

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2012 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program**  
**A Non-Public School - 12PV78**

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

Name of Principal: Dr. Venette Biancalana PhD

Official School Name: School of St Mary

School Mailing Address: 185 East Illinois Road  
Lake Forest, IL 60045-1915

County: Lake County State School Code Number\*:

Telephone: (847) 234-0371 E-mail: ybiancalana@schoolofstmary.org

Fax: (847) 234-9593 Web site/URL: www.schoolofstmary.org

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.

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

Name of Superintendent\*: Sister Mary Paul McCaughey, O.P. Superintendent e-mail:  
mmccaughey@archchicago.org

District Name: Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Catholic Schools District Phone: (312) 534-5212

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.

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

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Cecile Schoenheider

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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

*\*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

---

12PV78

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

12PV78

All data are the most recent year available.

### DISTRICT

Questions 1 and 2 are for Public Schools only.

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

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

4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 4

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                      | 37         | 37           | 74          |  | 6  | 24         | 33           | 57          |
| K                         | 22         | 25           | 47          |  | 7  | 26         | 22           | 48          |
| 1                         | 24         | 26           | 50          |  | 8  | 31         | 26           | 57          |
| 2                         | 27         | 19           | 46          |  | 9  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 3                         | 23         | 31           | 54          |  | 10 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 4                         | 27         | 34           | 61          |  | 11 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 5                         | 27         | 15           | 42          |  | 12 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| Total in Applying School: |            |              |             |  |    |            |              | 536         |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
2 % Asian  
1 % Black or African American  
4 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
91 % 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: 3%

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

|     |   |      |
|-----|---|------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred <b>to</b> the school after October 1, 2010 until the end of the school year.   | 11   |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <b>from</b> 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)].  | 16   |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2010  | 536  |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).                                       | 0.03 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.  | 3    |

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school: 0%

Total number of ELL students in the school: 0

Number of non-English languages represented: 0

Specify non-English languages:

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 0%

Total number of students who qualify: 0

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: 6%

Total number of students served: 32

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>0</u> Autism                | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>0</u> Deafness              | <u>2</u> Other Health Impaired                 |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u>10</u> Specific Learning Disability         |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>18</u> Speech or Language Impairment        |
| <u>1</u> Hearing Impairment    | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation    | <u>1</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</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>3</u>         | <u>1</u>         |
| Classroom teachers  | <u>29</u>        | <u>2</u>         |
| Resource teachers/specialists<br>(e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.) | <u>7</u>         | <u>2</u>         |
| Paraprofessionals   | <u>9</u>         | <u>2</u>         |
| Support staff<br>(e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.)                              | <u>5</u>         | <u>5</u>         |
| Total number  | <u>53</u>        | <u>12</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%       | 96%       | 96%       | 96%       | 98%       |
| 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? Before 2007

Visitors to the School of St. Mary immediately recognize key elements of the school's mission in action. From the youngest Primary Grade Center preschooler to the most mature eighth grader at the Upper Grade Center, St. Mary Crusaders display strong school pride, a sense of community amongst peers, personal confidence, and a deep commitment for outreach in order to build a better world for tomorrow.

*Our school mission states: "The School of St. Mary is a Catholic educational community in which children experience the Gospel message, receive excellent academic preparation, and accept responsibility for themselves and others. Our school is committed to the development of the unique gifts of each child--spiritual, intellectual, physical and emotional. In a supportive atmosphere, students are challenged to academic excellence and are provided with the knowledge and skills necessary for future success. In an atmosphere that deepens Christian values, students experience prayer and worship, and are encouraged to make responsible decisions for themselves and to cooperate with and care for others. Faith development, self-awareness, academic achievement, and community responsibility are emphasized in order to prepare the children of the School of St. Mary to be contributing Christian citizens in the society of the future. Our mission is accomplished in a strong partnership of cooperative parents, supportive parishioners, and highly qualified faculty."*

This mission exemplifies an outstanding Catholic elementary school currently serving 536 preschool through eighth grade students in Lake County, Illinois, near Chicago. Since 1917, the School of St. Mary has educated and formed generations of students for fulfilling careers in college and beyond. Our alumni assume roles of service and leadership in continuing education, the community, professions, as well as the Church. Graduates leave the School of St. Mary possessing a strong academic foundation and knowledge base, deeply rooted values and character, self-confidence, as well as personal faith that enable them to become well-respected, accomplished leaders.

With deep commitment to professional growth, the School of St. Mary has remained focused on enhancing pedagogical skills to create an evolving state-of-the-art learning community. Typical staff development opportunities have focused upon differentiation of instruction, assessment strategies, social-emotional growth, technology integration, classroom management, as well as faith formation. The administration seeks opportunities for faculty to receive training to meet the needs of all learners. Teachers learn to provide research-based academic interventions for students experiencing difficulties and offer enrichment opportunities to motivate highly capable students.

Within each classroom and grade, instructors level reading and math instruction to facilitate differentiation and provide adequate challenge. Likewise, teachers create and employ differentiated curriculum and instructional strategies in all subjects. From tablet computers to interactive boards and laptops, St. Mary's students at all levels receive an array of technological experiences to inspire efficiency and increase effectiveness.

St. Mary's comprehensive curriculum and co-curricular programs provide an enriched assortment of activities, including the fine arts (visual, performing, and music); physical education, wellness and athletics; and world languages. Students enjoy performing at a local senior citizen nursing home, as well as in annual events including a children's opera, musical theater, and choral performances. Upper grade literature classes include a "Shakespeare through Performance" unit. Students study Spanish at all grade levels, while an introduction to Latin begins at fourth grade. Seventh and eighth grade students choose a more intensive, daily language course in either Latin or Spanish.

Extra-curricular activities greatly enhance the St. Mary experience. Offerings include but are not limited to: art, chess, choir, debate, garden club, hands-on-science, high school test prep, literature study, math extension, Spanish, student government, and sports. Developing leadership through social interaction and participation, athletic programs serve as a source of tremendous school pride. The School of St. Mary proudly enforces a "no-cut" policy, which enables all interested students to participate.

The students gain confidence and poise as they lead prayers and read scripture at masses and religious services. Faculty pair students with cross-grade buddies who worship together and also jointly participate in outreach projects. Collections for local food pantries, winter coat drives, and projects supporting local homeless shelters provide service opportunities. Our students also respond to global needs.

Beyond academic preparation, students develop their faith and character through direct as well as indirect instruction. Daily religion classes deepen their Roman Catholic beliefs. Complementing religious formation, our *Second Step* curriculum enhances social and emotional skills. In grades five through eight, students attend annual retreats to reinforce concepts presented in advisory programs and religion classes.

In all, the School of St. Mary challenges students to grow in academic excellence, experience a wide array of curricular and extra-curricular activities, as well as develop a faith and value based character. The school celebrates a rich heritage of meeting the needs of its students as they prepare to learn, serve, and lead in the local community as well as the ever-changing world.



### 1. Assessment Results:

A. Each year, St. Mary teachers in grades two through seven administer the TerraNova, Third Edition Multiple Assessments. The Chicago Archdiocese requires testing only in grades three, five, and seven; however, in 2010 the school began administering the TerraNova assessments also to students in grades four and six to provide more data and inform instruction. In 2011, testing expanded to include grade two. To provide teachers and parents with information regarding high school preparation, eighth grade students are assessed with the Explore test.

All students in the indicated grades are assessed. Those students who have a formal Individual Educational Plan and require testing modifications (extended time, tests read aloud, etc.) receive those accommodations by school personnel.

The TerraNova reading sections measure objectives in *basic understanding; analyzing text; evaluating and extending meaning; and identifying and applying reading strategies*. The mathematics portion includes objectives covering *numbers and numerical relations; computation and estimation; measurement, geometry and spatial sense; data—statistics and probability; patterns—functions and algebra; problem solving and reasoning; and communication*.

The data collected from these assessments proves extremely valuable. The vast majority of the students perform in the top half of the National Norming Group, with the highest number of students performing in the top quartile. Furthermore, as a result of these assessments, faculty are able to track students' progress closely, align areas in need of development within the curriculum, and use the data as one of numerous criteria for providing enrichment or remediation to the student body.

Additionally, teachers administer AIMSweb benchmark assessments three times a year to students in kindergarten through fifth grade, measuring students' progress according to local norms that are higher than the AIMSweb national norms. When students' scores reveal they are at risk, research-based interventions, remediation for support and frequent progress monitoring assessments are provided.

B. Upon reviewing the past five years of TerraNova scores, School of St. Mary students at every tested grade have consistently improved performance in both reading and math. In the area of reading, students in third grade in 2007 scored a *national percentile of the mean NCE* of 68. The third grade tested in 2011 scored substantially higher at the 78<sup>th</sup> percentile. In mathematics, third grade level scored at the 77<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2007 and at the 83<sup>rd</sup> percentile in 2011.

In reading, the fifth grade class of 2007 performed at the 77<sup>th</sup> percentile as compared to the 79<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2011. The fifth graders scored at the 71<sup>st</sup> percentile in 2007 in the area of math and in 2011 at the 73<sup>rd</sup> percentile.

The 2007 seventh grade class performed at the 74<sup>th</sup> percentile in reading, however, the seventh graders tested in 2011 scored at the 81<sup>st</sup> percentile. In mathematics those same grade seven students performed at the 84<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2007, as compared to a 2011 score by seventh graders at the 86<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Fourth and sixth graders, who were added to the TerraNova assessment schedule two years ago, also increased their performance levels. In 2010, fourth graders obtained a score at the 81<sup>st</sup> percentile in reading, and in 2011, at the 82<sup>nd</sup> percentile. Likewise, for math the fourth graders scored a class average at the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2010, and the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2011. The sixth grade students performed at the 81<sup>st</sup> percentile in reading in 2010 and at the 84<sup>th</sup> percentile the following year. In mathematics, the grade six

class scored at the 77<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2010 and the sixth graders tested in 2011 scored at the 82<sup>nd</sup> percentile.

This five-year comparison indicates consistent growth. Likewise, tracking class cohorts of students passing from grade to each subsequent tested grade indicates overall continuous improvement in the tested areas.

The faculty is pleased with the performance gains identified as trends in student scores. These gains are attributed to the targeted professional development offered to teachers in differentiated instruction, curriculum and assessment development aligning to the rigorous standards of the state, Archdiocese of Chicago and now the new Common Core standards, along with additional advisory programs put into place to help strengthen students' social and emotional well-being. TerraNova assessment of students was expanded to a yearly schedule to determine their needs based upon a team analysis of their performance. This has helped focus instructional planning efforts.

In 2007, an earlier identification process was initiated for students in need of interventions. Coupling this research-based approach with intense direct instruction and assessment in the area of phonemic awareness, guided reading, significant teacher mentoring and staff development, notable improvement has been witnessed in the students' reading performance as demonstrated by AIMSweb scores. The direct instruction support now provided for students at each campus through learning resource specialists in conjunction with the regular classroom reading program, enable the school to help a number of students that, in the past, would have required outside reading assistance.

In 2009, the School of St. Mary began securing the services of outside university professors as consultants for assistance in yearly curriculum and instructional resource review. Engaging the services of these consultants has helped faculty become more knowledgeable about research-based findings on best instructional practices and resources to use with students to improve instruction for enhanced learning purposes. To fund the cost of these consultants, Title II Professional Development money was used.

## **2. Using Assessment Results:**

The purpose of assessment is not to demoralize or applaud success, instead it is to drive instructional design. In all core curriculum subjects, teachers administer chapter and unit assessments to monitor student progress and mastery of concepts. In the areas of spelling and math, specifically, teachers offer pre-tests to eliminate teaching already mastered concepts. That is, students demonstrating a solid command of concepts or skills will receive differentiated, advanced material while others will adhere to the instructional plan. Student progress is also assessed through educational software. This includes *Accelerated Reader* and *Mathletics*.

The school's new *Lead21* reading program heavily relies on assessment data to accurately assess instructional reading level. Teachers administer the first of these detailed tests the first week of school to determine placement in one of four guided reading groups: intensive, strategic, benchmark, or advanced. Students also take assessments after each unit in this innovative reading program. Beyond grouping, the data honed from these assessments also includes specific details relevant to phonics, comprehension, and literary interpretive skills.

For students receiving instructional support, the learning specialists provide more regular curriculum based measurements, referred to as progress monitors. It is essential these students at risk are assessed more frequently, so faculty can ascertain the success of our interventions.

Upon the receipt of TerraNova test results in early May, the administrative team reviews scores with homeroom teachers. Deficiencies are tracked and progress of all students is monitored. Additionally, the

Cognitive Skills Index is utilized to ascertain the relationship between the anticipated achievement scores as they compare to the actual achievement results. This enables the faculty to determine which students may or may not be reaching their potential. In cases where students are not performing at their anticipated ability level, plans are created to determine specific needs and collaboratively develop tactics to provide enrichment or remediation for students. Some students may require remediation, re-teaching, tutorial services, or enrichment opportunities. Sometimes the data is used as a basis to request a full case study through the local public school district or private psychological services.

At the beginning of each academic year, grade level teams meet to review prior assessment data of the students entering their respective classes. TerraNova represents only a portion of this review. Other assessments are also utilized relative to student progress, especially in the areas of reading and math. Teachers review grouping reports to identify various levels of mastery, as they create their differentiated lessons. For instructional planning, the information gathered from these assessments easily identifies goal areas for each student where additional review, instruction, or enrichment is necessary.

The school office mails TerraNova results to parents in early May. A detailed report is included that provides comprehensive information with regard to specific concepts assessed in each subject area. Additionally, at this time of the year, the Principal's newsletter highlights the overall performance analysis of how student scores compare to national norms. At Back to School Night, as well as at a daytime parent coffee, information is provided regarding testing trend data to the parents. These trends are used to formulate goals for the upcoming school year. Our Web site links to documents describing generalized test results for parents, prospective families, and the broader community to review.

Students at each campus receive progress reports throughout the year. At the Primary Grade Center, students are formally evaluated three times a year. The report cards in pre-school through grade three include achievement, effort, and behavior marks as well as extensive, thoughtful written comments. At the Upper Grade Center, families receive progress reports quarterly. These reports include achievement grades, effort and behavior marks along with a comment section indicating progress associated with work and study habits.

Formal parent, teacher, and student conferences are scheduled in November and again in March. Parents and teachers regularly use written notes, comments in student assignment notebooks, e-mail and voicemail services as progress communication vehicles. Additionally, in grades four through eight, parents can track real time grades by accessing the online grading software.

To track student progress and development in kindergarten through fifth grade, curriculum based measurements (CBM) are utilized. The learning specialists at both campuses administer these brief assessments in September, January, and May. The results of these assessments become part of the student file to use in providing data for instructional planning purposes. Parents also enjoy seeing positive progress of their children. Students not reaching prescribed target skill levels may be referred for further assessments, provided with support services, or recommended for tutorial assistance.

As a final testing vehicle, all eighth grade students take the ACT's Explore Test in November. Faculty and parents receive these test results in January. The scores are used to ascertain students' knowledge in their core subject areas and to design instructional plans necessary for success in high school.

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

The School of St. Mary realizes the tremendous benefits of collaborating with other educators to share expertise and gain knowledge. Our school works closely with Catholic schools in the area as well as with the local public system. Since Catholic schools lack the enormous funding of the public school counterparts, this partnership proves both cost effective and informative.

For administrative purposes, the Archdiocese of Chicago divides parishes into six geographic vicariates. As part of Vicariate 1, the principal meets each month with the other elementary principals in the vicariate to discuss educational topics related to curriculum and instruction, leadership, staffing, and assessment. Because a common mission, funding structure, and oversight by the Archdiocese are shared, these dialogues prove exceptionally valuable.

Last year, the principal recommended Vicariate I Council members host workshops for faculty relative to special education, both in the area of remediation and enrichment. The principals jointly created a planning committee to organize this event. Utilizing Archdiocesan resources as well as faculty volunteers, a keynote speaker from the Office of Catholic Schools opened the day. Then, numerous teachers from the twenty schools presented their expertise in small group seminars. Topics included: Effective Use of Occupational Therapy Strategies within the Classroom, Meeting the Needs of Gifted Students within Regular Classrooms, Strategies to Assist Struggling Readers, Phonemic Awareness for Primary Grades, and Articulation Opportunities for Meeting Individual Needs of Students in Fine Arts Programs. Prior to this in-service, Vicariate I teachers preferred lists of workshops. Vicariate I principals received extremely positive evaluations from this inaugural collaborative opportunity. Future plans for continued professional development might include differentiation strategies, religious education, and social-emotional topics.

Over the last five years, a strong reciprocal relationship has been cultivated with the local public system to assess students demonstrating learning issues. A process has been developed with their lead psychologist for planning interventions, gathering data, and recommending testing. After psychological testing, administrators and teachers meet with a team from the public district as well as the parents to review results and formalize an educational plan if necessary.

The School of St. Mary works closely with the local public schools. Faculty members regularly attend workshops hosted by the public system. At special meetings with public school colleagues, successful approaches for our students' academic, social, and emotional development are communicated. Likewise, regularly scheduled articulation meetings occur between faculty and the six area high schools attended by our graduates.

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

Realizing the tremendous benefits of parental commitment to education, the School of St. Mary closely collaborates with and encourages participation from the parent community. To do so, a variety of inclusive strategies are employed.

School of St. Mary believes that parents, administrators, teachers, and parish staff must share crucial roles in providing exceptional opportunities for children. Assuming this team approach to decision-making, the school relies on parental advisors with unique skills. Parents representing various aspects of education, from technology to finance serve on a School Advisory Council (SAC). Created in 1998, SAC has significantly contributed to aligning the school and leadership around its direction and vision for success.

Outside of SAC, parents contribute indispensable support and expertise. Comprised of teachers, alumni, parents, as well as parish and school leadership, the Enrollment Management Team focuses on maintaining and building the student population. The Curriculum Review and Development Committee convenes select administrators, consultants, teachers, and parents to annually assess and modify rotating academic disciplines, ensuring curriculum remains competitive, engaging, and challenging. The Discipline Task Force of parents, teachers, and administrators has developed the Code of Conduct and age-appropriate approach to discipline. The Parents' Club focuses on fundraising to minimize tuition increases and enhance programs while aligning parents around the school community. Led by parents and teachers, the Community Service Team seeks opportunities for students to engage in charitable opportunities locally, nationally and globally.

Considering the immeasurable value of parental involvement, the school offers numerous volunteer opportunities. In the early grades, parents assist in classroom centers, providing appreciated extra hands and guidance for projects, technology, and early literacy activities. Class parents plan and schedule parties as well as special events. Parents especially enjoy volunteering as Great Books facilitators and lunchroom assistants. The school's vast athletic program relies heavily on the commitment and expertise of parent coaches.

Faculty engages and communicates with the parents through a variety of approaches. Monthly parent coffees feature speakers on noteworthy educational topics. Weekly electronic newsletters align communication and illustrate goals as well as progress. The Web site provides classroom and all-school information as well as access to grades, homework, resources, and forms. Local media sources and the parish publish school news. Parents are invited to share faith experiences at masses and prayer services. Throughout the year, the school welcomes visitors at special events such as Catholic Schools Week, Special Persons Day, classroom presentations, in addition to open houses.

### 1. Curriculum:

The School of St. Mary continues the Catholic tradition of combining unconditional positive regard for each student with academic excellence in a caring, nurturing, student-centered environment. The most current of educational theory and research is used to motivate and challenge each student. The curriculum focuses on the development of the whole child, challenging students to maintain high personal standards, follow cultural pursuits, think critically and creatively, value the democratic ideals of our American heritage, and regard faith formation and education as a life-long process. The curriculum is regularly updated, by subject, to keep it current and relevant to the children's needs. Students prepare for academic success, service to community, and leadership roles in high school. Outstanding alumni demonstrate the successes of our curriculum.

Common Core Learning Standards combined with those of the State of Illinois and Archdiocese of Chicago drive curriculum. Classes from pre-school through fifth grade are self-contained, while middle school courses are departmentalized. Core curricular areas include religion, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. The school provides music, physical education, and art instruction twice a week. All pre-school through sixth grade students learn Spanish, and all students in fourth through sixth grade study Latin twice weekly. In seventh and eighth grades, students choose courses of daily instruction in either Spanish or Latin. School of St. Mary is in compliance with the program's foreign language requirements.

The School of St. Mary places primary emphasis on spiritual formation concisely articulated in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. A strong, well-rounded curriculum fundamentally based in the teachings of the Catholic Church serves the cornerstone of the academic program. In addition to formal religious instruction based upon grade-level-specific texts, teachers supplement with activities such as research projects, dramatic presentations, service opportunities, retreats, visits to a synagogue, and art history.

*Second Step*, the social-emotional curriculum, further enhances Christian behavior through age-appropriate, real-life scenarios and role-playing. Students learn how to respond to difficult social situations and frustrations with appropriate words and behaviors.

Pre-school classes introduce children to the joy of gaining knowledge and independence while mastering routines of the classroom. Preschoolers thrive in a loving, encouraging atmosphere where students developmentally work through play. Gaining confidence and autonomy, they focus on exploring and manipulating materials through individual and group experiences. Teachers encourage preschoolers to enjoy learning and actively participate spiritually, emotionally, socially, intellectually, and physically, to become lifelong learners.

Recognizing reading and language as the foundation of all learning, tremendous emphasis is placed on building strong literacy skills. This begins with exposure to a rich print environment, aural phonics, quality literature, and oral communication. Teachers utilize whole group as well as leveled guided reading instruction. Students develop critical and analytical skills in literature studies and build effective written communication skills in language arts classes.

In mathematics, understanding and mastery are emphasized. Students develop critical thinking skills and concepts that serve them other academic disciplines as well as in everyday life experiences. Our leveled curriculum enables students to progress toward advanced high school placement.

The science curriculum develops curiosity, questioning, experimentation, and discovery through sensory experiences and hands-on activities. Through scientific method, students learn to observe, compare, quantify, measure, question, predict and classify in order to understand and appreciate concepts of life, physical, and earth sciences. Excellent resources and lab facilities support this curriculum.

The social studies curriculum encourages students to explore their relationship with the ever-changing world and human diversity. The curriculum promotes understanding of the physical, geographic, civic and human resources of our world and the global communities it supports. Students gain an historical and cultural perspective of our nation and the world.

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

A. Educators at the School of St. Mary share a common goal of strengthening fundamental phonics and word attack skills, enhancing fluency, and developing comprehension strategies with focus on different genres, literary elements, critical thinking, as well as writing. Ultimately, all reading instruction aims to engender a passion for literature and develop each student to their fullest literacy potential. Adopting the guided reading philosophy, we realize the one-size fits all basal reading approach fails to meet the needs of the diverse student population.

To guarantee reading success, key components within the curriculum provide for differentiation and individualized instruction. Foundational reading skills begin in pre-school through numerous early literacy activities as well as the *Sunform Alphabet System*, an integrated approach that delivers basic letter recognition, phonics, and handwriting skills. Kindergarten and first grade teachers augment aural phonics with Michael Haggerty's *Phonemic Awareness*. Kindergarten teachers supplement these programs and also build fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension skills through the use of *Treasures*, an engaging guided reading series. In the 2011-2012 academic year, the school adopted the innovative *Lead21* series for first through fifth grades to develop phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, spelling, and writing skills. Its unique themed readers are differentiated, comprehensive, and cross-curricular, helping students gain knowledge in all five core areas of reading while learning at their individual level. We utilize the Accelerated Reader Program to encourage on-level reading while monitoring students' comprehension.

All School of St. Mary students in kindergarten through fifth grade, in addition to students with special needs or intervention plans in grades six through eight, receive AIMSweb curriculum based measurements at least three times a year. These assessments reveal students' progress in reading fluency. Students who reveal deficiencies in their reading development participate in small group and individual reading interventions taught by full time resource teachers. Each resource teacher designs an intervention program based on the student's area of need. They employ research-based and individualized programs to help students overcome reading difficulties. Some of these programs include: Wilson Foundations, Wilson Reading, SRA Decoding and Comprehension, Read Naturally, Lexia Phonics, and Rewards. Students with an Individualized Catholic Education plan receive accommodations both in and out of general education classrooms. Additionally, students with speech needs receive service through a part time speech pathologist from the public school district. All of these interventions, combined with parental support, create reading success and confidence for each and every student.

B. In the middle school, higher-level grammar and sentence structure skills are introduced. Parts of speech, mechanics, phrases (prepositional, appositive, and verbal), clauses (independent and subordinate), simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex sentences are all studied to foster more mature, varied writing. To become increasingly fluent and accomplished in their written expression and to develop critical thinking skills, each day, students have a proofreading challenge and write in a journal on a given prompt. Self-selected journal entries are read by the author to small groups and/or the class as a whole on an ongoing basis to foster confidence in sharing written work. More formally, students are encouraged to explore descriptive, narrative, expository, and persuasive writing in unique, individual ways using 6+1 Trait Writing. The study of paragraph and essay structure forms the core of this

experience.

In literature class, students continue their study of literary terms and devices through the use of novels, works of non-fiction, short stories, and poetry. Throughout the year, students are asked to examine their ideas of tolerance, relationships, leadership, and values. Units focus on essential questions that express a human truth and recurring theme in society. Students are challenged with works that discuss these recurring themes. Much of the study of novels and longer non-fiction works is built on the student-directed literature circles. Literature circles give the students an opportunity to explore literature with their peers while building leadership as well as literary skills. Literature circles are differentiated allowing each individual student to be challenged at his or her own level. Additionally, each quarter students read a book outside of class that they select from a book list differentiated by reading level to meet the needs of developing learners through advanced learners. At the end of the quarter, the students share their book in the form of a project based on multiple intelligences. These projects give students an opportunity for unique, individual, creative expression while also asking them to stretch their boundaries and think “outside the box.” In order to enrich students’ knowledge of words, vocabulary is studied both in conjunction with literary works and as a separate course. Students have a weekly vocabulary lesson culminating in an assessment to check for understanding and mastery.

### **3. Mathematics:**

At every level, the math curriculum at the School of Saint Mary intends to challenge but not overwhelm. All students must possess a fluent computational foundation and conceptual understanding prior to pursuing more complicated problem solving and computation exercises. Each student can achieve success while maintaining a positive attitude towards math.

The school's approach to mathematics instruction differs through the various grade levels. Beginning in the primary years, teachers differentiate curriculum within the classroom to meet individual needs. In grades four through eight, an extra section of math at each grade level is offered to ensure small class sizes, provide more instructor time per student, and promote flexibility in meeting individual needs. Additionally, at the middle school level, instructors develop groupings that enable each student to succeed and perfect math skills as well as understandings at his or her unique pace. The administration and faculty consider TerraNova math results, InView test scores, grades, as well as teacher recommendations for placement in the various math groups.

The school provides unique instruction in the middle school leveled math sections. Beginning in sixth grade, St. Mary’s offers accelerated instruction for students achieving two years above grade level; small group instruction is also provided for students who benefit from individual attention and one-on-one math instruction. Most students complete pre-algebra in seventh grade and algebra in eighth grade. The goal at all grade levels is to begin with concrete and move to abstract experiences, relying upon manipulatives and foundational skills as needed. As students progress, each teacher encourages them to think more abstractly and apply specific concepts to multistep problems.

The School of St. Mary relies on the in-house Department of Student Services to further enhance math instruction with lower performing students at all grade levels. From hands on manipulatives to complex, multistep problems, each student is encouraged to demonstrate mastery of the material. Teachers work collaboratively to ensure the success of each student. Student understanding drives the curriculum.

Throughout all grade levels, teachers employ technology to illuminate and reinforce math concepts. Kindergarteners count coins and match their value on interactive white boards. First graders play math games on iPads. Children in first through fifth grade enhance skills through *Mathletics* and other online software. In middle school, students rely on technology to graph and organize data as well as represent algebraic functions. They visit mathematical Web sites to enhance concepts.



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

Along with academic proficiency, a well-balanced education must include fine arts: visual, musical and performance. As students develop their spiritual, intellectual, physical, and emotional identities via the fine arts, they express confidence and gain an appreciation of world history and cultures. This prepares them for a diverse global society. St. Mary students in kindergarten through eighth grade participate in art and music two periods each per week, as well as various co-curricular art, music and performing offerings.

The School of St. Mary's visual arts curriculum introduces elements of shape, line, color, and texture, eventually exploring sophisticated elements such as directionality, perspective, dimension and shading. Students experience an array of tools and materials for projects and activities in various media that enhance eye-hand coordination, which also enhances reading and writing skills. With greater technical understanding, students become more capable of revealing imagination and expressing personality.

Studying the works of significant artists and movements enables students to gain appreciation and historical perspective. Students employ different media and techniques (sketching, sculpting, painting, etc.) to personally replicate these historical works expressing their unique artistic imagery. At both campuses, we proudly display art work, recognizing the many talents of the students.

Likewise, the music curriculum develops reading notation, performance skills, historical perspective, cultural awareness, and creativity. Music serves as an integral part of daily life, allowing the recognition and celebration of what we know, believe, and feel. Musical elements including tempo, rhythm, melody, and mood provide new ways to communicate. Students study and extensively perform religious and liturgical music. Individual and choral singing is integral to the curriculum, with percussion instruments used extensively at the primary grades. Some students receive classical violin instruction as an elective.

Performance opportunities enable students to build self-confidence and poise. Primary and upper grade choirs offer musical leadership at liturgies and occasionally visit nursing homes to share their talents with seniors. Each year grade three performs a children's opera, and grade eight mount a musical theater performance. All grades offer choral performances during the year. Upper grade literature classes complete "Shakespeare through Performance" units where they learn Shakespearean works by enacting rather than simply reading them. An annual talent show is another means by which fourth through eighth graders may express their artistic performance abilities.

#### **5. Instructional Methods:**

Through whole group lessons, cooperative learning, and individualized instruction, the School of St. Mary provides an inclusive educational experience. Support and interventions are supplied to students with special learning needs, including those requiring extra challenge through differentiation. Using a data driven system, specific procedures are followed for referring and screening students. For students who have individualized plans, accommodations and support are provided both inside and outside the classroom. Additionally, a case manager is assigned to ensure compliance with state educational guidelines. The Student Services Department includes a director, social worker, nurse, two learning resource specialists, in addition to a speech and language pathologist.

For students revealing a consistent aptitude for higher-level thinking and the ability to process complex information beyond their peers, a variety of enrichment opportunities are provided. In kindergarten through third grade, in-class differentiation offers challenge, including curriculum compacting and extension activities. AIMSweb reading and math scores, teacher recommendations, and parental requests help us identify students who may benefit from additional challenge. If supplementary data is required, the Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test 2 is administered or a referral is made to outside evaluations.

Weekly enrichment programs are designed for fourth and fifth graders to engage students in challenging, project-based learning opportunities. Teachers trained in gifted education encourage cooperative teams of students to think deeply about real-world problems, researching and exploring possible solutions.

In sixth through eighth grade, the honors literature program challenges students to read quality poetry and prose, expand genres, and examine content using higher level thinking skills. These classes also engage in analytical, narrative, expository, and persuasive written expression.

In fourth through eighth grade mathematics, instruction is tiered, offering an additional section and teacher. This ensures smaller class sizes, greater instructor contact, and increased flexibility of student groupings. While the number of students is limited in each section, the number of advanced mathematics classes is not; that is, multiple advanced sections are offered as dictated by the student population. TerraNova math scores, the InView results, classroom performance, as well as, teacher recommendations are considered for math placement.

In providing technology hardware and software, educational excellence is promoted by facilitating resource sharing, innovation, and communication. Students have access to iPads, wireless laptops, interactive whiteboards, Mobi's, video streaming, numerous software applications to support their learning. Industry experts and teacher-leaders provide regular staff development to inspire and increase comfort level as well as usage of devices and available programs.

## **6. Professional Development:**

The School of St. Mary relies on a committee of teachers and administrators who solicit and communicate with various school constituencies to plan professional development opportunities. With input from stakeholders, the committee designs professional development opportunities in accordance with the three Archdiocesan Genesis goals: Catholic Identity, Academic Excellence, and School Vitality.

Recently, professional development has focused on differentiation strategies to meet diverse student needs. Faculty have attended presentations by outside speakers and joined with local public and Catholic faculties to learn best practices in differentiation, including remediation and enrichment. Administrators have also collaborated with public schools to obtain professional development funding to support faculty attendance at the Illinois Association of Gifted Children convention as well as the Gifted Education Seminar.

As a result of expertise gained through professional development, teachers and administrators serve as resources on our Talented and Gifted or Problem Solving Teams. These teams communicate criteria for identifying children who may require enrichment or remediation. In addition to serving as a resource to faculty and parents, these teams recommend strategies for challenging or remediating students. They also review in-house assessments and standardized test scores, when considering instructional decisions and faculty in-service plans.

Utilizing Title money, local university professors are engaged to share relevant research on best practices in teaching science, social studies, language arts, and math. When adopting curriculum, the school devotes in-service training to faculty familiarization and mastery of resources and methods.

Teachers and administrators participate in technology training, including: video streaming, projecting on and using interactive white boards, iPads, Mobi's, document cameras, software and student information systems. Faculty members receive support to create and maintain classroom Web pages and online grading software.

Much professional development has focused on ways to meet the social and emotional needs of students. Two teachers have attended a "train the trainer" *Second Step* seminar and, then, instructed the faculty to

effectively employ this social and emotional curriculum throughout the school. This program in conjunction with faith based resources has positively impacted students.

Memberships in local and national professional organizations, have heightened our awareness of recent research and best practices. An annual allotment of up to \$1,200 for each teacher to participate in conferences or coursework is provided. If areas are in need of improvement as determined by subjective and objective data relative to the Common Core Standards or State and Archdiocesan Standards, the Professional Development team seeks additional in-service training opportunities.

## **7. School Leadership:**

With two campuses separated by approximately four miles, our school is fortunate to share leadership between a fully certified four person team consisting of the principal, two assistant principals, as well as a director of student services. The principal and director of student services split their time between the two campuses while the two assistant principals primarily remain at their respective campuses. Much like a superintendent, the principal oversees and coordinates curriculum and instruction, personnel and budgetary decisions. To do so, the principal heavily relies on the expertise and joint decision making efforts as well as the consent of the entire administrative team. For example, whether finalizing the annual budget, school calendar, professional development opportunities, personnel review, or curriculum development, the entire administrative team meets to consider the best options for the school. Throughout the year, the administrative team schedules formal bi-weekly meetings, while faculty meets on a monthly basis. The administrative team also convenes less formally through phone conferences, email, or in small groups to address daily decision making.

Following a participatory management model, the leadership team also relies on faculty input. Teachers serve on committees to improve every aspect of our community. They wear many hats and serve as an integral part of decision making in the areas of curriculum, instruction, discipline, professional development, and service. In fact, teachers sit on almost twenty-five committees to assist in the decision making process. As stakeholders, they are empowered to share their ideas and expertise in all facets of our educational community.

A number of our committees pertain to student achievement. The administration and teachers meet to analyze data obtained from AIMSweb assessments as well as TerraNova results. Reliance upon surveys ascertain students' social and emotional development. Administrators review report cards with teachers to determine if each student is meeting his/her potential through our current programming. Each campus offers a problem solving team to recommend appropriate intervention strategies for academic or social improvement. Closely adhering to the Response to Intervention model, this group determines personnel resources and materials necessary to ensure learning.

The administrative team recognizes faculty and staff members by written and verbal commendations as well as notes of accomplishments on yearly summative evaluations. This practice encourages faculty involvement in decision making and praises teachers for their expertise and commitment. Just as the individuality of every student is valued, the gifts of our diverse faculty are cherished.

## PART VI - PRIVATE SCHOOL ADDENDUM

12PV78

1. Private school association: Catholic

2. Does the school have nonprofit, tax-exempt (501(c)(3) status? Yes

3. What are the 2011-2012 tuition rates, by grade? (Do not include room, board, or fees.)

|               |               |               |               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <u>\$5200</u> | <u>\$5000</u> | <u>\$5000</u> | <u>\$5000</u> | <u>\$5000</u> | <u>\$5000</u> |
| K             | 1st           | 2nd           | 3rd           | 4th           | 5th           |
| <u>\$5000</u> | <u>\$5000</u> | <u>\$5000</u> | <u>\$0</u>    | <u>\$0</u>    | <u>\$0</u>    |
| 6th           | 7th           | 8th           | 9th           | 10th          | 11th          |
| <u>\$0</u>    | <u>\$3450</u> |               |               |               |               |
| 12th          | Other         |               |               |               |               |

4. What is the educational cost per student? (School budget divided by enrollment) \$5597

5. What is the average financial aid per student? \$392

6. What percentage of the annual budget is devoted to scholarship assistance and/or tuition reduction?  
4%

7. What percentage of the student body receives scholarship assistance, including tuition reduction? 57%

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third Edition Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 83        | 84        | 78        | 77        | 77        |
| Number of students tested  | 51        | 43        | 57        | 53        | 56        |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78

## NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3

Test: TerraNova

Edition/Publication Year: Third Edition Publisher: McGraw Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 78        | 79        | 73        | 74        | 68        |
| Number of students tested  | 51        | 43        | 57        | 53        | 56        |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78

## NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third/2007 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       |           |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 75        | 70        |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 40        | 57        |           |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       |           |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78

# NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       |           |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 82        | 81        |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 40        | 57        |           |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       |           |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78



# NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third/ 2007 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 73        | 78        | 74        | 79        | 71        |
| Number of students tested  | 56        | 43        | 49        | 53        | 62        |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78

# NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third/2007 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 79        | 81        | 76        | 83        | 77        |
| Number of students tested  | 56        | 43        | 49        | 53        | 62        |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78

## NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third/ 2007 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       |           |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 82        | 77        |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 42        | 46        |           |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       |           |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78

# NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third/ 2007 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       |           |           |           |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 84        | 81        |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  | 42        | 46        |           |           |           |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       |           |           |           |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78

# NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 7

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third / 2007 Publisher: CTB McGraw-hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 86        | 90        | 84        | 86        | 84        |
| Number of students tested  | 47        | 47        | 52        | 46        | 49        |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78

## NATIONAL NORMS-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 7

Test: Terra Nova 3

Edition/Publication Year: Third / 2007 Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill Scores reported as: Percentiles

|  | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month  | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  | 81        | 81        | 81        | 82        | 74        |
| Number of students tested  | 47        | 47        | 52        | 46        | 49        |
| Percent of total students tested   | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>               |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>2. African American Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Special Education Students</b>   |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6.</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Average Score  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested  |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>NOTES:</b>  |           |           |           |           |           |
| Only grades 3, 5, and 7 tested in 2007, 2008, 2009 No subgroups larger than 5 students |           |           |           |           |           |

12PV78