

2003-2004 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program Cover Sheet

Name of Principal Dr. Charles Abelmann (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Bernard T. Janney Elementary School (As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 4130 Albemarle Street, NW (If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

City Washington State D.C. Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 20016-2185

Tel. (202) 282-0110 Fax (202) 282-0128

Website/URL www.janneyschool.org Email charlie.abelmann@k12.dc.us

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

(Principal's Signature) Date

Name of Superintendent Dr. Elfreda Massie (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name District of Columbia Public Schools Tel. (202) 442-5885

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

(Superintendent's Signature) Date

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Ms. Peggy Cooper Cafritz (Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

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

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

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 of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. 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.
8. 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

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: 101 Elementary schools
 11 Middle schools
 9 Junior high schools
 20 High schools
- 141 TOTAL

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: \$12,046
- Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: \$12,046

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

- Urban or large central city
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural area
 Rural

4. 3 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
 ___ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	31	49	80	7			
1	35	34	69	8			
2	28	31	59	9			
3	29	28	57	10			
4	25	20	45	11			
5	39	30	69	12			
6	30	39	69	PreKgn	14	17	31
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL							479

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|------------|--------------------------------|
| <u>67%</u> | White |
| <u>20%</u> | Black or African American |
| <u>4%</u> | Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>9%</u> | Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>0%</u> | American Indian/Alaskan Native |

100% Total

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 6%

(This rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	11
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	16
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	27
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	456
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.06
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	6%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 4%
19 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 12

Specify languages: Turkish, French, Hindi, Basque, Kazakh, Russian, German, Hungarian, Chinese, Spanish, Portuguese (full population also includes Italian, Arabic, Armenian, Vietnamese, Bahasa Indonesian, Bulgarian, Greek, Korean, Romanian, Lithuanian)

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 7%
35 Total Number Students Who Qualify

10. Students receiving special education services: 9%
42 Total Number of Students Served

PART III – SUMMARY

Bernard T. Janney Elementary School is a neighborhood school that has served the American University/Tenleytown area of the District of Columbia for the past 78 years. The school depends on the commitment of the parents and staff who value public schooling and who work together to achieve a rich stable academic program in a system that continues to have much turmoil. Each year the school has a long waiting list, with at least 200 families from outside the boundary area. The school values diversity and does its best to accommodate students from across the metropolitan area based upon a lottery conducted by the school system. The Janney community emphasizes inclusion by advocating for a diverse student body and promoting an understanding of different backgrounds, cultures and learning needs. Each day we also have 20 students, whose parents live and work on Bolling Air Force, commute over an hour each way to be able to attend the school. The average student performance level of our students is consistently one of the highest in the school system and comparable to the highest performing schools in the country.

We know that a school with high-performing students does not necessarily equate with a high-performing school as we benefit from the social and human capital of the student body. It is our responsibility at Janney, with the help of each family, to understand and best support the emotional, cognitive and physical well-being of each student. This requires a supportive educational setting that takes time to address individual needs and to work with families as an integral part of the education process. Janney strives to cultivate in its community the skills, values, and confidence to support a lifetime of learning, leadership, and service. The school encourages children to be joyful, active learners who are confident and ethical citizens of the school community and can apply this to the larger global community. We encourage students to discover and appreciate their own voice, to listen to others, to express themselves verbally and in writing, to think critically, to solve problems in creative ways, to work cooperatively with others and to use technology to promote understanding and communication.

The school's core values promote achievement as we recognize that children learn in different ways and each educator must face the challenge of differentiating instruction to help all students meet high standards. The vision of the school also embraces the value of inquiry, equity, collaboration, reflection and experimentation. The complete vision statement is posted in the lobby of the school and in every classroom. It is also part of our extensive web site about the school (<http://www.Janneyschool.org>). The vision is discussed with students, staff and parents regularly. The school assumes that there is always room for improvement and conducts annual student, staff and parent satisfaction surveys. Supporting student development also requires constant adult development and growth. Schools that nurture staff also nurture students. Janney strives to create a rich professional community where teachers can work collaboratively, engaging in conversations about instruction and authentic student work.

The school has an active commitment to community service and finding meaningful ways for students to be engaged in the local community and other national and international causes. We strive to educate children to become citizens who will be champions for important civil and human rights while respecting the environment. Janney should leave students asking more questions about the world in which we live, while taking responsibility for active citizenship.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Understanding assessment results in reading and math

Janney is a school with many high-performing students. The background of the children who attend Janney can explain much of the school's performance on the SAT9. The real question is what value we as a school are adding to the children who attend Janney and how we establish high expectations for all children and monitor their progress over time. As a school, we have a great concern about becoming a "drill and kill" environment simply to meet the benchmarks for improvement in SAT9 scores set by the school district. The school believes that if we have a strong, research-based, coherent curriculum and rich instruction that meets each child's needs, then we will see adequate yearly progress by every child on standardized tests. Moreover, we will see students who can authentically demonstrate their ability to solve problems, communicate orally and in writing, use technology effectively, and work well with others. We are preparing children to be life-long learners and not simply test takers.

The results included in the tables indicate that Janney has consistently performed as one of the top three schools in the District of Columbia each year. The District of Columbia Schools use the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT 9). The SAT 9 is a nationally norm-referenced test. Scores are reported in scale scores, national curve equivalencies (NCE) and national percentile ranks (NPR) as well as in performance levels. In Spring 2003, the total percentile rank for students tested in reading was 86% and in math 89%, with approximately 40% of students performing at an advanced level in both subjects. Just under 80% of students score at proficient level or above in reading and math. There were no statistically significant differences in how boys and girls performed. Looking at the school data from year to year the figures are very stable despite different students being tested. The average NCE score in reading for all White students (n=157) was 79% compared to an average for African American Students (N=48) of 61%. While there is significant achievement gap, African Americans at Janney scored much higher than the overall district average. In reading, the average NCE for African Americans in District of Columbia in grades 2-6 was 38%.

While the school system looks at scores from one year to the next comparing the students who are tested each year who attend the school, we focus on looking at the students who continue to be in the school from one year to the next to more accurately capture the value added we make for the students who are tested from one year to the next. We are less interested in not looking at how one 4th grade class compares to the next or how the students tested in one year in 4th grade compare to students tested in 5th grade. We want to know how the same students perform year after year and thus we follow the performance of students who are in the school for two or more years. There is too much turnover in the school's student body that is tested from one year to the next. For example, only 234 of the 330 students who took the SAT9 reading test in Spring 2000 took the SAT9 reading test at Janney again in 2001. Thus, we look at scale scores and NCE scores over time for the students who remain in the school from year to year to be sure we are adding value. While the error for any one student in one year is great, we can look across all students who remain in the school to evaluate our instructional program. A sample of this type of analysis is included in a table at the end of the data section.

2. Using assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance

Each year the staff and community reflect on the performance of students through a careful examination of SAT 9 data at the individual, class, and school level. We also look carefully at data disaggregated by gender, race, and special needs during the summer and early fall. Teachers examine the item analysis, which is the most useful feedback for guiding instruction. This allows us to see for each subset of the test whether a student was below average, average, or above average. For example, if we see a pattern that students have trouble with estimation in one grade, we take note that the instructional program needs to address this sub area more carefully. We also use SAT 9 data as one input to the class assignment process to ensure that the classes we form are mixed ability and not tracked. We follow each student over time and monitor their growth in scale scores relative to the national norm. We also examine the results of the writing and science assessments given to students in grade 3 and 5. We follow the 3rd grade students to see how they progress when they take the assessment two years later. In addition to these standardized measures, which speak to our accountability to the DC school system and relative national percentile ranks, we also collect other assessment data that aid teachers in understanding individual students' current abilities to inform teaching strategies. Each student in the school has a writing portfolio that is passed on to the new teacher at the end of the year, as well as other data from assessments including running records. Students are also often part of the design of assessment rubrics as part of the instruction.

3. Communicating student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community

The school welcomes parents and students as partners in the delivery of education. Each morning parents bring their children into the school and feel a part of the school. On average we have 15 parents a day actively volunteering in classrooms helping teachers and children. By having parents be such an important part of the school program they are well informed about what we do and how we do it and they share their talents in helping improve our school. The school believes parents should have easy access to assessment data to support learning. Newsletters are used to explain how to interpret SAT 9 assessment data and presentations are also given at PTA meetings. The school web site includes data not only on SAT 9 reading and math but also the writing and science assessments. The school plan includes a much more technical discussion of data and can be found on the school web site as well. While the district and state report cross sectional data, many parents are interested to know if the students who enter the school at the advanced level stay advanced and if the students who enter at lower levels make continual progress. We answer these questions. Parents receive standards-based report cards quarterly and we have three parent/teacher conferences over the course of the year which review student work with a 98% participation rate. Teachers regularly conference with students about their progress and teachers use a homework log to communicate with parents. Teachers also write to students in reading logs. Our 6th grade students also write a narrative each quarter about how they see their own progress. We are also very careful to show students and parents multiple measures of progress.

4. Sharing successes with other schools

Reflection and growth are an ongoing process and fostered by sharing what we do with others. By doing so, we help others and we gain by having to reflect on what we share and the observations others make. We believe that we need to invite others to visit the school, as well as visiting other schools ourselves to be more reflective about what we do. Each teacher is expected to visit another school each year and these visits often result in others coming to see our program. Many of the teachers participate in citywide district committees and teacher seminars as part of In2Books. We had one teacher participate in the Fulbright Memorial Fund program this year and she has organized seminars for teachers and parents beyond our school. We have also invited teachers from other schools to join the school-based professional development workshops we have each year.

The school website (www.janneyschool.org) provides a wealth of information about the school and classroom activities. We include samples of student work and most all teachers have an active website. School and class newsletters are available on the website. A student each week writes an article about an activity at the school for the Northwest Current, which is distributed to all homes in this part of the city. Our decision to apply for this award is in part motivated by a desire to share what we do more broadly.

We have worked with local organizations to host international delegations through the U.S. State Department, The World Bank and The Meridian International Center. These visits allow time for our students to learn about other education systems and for our guests to learn more about American education by visiting one high-performing school in the nation's capital. We have a group of student tour guides who welcome visitors and share the practices of the school through the perspective of a student voice. Staff also meet the visitors and gain an international perspective on education. We also hold a few open houses each year and publish the times in the local newspaper.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Engaging students with a curriculum with significant content based on high standards

Three years ago the staff engaged in a serious curriculum mapping exercise. Each teacher was asked to record what he or she actually taught subject by subject, month by month. This information was organized by grade level so that we could all look within and across grades subject by subject. We were able to see gaps in our curriculum and areas that repeated themselves. The exercise allowed brutal conversation about what we value as well as what we expect of students at each grade level and formed the basis for teachers making a commitment to build greater coherence.

A balanced literacy approach is the basis of our reading curriculum. This balance of instructional approaches includes modeled, shared, guided and independent reading. Skills instruction is explicit and direct-aided by the mapping exercise and DCPS standards. Teachers are supported to match children to books at the right level through the use of running records, and tailor instruction to meet each child's instructional level. All subjects are viewed as an opportunity to teach reading. Students learn to distinguish between narrative text and informational text with emphasis on comprehension strategies and content vocabulary. We also expect students to read thirty minutes a night. At each grade level, students write for different purposes and audiences using a variety of genres as suggested by DCPS standards.

Over the last two years much of the staff participated in math workshops after school to increase their own math content knowledge. Much of the materials used in these teacher workshops came from EveryDay Mathematics (EDM). With staff and parent input, the school sought a waiver from DCPS to implement EDM in pre-k through 6th grade. The strength of the EDM program is its scientific research base and innovative teaching strategies that support NCTM standards. The program presents students with multiple methods and strategies for problem solving. Students often work collaboratively. We have had a number of events to help parents understand the program and how they can support it.

In September 2002, the school began using the Full Option Science System developed at the Lawrence Hall of Science in Berkeley, California with the support of the National Science Foundation. The program provides hands-on inquiry-based experiences across four strands: life sciences, physical sciences, earth sciences and scientific reasoning and technology. We welcome parents and members of the community with expertise to work with the grade level team that matches the curriculum interest and knowledge of the volunteer.

Through the curriculum mapping exercise, we identified essential questions for each grade level in social studies as a way to ensure greater coherence between grades and build upon the DCPS standards. The curriculum emphasizes depth over breadth of coverage, with the goal of developing habits of mind such as inquiring into causes, marshaling resources, seeing from multiple perspectives, and applying learning to new situations. We also strive to integrate the arts into other subject areas to promote deeper levels of inquiry and learning. It is our collective challenge to make the best use of the people, places, and artifacts close to us to enhance the instructional program at the school. We work hard to integrate the visual and performing arts in the core curriculum and have been supported through professional development provided by the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Students in grades 1-3 have Spanish twice a week for forty minutes, which we hope to expand each year. Each classroom is wired to the Internet and technology is integrated into the instructional program following national technology standards.

2. Sustaining a rich reading curriculum

Formal instruction in the primary grades is based upon a balanced literacy model to ensure that children have support through shared and guided reading to become independent readers who employ a variety of strategies to solve word reading and comprehension problems. Many of the primary teachers have Phonographix training and explicit word study is a part of each primary class. The word study time incorporates phonemic awareness and the crucial blending and segmenting skills for beginning readers. All children are administered running records throughout the year, so we know each child's reading levels and topical interests. This insures that teachers have knowledge about each child's reading behaviors and interests (strengths and weaknesses) that are not evident from standardized scores and helps us ensure children are matched to appropriate texts for independent reading and instruction. While all teachers have available to them the Houghton Mifflin Reading series, we use additional literature and other materials connected to the social studies and science curriculum. The school library has over 10,000 books and each classroom also has a library with books organized in varying levels and by genre.

The intermediate grades use a reading workshop model based upon the work of Fountas and Pinnell which includes structured mini-lessons. Writing related to literary elements, genres or strategies is a regular requirement for students and one mode of assessment. All students in grades two through five participate in In2Books, a reading program which provides books in different genre and writing and reading assignments aligned with the content standards across all subjects. Reading buddies is a school-wide program that matches primary and intermediate classes for a reading time once a week to support fluency. Finally, children who need extra support at Janney receive it through several possible avenues: early intervention from a reading specialist; tutoring through Oasis, an intergenerational tutoring program; one on one reading with a parent volunteer; and extra small-group instruction from the classroom teacher once a week.

3. Exploring how one curriculum experience relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission

Each year we find a way to integrate the arts with core subjects and make use of the amazing resources the city has to offer. Last year this was done through a sustained relationship with the different museums that make up the Smithsonian by mapping a different museum to each grade. This year we partnered with the U.S. Park Service around the theme of monuments and memorials. Each class explored the concepts in a way that connect to the DCPS standards for their grade either in social studies, science or language arts. The pre kindergarten students, for example, studied the concept of family and differences by looking at the Roosevelt Memorial. Rangers visited each class at the school and then the entire school on one day went to visit the memorials and monuments. After the visit, classes have engaged in writing activities as well as art projects aligned with the DCPS art standards. As part of the school vision, we foster a spirit of experimentation and discovery among children and educators. The school community encourages its members to be entrepreneurial and accept that some programs will succeed and some will fail. After each class visited their spot, the entire school gathered for a picnic along the Potomac River and formed a one-quarter-size replica of the Washington Monument using all the students to form the shape. The day was also thus connected to measurement and perspective as well. Many classes continue to build on the theme in the work they are doing.

4. Using differentiated instructional methods to improve student learning

As a school we benefit from having many parent volunteers and student teachers to work along with our teachers. We also organize our special education services so there is the opportunity for team teaching between the classroom teacher and the special education teacher. Thus, the knowledge and skills of our special education teachers about different learning styles can benefit all students. Teachers are able to differentiate instruction by the formation of flexible groups in reading. In reading, we use leveled texts that are matched to the student's individual reading level. Classroom libraries are all leveled and students are encouraged to read at an appropriate level as informed by the use of running records. In writing, most all teachers in first through sixth grade use a Writer's Workshop format. The workshop format allows teachers, parent volunteers and student teachers to either individually or in small groups confer with students about their writing. Students are also involved in peer editing. We also look for multiple ways for students to be able to demonstrate what they know and can do based on their own learning profile.

The school's reading and math specialists work with teachers to plan how best to meet the needs of all students in each class. In some cases these specialists co-teach classes or work with individual students. Students who need to be more challenged are given additional work assignments to pursue both in class and at home. We have also created after school programs to help students who need more work in basic skills.

5. Supporting professional development and the link to improving student achievement

The Janney professional development plan promotes a collegial professional community as a means to achieve continuous improvement in instructional capacity. Teachers are encouraged to reflect about the practice of teaching and learning. For example, teachers read books together and discuss them during staff meetings. All teachers have been invited to observe other teachers at the same grade level and at least one teacher at a preceding and subsequent grade level. All teachers have been encouraged to observe a class at another school. Staff are encouraged to allow themselves to be filmed as part of a peer-coaching program for their own use to reflect upon teaching and learning. These observations are part of what we believe teachers need to do to be reflective about practice and continue their own growth and development. Each year we also organize voluntary school-based courses that take place after school and on Saturdays in areas of interest to the staff and in areas where data shows we need improvement. District professional development days build on these same workshops to ensure all building staff receives some of the information that the subset of staff who do the additional workshops benefit from. We also invite master teachers from other schools to come and do model lessons that can be observed by our staff. We use substitute teachers to allow teachers to leave their room and see these lessons and then meet to discuss what they saw.

We value the enormous amount of knowledge and experience we hold collectively, and our challenge is to use that asset as we reflect on what we do, how we do it, and where we can improve. This requires each teacher to be a school leader by taking some responsibility for the school in its entirety. By working collectively on issues related to teaching and learning, we foster greater collegiality and a rich professional community. As a professional community we talk about practice, share craft knowledge, observe each other, and constantly ask how we can improve what we do.

Janney Summary Report, Reading By Grade 1999-2003

Stanford Achievement Test Series (Harcourt, Inc.) 9th Edition Select/1996

Scores provided include scale scores, performance level, mean NCE and percentile ranks

Grade Tested	# of Students	# of Students Tested	% of Students Tested	% Not Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand. (%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
Spring 2003													
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	48	48	100%	0.00%	661.60	89.58	10.42	43.75	77.08	89.58	100	69.45	82
4	57	57	100%	0.00%	682.30	100.00	0.00	47.37	75.44	100.00	100	71.27	84
5	60	60	100%	0.00%	692.25	96.67	3.33	28.33	73.33	96.66	100	70.28	83
6	68	68	100%	0.00%	716.12	100.00	0.00	42.65	88.24	100.00	100	79.62	92
Totals:	233	233	100%	0.00%	690.47	97.00	3.00	40.34	78.97	96.99	100	73.08	86
Spring 2002													
1	51	50	98%	1.96%	591.22	100.00	0.00	38.00	84.00	100.00	100	72.28	85
2	45	44	98%	2.22%	630.41	93.18	6.82	45.45	75.00	93.18	100	71.31	84
3	61	60	98%	1.64%	670.37	96.67	3.33	53.33	81.66	96.66	100	73.47	87
4	61	59	97%	3.28%	681.64	98.31	1.69	52.54	72.88	98.30	100	70.30	83
5	72	69	96%	4.17%	708.62	97.10	2.90	50.72	85.50	97.09	100	78.38	91
6	60	59	98%	1.67%	711.05	100.00	0.00	37.29	81.36	100.00	100	75.56	89
Totals:	350	341	97%	2.57%	670.34	97.65	2.35	46.63	80.35	97.65	100	73.82	87
Spring 2001													
1	50	47	94%	6.00%	585.30	100.00	0.00	51.06	82.97	99.99	100	71.23	84
2	62	60	97%	3.23%	626.55	93.33	6.67	31.67	71.67	93.34	100	69.00	82
3	58	54	93%	6.90%	664.54	96.30	3.70	50.00	85.19	96.30	100	71.62	85
4	72	70	97%	2.78%	699.61	98.57	1.43	68.57	87.14	98.57	100	79.10	92
5	62	62	100%	0.00%	697.56	100.00	0.00	38.71	70.97	100.00	100	72.45	86
6	51	51	100%	0.00%	710.80	100.00	0.00	33.33	88.23	99.99	100	76.86	90
Totals:	355	344	97%	3.10%	667.03	97.96	2.04	46.22	80.81	97.96	100	73.56	87
Spring 2000													
1	-	60	-	-	574.28	96.67	3.33	31.67	76.67	96.67	100	66.90	79
2	-	52	-	-	639.56	100.00	0.00	46.15	82.69	100.00	100	75.02	88
3	-	63	-	-	677.75	98.41	1.59	61.90	88.88	98.40	100	77.14	90
4	-	55	-	-	688.60	100.00	0.00	52.73	81.82	100.00	100	73.55	87
5	-	48	-	-	717.81	100.00	0.00	54.17	95.84	100.00	100	81.18	93
6	-	42	-	-	718.74	100.00	0.00	45.24	88.10	100.00	100	81.08	93
Totals:		320			665.40	99.06	0.94	48.75	85.31	99.06	100	75.38	89

	Grade Tested	# of Students	# of Students Tested	% of Students Tested	% Not Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand.(%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
Spring 1999														
1	-	56	-	-	-	595.11	96.43	3.57	51.79	92.86	96.43	100	74.92	88
2	-	64	-	-	-	634.00	98.44	1.56	34.38	82.82	98.45	100	72.47	86
3	-	52	-	-	-	664.25	98.08	1.92	48.08	86.54	98.08	100	71.28	84
4	-	50	-	-	-	697.38	100.00	0.00	62.00	92.00	100.00	100	77.92	91
5	-	46	-	-	-	711.87	100.00	0.00	52.17	89.13	100.00	100	79.71	92
6	-	54	-	-	-	718.93	100.00	0.00	38.89	88.89	100.00	100	79.71	92
Totals:		322				667.33	98.76	1.24	47.21	88.51	98.76	100	75.80	89

All students have taken the test each year with the only exception being a few ED students whose IEP's prohibit their participation in standardized assessment. Academic Performance for these students is monitored through the use of portfolio assessment. A few families object to standardized testing and refuse to allow their children to be tested.

Janney Summary Report, Math By Grade 1999-2003

Stanford Achievement Test Series (Harcourt, Inc.) 9th Edition Select/1996

Scores provided include scale scores, performance level, mean NCE and percentile ranks

Grade Tested	# of Students	# of Students Tested	% of Students Tested	% Not Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand. (%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
SPRING 2003													
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	48	48	100%	0.00%	648.1	97.92	2.08	45.8	70.83	97.91	100	74.8	88
4	57	56	98%	1.75%	666.6	96.43	3.57	33.9	75.00	96.43	100	71.3	84
5	60	60	100%	0.00%	687.4	93.33	6.67	23.3	76.66	93.33	100	72	85
6	68	68	100%	0.00%	731.5	98.53	1.47	52.9	89.70	98.52	100	85	95
Totals:	233	232	100%	0.43%	687.2	96.55	3.45	39.2	78.87	96.54	100	76.2	89
SPRING 2002													
1	51	50	98%	1.96%	589	100	0	52	94.00	100.00	100	79.2	92
2	45	44	98%	2.22%	626.3	95.45	4.55	47.7	86.37	95.46	100	77.1	90
3	61	61	100%	0.00%	649.3	96.72	3.28	37.7	78.68	96.71	100	75.4	89
4	61	59	97%	3.28%	662	94.92	5.08	33.9	71.19	94.92	100	68.6	81
5	72	69	96%	4.17%	703.4	94.2	5.8	44.9	85.51	94.21	100	79.6	92
6	60	59	98%	1.67%	722.5	96.61	3.39	42.4	79.66	96.61	100	80.2	92
Totals:	350	342	98%	2.29%	663.3	96.2	3.8	42.7	82.16	96.20	100	76.7	90
SPRING 2001													
1	50	48	96%	4.00%	573.9	100	0	39.6	85.41	99.99	100	73.6	87
2	62	60	97%	3.23%	613.5	88.33	11.7	38.3	71.66	88.33	100	70.9	84
3	58	54	93%	6.90%	646.4	96.3	3.7	31.5	79.63	96.30	100	73.4	87
4	72	70	97%	2.78%	674.7	98.57	1.43	48.6	85.71	98.57	100	75.8	89
5	62	60	97%	3.23%	700.4	93.33	6.67	40	75.00	93.33	100	76.9	90
6	51	51	100%	0.00%	724.4	100	0	43.1	86.28	100.00	100	82.7	94
Totals:	355	343	97%	3.38%	657.3	95.92	4.08	40.5	80.46	95.91	100	75.5	89
SPRING 2000													
1	-	60	-	-	569	100	0	35	78.33	100.00	100	70.7	84
2	-	53	-	-	617.4	94.34	5.66	26.4	83.02	94.34	100	73	86
3	-	63	-	-	651	98.41	1.59	33.3	88.89	98.41	100	76.7	90
4	-	55	-	-	670.5	96.36	3.64	40	76.36	96.36	100	72.8	86
5	-	47	-	-	714.6	100	0	61.7	91.49	100.00	100	85.4	95
6	-	42	-	-	731.7	100	0	59.5	85.71	100.00	100	85.6	95
Totals:		320			653.3	98.12	1.88	41.3	83.75	98.13	100	76.7	90

	Grade Tested	# of Students	# of Students Tested	% of Students Tested	% Not Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand.(%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
SPRING 1999														
1	-	55	-	-	-	576.1	100	0	38.2	85.45	100.00	100	73.6	87
2	-	62	-	-	-	613.8	96.77	3.23	22.6	77.42	96.77	100	70.9	84
3	-	52	-	-	-	637.8	96.15	3.85	28.9	63.47	96.16	100	69.1	82
4	-	51	-	-	-	676.3	100	0	45.1	82.35	100.00	100	76	89
5	-	46	-	-	-	708.9	97.83	2.17	54.4	82.61	97.83	100	82.2	94
6	-	54	-	-	-	726.2	100	0	50	83.33	100.00	100	82.3	94
														89
Totals:		320				653.8	98.44	1.56	39.1	79.06	98.44	100	75.4	

All students have taken the test each year with the only exception being a few ED students whose IEP's prohibit their participation in standardized assessment. Academic Performance for these students is monitored through the use of portfolio assessment. A few families object to standardized testing and refuse to allow their children to be tested.

State (DCPS) Summary Report, Reading By Grade 1999-2003

Stanford Achievement Test Series (Harcourt, Inc.) 9th Edition Select/1996

Scores provided include scale scores, performance level, mean NCE and percentile ranks

Grade Tested	# of Students Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand. (%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
SPRING 2003										
1	2,645	544.5	91.49	8.51	13.57	50.81	91.49	100	54.55	59
2	2,621	576.1	72.8	27.2	3.59	24.99	72.8	100	46.31	43
3	5,144	605.4	67.24	32.76	7.8	30.89	67.24	100	44.86	40
4	5,323	628.5	69.42	30.58	8.4	29.35	69.42	100	45.07	41
5	5,059	642.2	70.31	29.69	4.49	22.18	70.31	100	43.8	38
6	4,909	656.1	76.74	23.26	3.93	24.16	76.74	100	46.32	43
Totals:	25,701	608.8	74.67	25.33	6.963	30.4	74.67	100	46.82	44
SPRING 2002										
1	5,085	543.3	90.89	9.11	14.53	48.96	90.89	100	54.08	58
2	5,255	580.2	74.33	25.67	5.2	29.23	74.33	100	48.16	47
3	5,483	603.8	65.27	34.73	8.04	29.09	65.27	100	44.12	39
4	5,200	628.8	70.08	29.92	8.42	29.65	70.07	100	45.25	41
5	5,206	644	72.34	27.66	5.21	22.57	72.34	100	44.78	40
6	4,758	657.3	78.92	21.08	3.43	24.97	78.92	100	46.97	44
Totals:	30,987	609.5	75.31	24.7	7.472	30.75	75.3	100	47.23	45
SPRING 2001										
1	5,544	539.3	88.38	11.62	12.68	45.33	88.39	100	52.24	54
2	5,591	577.1	72.04	27.96	4.65	26.11	72.04	100	46.78	44
3	5,490	602.9	65.87	34.13	6.17	27.7	65.86	100	43.77	38
4	5,427	628.2	71.14	28.86	7.39	27.47	71.14	100	45.04	41
5	4,976	643.2	73.73	26.27	4.04	21.62	73.73	100	44.46	40
6	4,545	657.3	78.11	21.89	3.43	25.43	78.1	100	46.96	44
Totals:	31,573	608	74.88	25.12	6.393	28.94	74.88	100	46.54	44
SPRING 2000										
1	5,698	536.9	86.59	13.41	12.02	43.08	86.59	100	50.97	52
2	5,264	579.1	74.62	25.38	4.88	27.87	74.62	100	47.69	46
3	5,126	609.1	72.06	27.94	8.29	33.01	72.07	100	46.64	44
4	4,507	632.1	74.08	25.92	9.01	31.26	74.08	100	46.94	44
5	4,127	647.8	77.66	22.34	5.14	25.93	77.66	100	46.76	44
6	3,342	663.5	84.56	15.44	4.28	31.15	84.56	100	50.48	51
Totals:	28,064	611.4	78.26	21.74	7.27	32.05	78.26	100	48.25	47

Grade Tested	# of Students Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand.(%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
SPRING 1999										
1	5,603	535.7	86.2	13.8	11.4	42.22	86.2	100	50.5	51
2	5,377	577.7	73.63	26.37	4.5	26.02	73.63	100	47.01	44
3	4,826	605.3	68.32	31.68	7.23	30.42	68.32	100	44.91	40
4	4,431	628.7	71.47	28.53	7.9	28.3	71.47	100	45.22	41
5	3,613	646.2	77.06	22.94	4.68	24.33	77.06	100	46.03	42
6	3,306	659.9	81.55	18.45	3.84	25.86	81.55	100	48.45	47
Totals:	27,156	608.9	76.37	23.63	6.592	29.53	76.37	100	47.02	44

State (DCPS) Summary Report, Math By Grade 1999-2003

Stanford Achievement Test Series (Harcourt, Inc.) 9th Edition Select/1996

Scores provided include scale scores, performance level, mean NCE and percentile ranks

Grade Tested	# of Students Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand. (%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
SPRING 2003										
1	2,685	541.4	89.94	10.06	15.61	51.55	89.95	100	55	59
2	2,672	572.8	75.19	24.81	7.26	37.01	75.18	100	49.92	50
3	5,169	603.5	74.83	25.17	9.89	35.12	74.84	100	51.86	54
4	5,378	621.8	67.42	32.58	7.62	32.03	67.41	100	47.98	46
5	5,087	643.9	58.74	41.26	6.23	24.96	58.73	100	48.23	47
6	4,910	659.3	56.66	43.34	6.23	23.26	56.66	100	50.64	51
Totals:	25,901	607.1	54.41	45.59	5.79	23.5	54.41	100	47.94	46
SPRING 2002										
1	5,184	540.1	89.97	10.03	14.76	50.35	89.97	100	54.47	58
2	5,453	574.3	75.39	24.61	9.74	38.15	75.4	100	50.63	51
3	5,572	600.1	73.64	26.36	7.91	30.81	73.63	100	50.17	50
4	5,290	622.1	68.41	31.59	8.49	31.14	68.42	100	48.2	47
5	5,272	642.9	56.37	43.63	6.16	23.12	56.37	100	47.6	45
6	4,778	659	57.24	42.76	5.34	22.38	57.25	100	50.55	51
Totals:	31,549	606.4	70.17	29.83	8.733	32.66	70.17	100	50.27	50
SPRING 2001										
1	5,665	537.2	87.93	12.07	14.16	47.65	87.93	100	52.81	55
2	5,755	571.3	73.85	26.15	7.96	34.68	73.85	100	49.11	48
3	5,543	600.1	75.3	24.7	6.68	30.76	75.3	100	50.27	50
4	5,517	620.2	67.74	32.26	6.54	28.83	67.73	100	47.24	45
5	5,001	643.8	58.53	41.47	5.82	22.94	58.53	100	48.19	47
6	4,565	660.7	59.93	40.07	5.76	23.33	59.93	100	51.43	53
Totals:	32,046	605.5	70.55	29.45	7.82	31.37	70.55	100	49.84	50
SPRING 2000										
1	5,865	537	88.68	11.32	12.8	46.93	88.67	100	52.56	55
2	5,433	573.4	75.23	24.77	8.8	36.28	75.23	100	50.17	50
3	5,181	603.6	78.92	21.08	7.26	33.47	78.92	100	52.05	54
4	4,565	625.7	72.51	27.49	8.48	32.16	72.51	100	50.07	50
5	4,157	646.6	62.14	37.86	5.44	24.11	62.14	100	49.67	49
6	3,363	668.4	69.05	30.95	6.99	29.38	69.05	100	55.62	60
Totals:	28,564	609.1	74.42	25.58	8.295	33.72	74.42	100	51.69	53

Grade Tested	# of Students Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand.(%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
SPRING 1999										
1	5,838	526.9	82.89	17.11	8.75	38.64	82.88	100	47.14	44
2	5,577	565.4	69.11	30.89	5.61	29.85	69.1	100	45.92	42
3	4,919	594.8	71.54	28.46	5.12	25.41	71.54	100	47.53	45
4	4,574	617.4	64.17	35.83	5.92	25.84	64.17	100	45.75	42
5	3,660	641.9	56.75	43.25	4.84	20.8	56.76	100	47.21	45
6	3,332	660	59.45	40.55	5.22	20.26	59.46	100	51.18	52
Totals:	27,900	601.1	56.84	43.16	4.59	21.6	56.84	100	46.62	44

Janney Summary Report, Reading By Ethnicity 1999-2003

Stanford Achievement Test Series (Harcourt, Inc.) 9th Edition Select/1996

Scores provided include scale scores, performance level, mean NCE

Ethnicity	# of Students Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand. (%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
Spring 2003										
Asian	14	658.21	92.86	7.14	7.14	57.14	92.86	100	57.14	63
African American	48	666.37	93.75	6.25	10.42	56.25	93.75	100	61.25	70
Hispanic	14	671.93	100.00	0.00	28.57	57.14	100.00	100	62.48	72
White	157	702.36	98.09	1.91	53.50	89.81	98.09	100	79.06	92
Spring 2002										
Asian	17	644.24	100.00	0.00	29.41	76.47	100.00	100	68.01	80
African American	55	643.29	90.91	9.09	18.18	56.36	90.91	100	59.98	68
Hispanic	19	635.74	89.47	10.53	42.11	73.69	89.48	100	67.95	80
White	249	681.10	99.60	0.40	54.62	86.75	99.60	100	77.83	91
Spring 2001										
Asian	11	634.00	90.91	9.09	27.27	63.63	90.90	100	64.07	75
African American	56	641.23	94.64	5.36	17.86	53.57	94.64	100	60.39	69
Hispanic	20	645.25	95.00	5.00	35.00	50.00	95.00	100	60.82	70
White	257	675.77	99.22	0.78	54.09	89.89	99.23	100	77.82	91
Spring 2000										
Asian	9	624.00	100.00	0.00	44.44	77.77	99.99	100	69.54	82
African American	37	643.60	97.30	2.70	27.03	67.57	97.30	100	65.01	76
Hispanic	23	652.78	100.00	0.00	34.78	73.91	100.00	100	69.77	83
White	251	671.25	99.20	0.80	53.39	89.25	99.21	100	77.63	91
Spring 1999										
Asian	8	705.63	100.00	0.00	37.50	87.50	100.00	100	78.05	91
African American	47	639.28	93.62	6.38	29.79	72.34	93.62	100	65.52	77
Hispanic	22	661.82	100.00	0.00	50.00	77.27	100.00	100	71.75	85
White	245	671.96	99.59	0.41	50.61	92.65	6.94	100	78.06	91

Janney Summary Report, Math By Ethnicity 1999-2003

Stanford Achievement Test Series (Harcourt, Inc.) 9th Edition Select/1996

Scores provided include scale scores, performance level, mean NCE and percentile ranks

Ethnicity	# of Students Tested	Scaled Score Ave.	Meet/Exc. Stand.(%)	Below Stand (%)	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	NCE Average	Percentile Rank
Spring 2003										
Asian	14	658.64	85.71	14.29	7.14	57.14	85.71	100	64.18	75
African American	48	661.58	89.58	10.42	14.58	56.25	89.58	100	63.58	74
Hispanic	14	674.36	100.00	0.00	21.43	64.29	100.01	100	68.61	81
White	156	698.79	99.36	0.64	51.28	89.10	99.36	100	81.85	93
Spring 2002										
Asian	17	643.47	100.00	0.00	17.65	76.47	100.00	100	71.49	85
African American	55	636.27	83.64	16.36	14.55	60.00	83.64	100	62.15	72
Hispanic	20	624.65	95.00	5.00	25.00	70.00	95.00	100	67.91	80
White	249	674.20	99.20	0.80	52.21	88.75	99.19	100	81.13	93
Spring 2001										
Asian	11	631.82	90.91	9.09	27.27	45.45	90.91	100	66.65	79
African American	55	630.78	81.82	18.18	12.73	50.91	81.82	100	60.41	69
Hispanic	20	645.65	95.00	5.00	25.00	60.00	95.00	100	66.21	78
White	257	664.98	99.22	0.78	48.25	89.88	99.22	100	79.81	92
Spring 2000										
Asian	9	623.67	100.00	0.00	44.44	66.66	99.99	100	76.07	89
African American	37	630.65	91.89	8.11	13.51	64.86	91.89	100	64.76	76
Hispanic	23	636.48	100.00	0.00	21.74	65.22	100.00	100	68.27	81
White	251	659.27	98.81	1.19	47.01	88.84	98.80	100	79.29	92
Spring 1999										
Asian	8	700.13	100.00	0.00	50.00	75.00	100.00	100	77.08	90
African American	47	623.00	95.74	4.26	12.77	57.45	95.75	100	62.89	73
Hispanic	21	641.76	90.47	9.53	33.33	57.14	90.47	100	69.16	82
White	244	659.29	99.59	0.41	44.26	85.25	99.60	100	78.31	91

Mean Growth in Scale Scores and NCE for Reading for One Cohort Tracked Over Time at Janney by Race

	Spring 1999 Grade 2 vs Spring 2003 Grade 6	Spring 2000 Grade 3 vs Spring 2003 Grade 6	Spring 2001 Grade 4 vs Spring 2003 Grade 6	Spring 2002 Grade 5 vs Spring 2003 Grade 6
White Mean Growth in Scale Score	85.52 (n=44)	38.65 (n= 43)	15.75 (n=48)	7.08 (n=48)
African American Mean Growth in Scale Score	90.43 (n=7)	49 (n=8)	29.56 (n=9)	20.1 (n=10)
White Mean Growth in NCE	10.1 (n=44)	4.37 (n=43)	0.78 (n=48)	0.98 (n=48)
African American Mean Growth in NCE	7.73 (n=7)	3.78 (n=8)	4.03 (n=9)	6.57 (n=10)

Mean Growth in Scale Scores and NCE for Math for One Cohort Tracked Over Time at Janney by Race

	Spring 1999 Grade 2 vs Spring 2003 Grade 6	Spring 2000 Grade 3 vs Spring 2003 Grade 6	Spring 2001 Grade 4 vs Spring 2003 Grade 6	Spring 2002 Grade 5 vs Spring 2003 Grade 6
White Mean Growth in Scale Score	121.73 (n=44)	87.51 (n=43)	60.31 (n=48)	29.27 (n=48)
African American Mean Growth in Scale Score	128.14 (n=7)	82.25 (n=8)	58 (n=9)	31.7 (n=10)
White Mean Growth in NCE	14.17 (n=44)	10.34 (n=43)	9.65 (n=48)	4.79 (n=48)
African American Mean Growth in NCE	22.07 (n=7)	12.86 (n=8)	13.17 (n=9)	9.99 (n=10)

Note: Students who enter the school advanced have little area to grow on the assessment and thus deflate overall means. We do this type of tracking for all students and compare growth to national growth in scale scores.