a daily basis requires some level of understanding in science. Science is everywhere and is therefore at the heart of our program at STEM.

Scientific inquiry is a powerful way for students to learn and understand the natural world around them. As mentioned in our mission statement, STEM creates a "rich learning environment" by planning an inquiry-based science program that encourages students explore and develop their own investigable questions. The teacher's job is to guide or facilitate the learning by creating a learning environment that supports students conducting their own investigations, developing explanations from their data, and communicating their conclusions. Scientific inquiry is key to understanding science and how real scientific research is done. In the real world however science is never done in isolation. In accordance with our mission statement, science occurs through the "integration of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics". Incorporated in that are the Common Core State Standards of Technical Literacy which includes reading and understanding non-fiction, and writing with a scientific lens.

At STEM we are tearing down traditional boundaries. We are integrating and bridging discrete subject areas to provide students with a more holistic view of the world. For example, our sixth grade students wanted to know if height affects the stability of buildings in an earthquake. The students used measurement and scale in mathematics to apply engineering principles as they built their own models of buildings out of wood. Their structures were then tested on an earthquake table. This is an example of STEM education at its best. Understanding the importance of scientific literacy and inquiry is a foundation for our school's mission and will give our students a foundation for success in today's society.

## **5. Instructional Methods:**

High levels of student learning and achievement are ensured for every student at STEM. Due to the small class sizes and overall enrollment of approximately 350 students the administrator, coaches, and support staff all have personal knowledge about the learning needs of every student in the building. Weekly data team meetings and collegial planning times are spent talking about student achievement and planning instruction to meet the individual needs of all students. Through small group, targeted instruction, teachers are able to teach skills and strategies on a needs-basis. The top 5% and the bottom 5% of performers at each grade level are identified and monitored carefully by classroom teachers and content-area coaches. If these students' specific level of instruction cannot be met in the classroom, these students are placed in alternate grade levels for certain parts of their day. For example, a third grader who currently reads at a 6th grade reading level does not stay with his grade level peers for guided reading instruction. Instead, he travels to a fourth grade classroom where there are several other students reading on the same level as him. This vertical movement happens with both high performing and low performing students, and is executed on a case-by-case basis. The culture at STEM allows for this vertical movement of students between grade levels, because the children have come enculturated with different students being in and out of their classrooms daily, making this practice a very positive experience for all. Our building-wide schedule was designed to support this level of movement.

One hundred percent of the students at STEM have access to scientifically research based interventions (RtI) each day. Data from district and school-based assessments is analyzed and student weaknesses are noted. Students then spend 20 minutes per day receiving targeted instruction to improve performance in weak areas. This instructional method is aligned with the SRBI/RtI system.

Our core instructional model of Inquiry also supports our mission to differentiate instruction. The hands-on learning opportunities and student-led investigations increase the level of intrinsic motivation within our students and drive the learning process. At the conclusion of an inquiry lesson or unit, students share their final understandings with one another. These shared understandings are presented in a variety of ways, including through the use of digital tools and technology. For example, third grade students who recently completed an inquiry about Petroglyphs conducted internet research, took digital photos of the artifacts they created, and imported the photos into word processing documents which described both the petroglyph and the process used to create the artifact. This authentic assessment model serves to inform teachers and families about the knowledge and experiences gained by students.

## **6. Professional Development:**

Inquiry-based instruction is the core instructional philosophy of STEM. STEM has a three year professional development plan that reflects our commitment to inquiry-based instructional practices and our magnet theme. Inquiry-based instruction is a student centered approach to teaching that encourages students to be intrinsically involved in their academic program. Through inquiry, students generate their own questions, design and conduct their own investigations, construct their own knowledge, analyze data, formulate their own explanations, and communicate their findings to others. Every K-8 certified staff member completed 220 hours of direct inquiry-based professional development. The inquiry-based professional development supports the schools goal of "all teachers speaking the same instructional language". Teachers have learned about process skills by being actively engaged in them, exploring different approaches to teaching hands-on learning and developing common formative assessments. In conjunction with the inquiry trainings, teachers learned how to integrate science into other subject areas by participating in courses on Science Notebooking, Integrating Probeware into Science and Mathematics, and a Science and Literacy Workshop. Through Science Notebooking, teachers learned how to incorporate science notebooks with inquiry instruction, allowing for students to note their thinking and to communicate their learning through the use of notebooks. This training provided staff with a hands-on experience in developing a high-quality science notebook.

Additionally, all STEM teachers received professional development in Curriculum Mapping, Engineering is Elementary (EiE), Standards Based Report Cards, Science Elementary Safety, and Data Teams. Through the EiE training, teachers developed a school wide definition of STEM, which is essential to the foundation of our school. Through the curriculum mapping training, teachers learned how to map out the topics and units they teach and to align them with the state and Common Core Standards.

In support of teacher professional learning, 100% of STEM teachers attended the NSTA Conference in Hartford, where they selected specific courses to advance their individual learning needs in STEM. Teachers were amazed as to the numerous learning opportunities, the abundance of resources, and the materials and strategies that they were able to bring back to their classrooms. STEM has a STEM Coach, a math coach and a literacy coach who work with teachers in the classroom on implementing inquiry-based instruction, integration of the STEM content areas, and applying strategies learned in professional development.

## **7. School Leadership:**

The structure of leadership within STEM is one of collaboration, teaming, and involvement. We believe that through enrollment of parents, community partners, and teachers we have created a governance structure that will continue to support raising student achievement and keeping fidelity to our theme.

The leadership structure of the school includes the following: one principal, three academic teacher coaches (STEM Coach, Literacy Coach, and Mathematics Coach), teachers, and support staff. In terms of hierarchy, the structure is one of collaboration and open communication with the coaches typically they are the communication pathway from the teachers to the principal. However there is a 100% open-door, open-time policy within the school which encourages a very family and teacher friendly approach. The principal serves as the core instructional leader with the support of the three academic teacher coaches. The coaches provide seamless, instantaneous instructional support to teachers.

The school has a “Leadership Team” that meets bi-weekly. This team is represented by grade level teacher leaders, specials teachers, the social worker, a teacher union representative, the three academic coaches, and the principal. During these meetings curriculum, scheduling, class development, student issues, and data are discussed and information is disseminated to the remaining staff. Grade level team leaders also hold weekly data team meetings. During these meetings, students' academic data is reviewed and instructional programming is adjusted. All communications from these meetings are then disseminated to the academic coaches and principal for further feedback or instructional adjustment, if necessary.

One of the unique features of our program is the existence of our School Governance Council. The SGC informs budget, compliance issues, curriculum, school accountability plan, etc. This body is represented by six parents, six teachers, one community member, and one higher-education official. The individuals on the School Governance Council serve two to three year terms and are elected by our parent body. In partnership with this guiding body, the principal is able to make informed decisions that support all stakeholders. This uniform, consistent School Governance model is what has enabled us to plan programming that is effective for students and is helping to close the achievement gap.



# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: Math

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	88	58	63	54	35
Goal and Advanced	59	28	27	21	12
Number of students tested	32	36	41	63	60
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	2	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	6	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	79	58	63	54	38
Goal and Advanced	43	28	27	21	12
Number of students tested	14	36	41	63	50
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	75	65	64	54	38
Goal and Advanced	44	32	25	23	13
Number of students tested	16	31	36	56	45
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					20
Goal and Advanced					0
Number of students tested					10
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced				31	9
Goal and Advanced				8	0
Number of students tested	1	2	4	13	11
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	9		1	2	4
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3

Test: Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	84	36	58	35	20
Goal and Advanced	69	16	30	16	7
Number of students tested	32	36	40	63	59
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	2	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	6	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	64	36	58	35	20
Goal and Advanced	43	17	30	16	4
Number of students tested	14	36	40	63	49
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	81	39	60	39	24
Goal and Advanced	56	19	31	18	9
Number of students tested	16	31	35	56	45
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	5	5	4	5	9
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced				8	0
Goal and Advanced				8	0
Number of students tested	1	2	3	13	10
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested					
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	9		1	2	4
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment for Special Education Students began in 2009-2010					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4

Test: Math

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	70	61	47	52	47
Goal and Advanced	48	29	22	24	16
Number of students tested	50	31	45	50	70
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	6	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	4	2	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	59	61	47	52	46
Goal and Advanced	41	29	22	24	13
Number of students tested	22	31	45	50	55
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	63	54	44	56	48
Goal and Advanced	33	27	23	23	15
Number of students tested	30	26	39	39	59
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					46
Goal and Advanced					18
Number of students tested	5	4	5	8	11
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					9
Goal and Advanced					0
Number of students tested	1	3	3	8	11
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested			1	1	
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	8	1		3	
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4

Test: Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, goal and advanced	60	48	41	28	39
Goal and Advanced	50	22	27	12	16
Number of students tested	50	31	44	50	69
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	2	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	8	6	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, goal and advanced	55	48	41	28	35
Goal and Advanced	41	23	27	12	11
Number of students tested	22	31	44	50	54
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, goal and advanced	50	42	45	31	41
Goal and Advanced	37	15	32	15	17
Number of students tested	30	26	38	39	58
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, goal and advanced					27
Goal and Advanced					9
Number of students tested	5	4	5	8	11
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, goal and advanced					0
Goal and Advanced					0
Number of students tested	1	3	2	8	11
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, goal and advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested			1	1	
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, goal and advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	8	1			
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2012 Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	87	73	71	60	41
Goal and Advanced	58	46	46	22	22
Number of students tested	38	26	24	58	74
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	3	6	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	8	23	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	83	73	71	60	41
Goal and Advanced	44	46	46	24	20
Number of students tested	18	26	24	58	54
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	79	71	71	63	38
Goal and Advanced	46	42	46	25	19
Number of students tested	24	24	24	49	68
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	3	2		9	6
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					17
Goal and Advanced					8
Number of students tested	3	1		8	12
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested					1
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	9				
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5

Test: Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced	74	54	42	43	38
Goal and Advanced	55	35	33	28	19
Number of students tested	38	26	24	58	74
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	8	23	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	3	6	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced	78	54	42	43	39
Goal and Advanced	50	35	33	28	19
Number of students tested	18	26	24	58	54
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced	58	52	42	43	37
Goal and Advanced	38	37	33	29	18
Number of students tested	24	24	24	49	68
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	3	2		9	6
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced					0
Goal and Advanced					0
Number of students tested	3	1		8	12
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested					1
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	9				
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6

Test: Math

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	73	82	67	56	44
Goal and Advanced	53	47	30	25	24
Number of students tested	30	17	33	57	45
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	7	6	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	23	35	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	50	82	67	56	62
Goal and Advanced	50	47	30	25	31
Number of students tested	16	17	33	57	13
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	58	82	64	56	42
Goal and Advanced	26	47	32	23	22
Number of students tested	19	17	28	52	41
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	3		5	5	4
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					18
Goal and Advanced					9
Number of students tested	2		1	7	11
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested				1	
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	4				
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6

Test: Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced	77	65	67	46	51
Goal and Advanced	57	53	42	32	29
Number of students tested	30	17	33	57	45
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	7	6	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	23	35	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced	81	65	67	46	53
Goal and Advanced	56	53	42	32	28
Number of students tested	16	17	33	57	32
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced	74	65	61	46	54
Goal and Advanced	53	53	43	31	29
Number of students tested	19	17	28	52	41
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	3		5	5	4
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced					36
Goal and Advanced					18
Number of students tested	2		1	7	11
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested				1	
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal and Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	4				
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4



## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 7

Test: Math

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	85	85	66	54	17
Goal and Advanced	50	46	34	22	2
Number of students tested	20	26	35	37	46
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	5	4	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	25	15	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	75	85	66	54	21
Goal and Advanced	33	46	34	22	3
Number of students tested	12	26	35	37	33
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	86	87	66	53	18
Goal and Advanced	43	48	34	18	2
Number of students tested	14	23	35	34	44
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	2	3		3	2
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	1	2	2	8	7
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested				1	1
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	3				
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 7

Test: Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	84	89	78	70	40
Goal and Advanced	84	77	49	51	20
Number of students tested	19	26	37	37	45
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	5	4	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	26	15	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	73	89	78	70	36
Goal and Advanced	73	77	49	51	21
Number of students tested	11	26	37	37	33
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	85	87	78	71	40
Goal and Advanced	85	74	49	53	19
Number of students tested	13	23	37	34	43
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	2	3		3	2
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested		2	3	8	7
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested				1	1
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	3				
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 8

Test: Math

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	92	76	61	32	49
Goal and Advanced	54	52	22	8	13
Number of students tested	26	29	23	37	47
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	3	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	15	10	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	93	76	61	33	49
Goal and Advanced	60	52	22	8	14
Number of students tested	15	29	23	36	35
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	94	76	62	34	50
Goal and Advanced	50	52	19	9	14
Number of students tested	18	29	21	35	42
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	3		2	2	5
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	2		4	5	6
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested				1	1
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	2				
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 8

Test: Reading

Edition/Publication Year: 2012

Publisher: Connecticut Mastery Test

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	96	77	79	40	40
Goal and Advanced	65	53	50	21	23
Number of students tested	26	30	24	38	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	4	2	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	15	7	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	93	77	79	41	36
Goal and Advanced	67	53	50	22	22
Number of students tested	15	30	24	37	36
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	94	77	82	42	42
Goal and Advanced	61	53	55	22	26
Number of students tested	18	30	22	36	43
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	3		2	2	5
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	2	1	5	5	6
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested				1	1
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	2				
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics      Grade: Weighted Average

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	81	70	61	52	39
Goal and Advanced	53	40	29	20	15
Number of students tested	196	165	201	302	342
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	28	27	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	13	15	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	72	70	61	52	41
Goal and Advanced	45	40	29	21	14
Number of students tested	97	165	201	301	240
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	74	71	60	53	39
Goal and Advanced	39	40	29	20	14
Number of students tested	121	150	183	265	299
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	90	64	68	46	42
Goal and Advanced	57	28	25	21	18
Number of students tested	21	14	16	32	38
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	90		28	18	13
Goal and Advanced	40		14	4	3
Number of students tested	10	8	14	49	58
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	0	0	1	4	3
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	91				
Goal and Advanced	83				
Number of students tested	35	1	1	5	4
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment began in 2009-2010 for Special Education Students					

12CT4

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading      Grade: Weighted Average

	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	76	59	60	42	37
Goal and Advanced	60	40	37	25	18
Number of students tested	195	166	202	303	340
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	29	39	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	13	12	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	72	59	60	42	35
Goal and Advanced	53	40	37	25	16
Number of students tested	96	166	202	302	258
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	69	59	60	44	39
Goal and Advanced	51	40	39	27	19
Number of students tested	120	151	184	266	298
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced	76	57	50	31	26
Goal and Advanced	47	35	12	15	13
Number of students tested	21	14	16	32	37
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced			50	16	8
Goal and Advanced			21	10	3
Number of students tested	9	9	14	49	57
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	0	0	1	4	3
<b>6. White</b>					
Proficient, Goal, Advanced					
Goal and Advanced					
Number of students tested	35	1	1	2	4
<b>NOTES:</b>					
New Modified Assessment for Special Education Students began in 2009-2010					

12CT4