

Revised 4/8/05

2004-2005 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Cover Sheet

Type of School: Elementary Middle High K-12

Name of Principal Mrs. Rhonda Sennaite Stowell Lewis

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

Official School Name Glenwood Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 50 Morison Terrace

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

Springfield

City

Massachusetts

State

01104-1004

Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County Hampden

School Code Number* 0065

Telephone (413) 787-7527

Fax (413) 787-7468

District Website: http://www.sps.springfield.ma.us/

E-mail stowellr@sps.springfield.ma.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.

Date: February 4, 2005

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Joseph P. Burke

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

District Name Springfield Public Schools

Tel. (413) 787-7100

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.

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board

President/Chairperson Mr. Charles Ryan

(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.

Date _____

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

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

The signatures on the first page of this application 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 2004-2005 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 1999 and has not received the 2003 or 2004 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award*.
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

All data are the most recent year available.

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

1. Number of schools in the district:

31	Elementary schools
6	Middle schools
0	Junior high schools
4	High schools
1	Other/K-8
3	Alternative High Schools
45	TOTAL

2. 2003 District Per Pupil Expenditure: 7,961
 2003 Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 8,264
 2004 Data Not Available

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

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total		Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0		7			
K	25	26	51		8			
1	38	25	63		9			
2	36	25	61		10			
3	37	23	60		11			
4	32	35	67		12			
5	24	34	58		Other			
6								
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →								360

[Throughout the document, round numbers to avoid decimals.]

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school: 31% White
18% Black or African American
50% Hispanic or Latino
1% Asian/Pacific Islander
0% American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 20%

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	37
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	36
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	73
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	360
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.20
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	20%

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 18%
66 Total Number Limited English Proficient
 Number of languages represented: 4
 Specify languages: Spanish, Russian, Arabic, and Vietnamese

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 72%

Total number students who qualify: 267

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 federally-supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: $\frac{10\%}{37}$ Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

0 Autism	0 Orthopedic Impairment
0 Deafness	5 Other Health Impaired
0 Deaf-Blindness	17 Specific Learning Disability
4 Emotional Disturbance	12 Speech or Language Impairment
2 Hearing Impairment	0 Traumatic Brain Injury
5 Mental Retardation	1 Visual Impairment Including Blindness
5 Multiple Disabilities	

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)	1	0
Classroom teachers	17	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	8.5	2
Paraprofessionals	7	2
Support staff	5	1
Total number	38.5	5

12. Average school student-“classroom teacher” ratio: 21

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	95%	95%	94%
Daily teacher attendance	95%	94%	96%	95%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	7%	0%	7%	10%	13%
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	%	%	%	%	%
Student drop-off rate (high school)	%	%	%	%	%

PART III - SUMMARY

Provide a brief, coherent narrative snapshot of the school in one page (approximately 600 words). Include at least a summary of the school's mission or vision in the statement.

Glenwood School, a Title I School with a 74% poverty rate, has distinguished itself by dramatically improving the achievement level of all students. Glenwood School, a K-5 elementary school located in an urban school district, serves a rather diverse population of approximately 350 students (49% Hispanic, 31% White, and 18% African American). Students in the English Language Learners Program account for 18% of our population, and another 10% receive services in our Special Education Program. Glenwood School's mission is to provide full access to an excellent curriculum and instruction that will result in a high level of achievement for all in a safe environment. As a result of the staff's dedication to this mission, Glenwood has been successful in improving the performance of students in all our programs and has recently received two Title I Distinguished School Awards (1999, 2003) and was named a Commonwealth of Massachusetts Compass School in 2003.

Glenwood School has focused all its efforts on improving instruction and as a result, improving performance for all of our students. All learners receive literacy instruction through a balanced literacy program. Children who have been identified as at-risk receive Language Arts instruction in inclusion model classrooms where they have many opportunities to interact with high achieving students. Because Glenwood School believes in the importance of giving children a strong foundation in literacy, it was the first school in the district to implement the Reading Recovery Program for at-risk first grade students. Improvements in the Mathematics Program include an increased focus on manipulatives and problem solving using higher order thinking skills. The Mathematics program is also organized in a way that students have opportunities to work at their instructional and developmental levels. Intervention and enrichment programs are offered to those students who would benefit from additional instruction in both Language Arts and Mathematics. The implementation of the Sheltered English Model for our English Language Learners provides the same quality instruction in a small group setting. Special Education services range from an inclusion model to a 502.4 level pull-out Special Education Program. Many of our students move along the continuum to less restrictive placements and full mainstreaming due to the gains they have made. Extensive work has been done to align the curriculum in our Special Education and English Language Learners Program with our Regular Education Program.

The success that Glenwood School has experienced is not just a result of what occurs within these four walls during the course of the school day. Service Teams meet before school to problem- solve in order to meet both our students' academic and emotional needs. Glenwood School receives a tremendous amount of support from parents and the community. Events such as Parent Information Night and an afternoon and evening devoted to report card distribution have helped foster a positive relationship between teachers and parents. Glenwood School is proud of its active Parent Teacher Organization that works closely with the faculty to provide additional education opportunities to all students. Our business partner, United Bank, provides us with volunteers and resources whenever needed to support our efforts. The Extended Day Program implemented by the district provides us with many opportunities to meet collaboratively in grade level teams, analyze assessment data, and engage in professional development that is

carefully planned to meet the needs of our students. Even though Glenwood School is proud of its accomplishments, we continue to investigate and explore new ways to help provide all children with the opportunity to be successful learners.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1.

Our school has done exceptionally well in the areas of Reading, English Language Arts and Mathematics according to our state assessment, the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System. The state of Massachusetts has developed a rating system which uses Performance Levels called a “Proficiency Index”. This Proficiency Index reflects how the school and their students are moving toward proficiency. In addition to the Proficiency Index, scaled scores are reported to the school district, the individual school and lastly the students. These scaled scores range within four performance levels from 200 to 280 and are labeled Warning, Needs Improvement, Proficient or Advanced. For further explanation of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System, please visit <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/mcaspld.html>. To look at our Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System Data information please refer to **Directory Profiles-Massachusetts Department of Education Glenwood-Test Results** or the direct link, <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/home.asp?mode=so&so=1562-6&ot=5&o-1549&viw=tst>.

In the area of Reading which is administered in Grade 3, students have demonstrated growth and development in the last three years as well as in the various subgroups reported. Our students who are determined to be Limited English Proficient scored 81% Proficient where the state scored 29%. Our racial breakdowns were also very strong. Our African American/Black students scored 82% Proficiency where the state average was only 41%. Our Hispanic/Latino population also reached a 74% Proficiency rating where the state recorded only 33%. With the continuation of quality instruction in addition to supplemental materials, we expect to bring our Hispanic/Latino population to a higher level of Proficiency.

Glenwood’s Grade 4 students have demonstrated some exceptional scores in both English Language Arts and Mathematics. Our school had a significant number of students who demonstrated strength in both the Proficient and Advanced ranges on both of these assessments as indicated on our attached chart.

In the area of Mathematics, our fourth grade students performed strongly. In this area, 32% of Glenwood students scored in the Advanced range as compared to 14% of the state. Glenwood had 42% of our students reaching Proficiency while the state average was 28%. Once again, the numbers in Needs Improvement and Warning were also lower than the state average. Only 20% scored in Needs Improvement and 6% scored in Warning range. The state average was higher at 44% for Needs Improvement and 14% for Warning.

Looking at the subgroups from the 2004 English Language Arts data, 38% of Glenwood’s African American/Black students scored in the Advanced range and 54% scored Proficient range while the state had only 3% reaching Advanced and 29% scoring Proficient. In addition to this, our Hispanic/Latino subgroup had 20% in the Advanced range and 60% were Proficient. The state comparably had 2% who were Advanced and 24% Proficient. In the area of Mathematics, our African-American students were at 31% Advanced and 54% Proficient. The state had only

3% score in the Advanced range and only 15% reaching Proficiency. Our Hispanic/Latino population had 20% in Advanced and 52% at Proficiency. Once again, the state average was lower with 3% scoring in the Advanced range and 14% reaching Proficiency. When our data is analyzed, it is clear that there are minimal discrepancies among our subgroups. We will continue to work toward Proficiency as well as Advanced scores from all of our students at Glenwood Elementary School. With all of the recent research and discussion about the Achievement Gap, there is no evidence of this at Glenwood Elementary School considering the strong performance of all the subgroups.

1. Show in one-half page (approximately 300 words) how the school uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance.

Glenwood School uses assessment data to understand and improve student and school performance in a variety of ways. Once the school receives the results from the state assessments (MCAS), the principal carefully reviews the data and prepares a report for the staff. After the staff has an understanding of the school's major strengths and weaknesses, teachers meet in grade level groups to do an item analysis of their grade level assessment. Grade level teams that are not directly involved in the state assessments (grades K-2) work together familiarizing themselves with the tests and discussing how their instruction can impact student performance on these assessments. At the end of these sessions each grade level (K-5) must formulate an MCAS Action Plan which indicates the steps they will take to improve student performance. The School Improvement Plan Committee carefully reviews the MCAS data before they begin writing the plan. Student performance goals and instructional change objectives are then formulated in order to raise student achievement. All professional development is planned around the objectives and goals that are part of the School Improvement Plan.

Grade level teams have been trained in looking at student work and meet frequently to score writing assessments and to plan or adjust instruction based on the results of these assessments. First and second grade level teams use data from the Developmental Reading Assessment to inform instruction and make decisions about how they organize for reading instruction. District assessments are frequently used to assess students' progress and help determine placements in our intervention and enrichment programs.

2. Describe in one-half page how the school communicates student performance, including assessment data, to parents, students, and the community.

An important component of Glenwood's success has been its ability to communicate its student performance along with the various assessments and high expectations that accompany it. The stage is set for these expectations during our Parent Information Night where teachers introduce parents to their child's curriculum on their specific grade level. Parents are educated on the state standards for each particular subject area their children will be instructed in.

Also, in early September we receive our MCAS data from the state. It is immediately compared to our goals written in our School Improvement Plan. It is then shared and distributed to the teachers for grade level item analysis along with creating both long and short term goals. Individual student data is distributed to parents and children. A formal presentation on the data is made at the first Parent Teacher Organization meeting. In addition to MCAS data, the School Improvement Plan is shared and explained. Another forum where our student achievement is

communicated is our Site Based Decision Making Team. This team made up of parents, teachers and community partners will also receive a report on student achievement.

A unique way to communicate student progress is our Report Card Distribution Night which requires parents to pick up the first report card. It also provides an opportunity to discuss any questions about their child's academic progress. Another avenue of communication between parents and teachers is the on-going use of conferences to monitor student performance. Through all of these initiatives, Glenwood Elementary School provides various avenues of communication of our exemplary student performance and success.

3. Describe in one-half page how the school has shared and will continue to share its successes with other schools.

Glenwood has had a history of successfully piloting new and innovative programs which have in turn been shared freely and adopted by the district. Glenwood was the first school to pilot the Reading Recovery Program. After Reading Recovery was successfully implemented, it was introduced to the other schools in the district. Several educators came to Glenwood to observe our intensive reading program and as a result, it became a district based program for all elementary schools. Another example of this sharing was our English Language Learner Program. Our ELL program was the first to incorporate all of the same materials used in the English speaking classrooms. With the same materials, ELL students could be taught all of the same skills and concepts. Another component of our ELL program is the organization of the instructional blocks. Our ELL teachers instruct the same subject matter at the same time as the non-ELL teachers. By organizing grade level instruction, teachers benefit from common planning time where they can share instructional practices and look at student work. It also sets high expectations for all learners, especially our ELL students. The end result of our planning and organizing around ELL students has been the district creating an English Language Learner Plan which explains the importance of these and other various strategies to help this specific group of learners. Our Balanced Literacy Block which will be explained in further detail in the narrative of our Reading curriculum has been created around the most recent data on successful Reading programs. We have shared our vision and implementation of the Balanced Literacy Block and its specific components to other schools and finally to the district.

Glenwood has been a trend setter for a number of years. Last year as recipients of the Commonwealth Compass Schools Award Program, we had the privilege of hosting two days of 'Walk-Throughs' for educators from various parts of the state. This year alone, we have had three different schools from within our district come to observe programs and instructional techniques. The district has recently asked permission to come to our school to see how we differentiate our instruction in the area of ELA. We will be hosting an observation for four underperforming schools and three district administrators who will be helping these principals find answers to some instructional questions for diverse learners.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1.

In the Springfield Public Schools the elementary school curriculum has been designed around the Massachusetts State Standards with the intent that curriculum taught in elementary school will lay the foundation for higher level skills and concepts in middle and high school.

Language Arts instruction is primarily delivered through a two hour balanced literacy block during which students are engaged in modeled, shared, guided, and independent reading and writing activities. A word study component is a crucial part of the literacy block particularly in grades K-2. The 2003 edition of Harcourt Trophies is the core resource for the reading program and the First Steps Writing Program (Heinemann Publishers) is the primary resource for writing instruction. Reading by the Rules and the literacy closet are just two of the additional resources available to help teachers deliver literacy instruction.

In the area of Mathematics, the state has emphasized the importance of higher order thinking skills and problem solving. With high stakes testing focusing on grade level specific standards, mathematics is now concept based. All five content strands, Geometry, Number Sense, Patterns Relations and Algebra, Measurement and Data, Analysis and Probability are introduced in Kindergarten. The understanding of these concepts is built throughout the K-5 school curriculum as the students actively engage in tasks and experiences designed to deepen and connect their knowledge. With new NCLB legislature in place, grades 3, 4 and 5 will all have to closely focus on the rigorous content and prepare students for the upcoming state assessments. Through the implementation of standards based planning and assessment, our school has continued to be ahead of the learning curve and a leader in student achievement. Examples of this have been the addition of the Collaborative Professional Development Teacher in the area of Mathematics along with grade level specific Professional Development for all educators.

The area of Science has been linked to our district Mathematics plan. The connections between Mathematics and Science become surprisingly clearer once students move into the more concentrated areas of both subject matters. The Science curriculum is based upon the National Science Education Standards which have been incorporated into our Massachusetts State Standards and are the core of our curriculum. Our District has developed a scope and sequence for each grade level for learners from Kindergarten to 12th grade. The K-5 program is an inquiry, kit-based Science sequence that emphasizes the use of investigation to develop student understanding of the physical, earth and life sciences. There is also a focus on Technology and Engineering within these scientific concepts. The primary goal of our Science program is for students to be able to ask, find, or determine the answers to questions derived from curiosity about everyday experiences and explain and predict natural phenomena.

The Social Studies curriculum is designed to communicate an understanding of the great discoveries, conflicts, and ideas of the human past that have shaped who we are and what is happening today. Specific topics that are covered in the K-5 curriculum include national holidays, American citizenship, the history of Massachusetts, geography and the formative years of United States history.

The curriculum described above is the same curriculum used for our English Language Learner and Special Education students. At Glenwood the state curriculum is instructed in a manner that is appropriate to these specific needs. Additional materials are utilized whenever necessary to further the children's understanding.

In an urban district as large as ours, Art and Music have become subject matter which must be presented in an interdisciplinary way. Because we do not have an Art or Music teacher, our educators incorporate the Arts into their Language Arts and Mathematics program. Other specialists like our technology teacher utilize music as well as graphic arts to reinforce content area lessons. With the staff working together as a team, students are instructed in all areas of the curriculum with district plans which are in alignment to state standards.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Describe in one-half page the school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.

Reading instruction is delivered daily to all students through a two hour balanced literacy block during which students participate in modeled, shared, guided, and independent reading and writing activities. (All students receive two and a half hours of Language Arts instruction daily with a small portion of this occurring outside of the literacy block.) Children who have been identified as at-risk receive literacy instruction in inclusion model classrooms where they have many opportunities to interact with high achieving students. Title I staff is used to lower the student teacher ratio during direct reading instruction and each child is placed at his instructional level. Both the balanced literacy block and the inclusion model of instruction at Glenwood School have evolved over the years as a response to high failure rates on the Massachusetts Basic Skills Test in 1987. It was obvious that children were not spending enough time reading and writing and that we were not meeting the needs of our very diverse population. Writing became a daily component of the literacy block and the district's implementation of the First Steps Writing program helped to strengthen this part of the curriculum. In addition, Glenwood was the first school in the district to implement the Reading Recovery Program for at-risk first grade students and has since added a second Reading Recovery teacher. Intervention and enrichment programs are offered to students who would benefit from additional reading activities. Reading instruction is delivered in a consistent manner using the same curriculum at all grade levels and across all programs including ELL and Special Education.

3. Describe in one-half page one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

Mathematics has been pushed into the spotlight by the intense demands of our global economy which requires highly skilled professionals who possess a range of problem solving and higher order thinking skills. The state of Massachusetts has created a grade level specific set of standards based on the five content strands developed by the National Council of the Teachers of Mathematics. Number Sense, Geometry, Measurement, Patterns Relations and Algebra, along with Data Analysis and Statistics are the concepts that are taught in each grade level through the use of hands-on instruction which later is transferred to paper and pencil application. The Mathematics Department for the Springfield Public Schools has developed an extremely helpful tool for both teachers and administrators. The creation of the Mathematical Instructional Guide coordinates the five content strands along with five processing skills that tie into the District Scope and Sequence which Glenwood teachers follow consistently. This component of the guide

provides a monthly plan book inclusive of the state standards and district learning outcomes. Another function of the MIG's is the concept and computation instruction which is taught with the various math materials used at each grade level. Glenwood has taken the initiative to purchase and use math manipulative which will help all learners grasp complex math concepts. In grades K-1 we have used the MathLand program which teaches concepts with hands on materials. Grades 2-5 utilize a variety of instructional resources. The Addison Wesley-Scott Foresman program along with the Terk Investigations program balance the conceptual as well as computational aspects of the Mathematics program. Groundworks in Algebra is a wonderful resource with which we have begin to uncover the "hidden" strand of Algebra and the different ways it is represented. Teachers have asked for these additional resources in order to improve their instruction for all students. These MIG's provide an "all in one" instructional tool that easily navigates educators through a year of math on their specific grade level. The district has also provided us with assessments similar to the MCAS for the beginning, middle and end of the year assessments for each grade level in the district. The staff at Glenwood uses their extended days to work in grade level teams correcting their assessments and looking at student work in order to improve their instruction. Another complement to the Mathematics program is the Collaborative Professional Development Teacher. The coaches in the area of Mathematics (CPDT's) are an additional resource and support system for schools to continue to focus on Mathematics. With all of the current improvements and an instructional focus for both students and teachers, we have started to make a lasting impact on the instruction of Mathematics.

4. Describe in one-half page the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

There are many different instructional methods that Glenwood School uses to improve student learning. These methods are an integral part of our Special Education and ELL programs. Instructional strategies used include modeling so that students will imitate models of effective writing, speaking, reading, and problem solving, checking comprehension frequently in order to adjust instruction if necessary, using cooperative learning strategies, building background knowledge and contextualizing academic material by having students work with manipulatives, pictures, videos, and other objects or sources of information to construct meaning. Teachers also adapt materials including assessments, carefully choose guided reading books at their students instructional level, and utilize audiotapes when appropriate. The instructional methods utilized at Glenwood school make the curriculum accessible to all our students.

5. Describe in one-half page the school's professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

We are fortunate in the City of Springfield that our district has provided an ongoing Professional Development Program since the early years of Massachusetts Educational Reform. With this plan in place for both educators as well as paraprofessionals, our district provides our staff with extended day workshops as well as job embedded professional development. The first four days of school are Professional Development workdays where the staff may have a school based PD program as we did last year, or go to something sponsored by the district in order to keep up with their state and federal certification requirements. This past August, nearly all of our staff members participated in a four day, three school PD program in the area of Mathematics. With the news that Mathematics state assessments were coming to grades 3 and 5, Glenwood teachers decided that exploring various materials as well as instructional and assessment options in the

area of mathematics would improve their instruction. In addition to the four days, on a school level we provide 15 more hours of PD to teachers during their extended day program which runs one hour a week after school. The process of developing extended day PD is generated by MCAS data analysis which in turn creates our School Improvement Plan. The SIP then provides a construct for the PD for the entire school year. The assessment of how well the PD was implemented is then provided by the new MCAS data which in turn will help create a new SIP and future PD. Last year the district hired teachers in the area of English Language Arts and Mathematics to work in the capacity of job embedded Professional Development. Collaborative Professional Development Teachers serve in three capacities. They are presenters in either the area of Mathematics or ELA. They instruct for at least 20% of their day and they also assist teachers improve the quality of instruction. This is a very unique position that is a wonderful addition to our school and district programs. There is a tremendous amount of opportunity in our school as well as the district in the area of professional development.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

**GLENWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
 SPRINGFIELD MASSACHUSETTS
 MASSACHUSETTS COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
 GRADE 3 READING**

MCAS State Assessment Data	2004			2003	2002	2001	2000
	G	D	S	Glenwood	Glenwood	Glenwood	Glenwood
Performance Index Percentage	92.6	72.6	85.5	91.5	No Data	No Data	No Data
% At or above Proficient	76	40	63	78	89	85	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	22	45	30	19	11	15	No Data
% At or above Warning	2	16	6	3	0	0	No Data
SUBGROUP SCORES							
African American/Black							
% At or above Proficient	82	39	41	91	77	*	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	18	48	46	9	23	*	No Data
% At or above Warning	0	13	13	0	0	*	No Data
Hispanic/Latino							
% At or above Proficient	74	29	33	65	91	25	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	24	50	49	27	9	0	No Data
% At or above Warning	3	21	18	8	0	0	No Data
Limited English Proficient							
% At or above Proficient	81	26	29	44	*	*	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	19	50	51	44.5	*	*	No Data
% At or above Warning	0	24	20	11	*	*	No Data
Free/Reduced Lunch							
% At or above Proficient	71	35	40	70	86	81	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	27	48	46	25	14	19	No Data
% At or above Warning	2	17	14	5	0	0	No Data
<i>* The state does not report scores for groups less than 10 students.</i>							
# Tested	63			65	56	68	No Data
% Tested	100			97	89	88	No Data
# Of Alternative Assessments	0			1	0	0	No Data
% Of Alternative Assessments	0			1	0	0	No Data

KEY

G=Glenwood

D=District

S=State

**GLENWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
 SPRINGFIELD MASSACHUSETTS
 MASSACHUSETTS COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
 GRADE 4 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS**

MCAS State Assessment Data	2004			2003	2002	2001	2000
	G	D	S	Glenwood	Glenwood	Glenwood	Glenwood
Performance Index Percentage	93.5	69.1	81	92.3	No Data	No Data	No Data
% At or above Advanced	28	5	11	7	17	8	0
% At or above Proficient	55	31	45	65	67	53	20
% At or above Needs Improvement	16	43	35	23	13	35	80
% At or above Warning	2	21	9	5	3	3	0
SUBGROUP SCORES							
African American/Black							
% At or above Advanced	38	4	3	0	*	7	No Data
% At or above Proficient	54	33	29	45	*	33	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	8	44	49	55	*	60	No Data
% At or above Warning	0	19	19	0	*	0	No Data
Hispanic/Latino							
% At or above Advanced	20	3	2	0	6	6	No Data
% At or above Proficient	60	25	24	70	74	63	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	20	46	48	19	15	25	No Data
% At or above Warning	0	26	25	11	6	0	No Data
Limited English Proficient							
% At or above Advanced	20	2	2	0	*	6	No Data
% At or above Proficient	70	17	18	90	*	63	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	10	47	48	10	*	25	No Data
% At or above Warning	0	34	32	0	*	0	No Data
Free/Reduced Lunch							
% At or above Advanced	16	3	3	5	17	3	No Data
% At or above Proficient	61	29	29	66	64	51	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	20	46	49	23	15	44	No Data
% At or above Warning	2	22	20	7	4	0	No Data
<i>* The state does not report scores for groups less than 10 students.</i>							
# Tested	64			57	62	61	64
% Tested	91			98	92	84	77
# Of Alternative Assessments	0			1	1	1	0
% Of Alternative Assessments	0			2	2	2	0

KEY

G=Glenwood

D=District

S=State

**GLENWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
 SPRINGFIELD MASSACHUSETTS
 MASSACHUSETTS COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
 GRADE 4 MATHEMATICS**

MCAS State Assessment Data	2004			2003	2002	2001	2000
	G	D	S	Glenwood	Glenwood	Glenwood	Glenwood
Performance Index Percentage	89.5	61.7	74	83.5	No Data	No Data	No Data
% At or above Advanced	32	6	14	12	12	8	3
% At or above Proficient	42	20	28	38	47	25	43
% At or above Needs Improvement	20	48	44	45	35	55	45
% At or above Warning	6	27	14	5	6	12	9
SUBGROUP SCORES							
African American/Black							
% At or above Advanced	31	5	3	0	*	7	No Data
% At or above Proficient	54	19	15	33	*	13	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	15	49	52	67	*	60	No Data
% At or above Warning	0	27	30	0	*	20	No Data
Hispanic/Latino							
% At or above Advanced	20	3	3	7	3	4	*
% At or above Proficient	52	17	14	39	44	22	*
% At or above Needs Improvement	20	47	49	43	46	59	*
% At or above Warning	8	33	33	11	8	11	*
Limited English Proficient							
% At or above Advanced	10	3	4	0	0	0	0
% At or above Proficient	60	14	14	27	25	20	40
% At or above Needs Improvement	30	42	47	73	75	80	40
% At or above Warning	0	42	35	0	0	0	20
Free/Reduced Lunch							
% At or above Advanced	25	4	4	9	10	4	No Data
% At or above Proficient	41	18	17	36	40	20	No Data
% At or above Needs Improvement	25	49	51	49	42	59	No Data
% At or above Warning	9	29	28	7	8	14	No Data
<i>* The state does not report scores for groups less than 10 students.</i>							
# Tested	65			58	68	72	No Data
% Tested	93			100	100	99	No Data
# Of Alternative Assessments	0			0	1	1	No Data
% Of Alternative Assessments	0			0	1	1	No Data

KEY

G=Glenwood

D=District

S=State