

# Old Tappan Public Schools

## State of the Schools Report

November, 2011

# Old Tappan Board of Education

Ms. Maryellen LaFronz, President

Mr. Tom McDermott, Vice President

Ms. Diane Brosnan

Ms. Nicole Gray

Ms. Lorraine Hliboki

# Administration

Dr. William Ward, Superintendent

Mr. Douglas Barrett, Business Administrator

Mr. Dennis Rossi, Principal

Charles De Wolf Middle School

Ms. Angela Connelly, Principal

T. Baldwin Demarest Elementary School

# Our Students

	Oct. '06	Oct. '07	Oct. '08	Oct. '09	Oct. '10	Oct. '11
TBD	451	441	453	440	415	380
CDW	418	433	404	433	411	391
TOTAL	869	874	857	873	826	771

# Special Education Students

	'06-07	'07-08	Oct. '08	Oct. '09	Oct. '10	Oct. '11
Enroll	869	874	857	873	826	771
Spec. Ed.	99	102	99	91	87	75
%	11.4	11.7	11.6	10.4	10.5	9.7

# Student Assessment Process

## Multiple Measures Including:

- Formal and Informal Measures
- Standardized Tests
- Northern Valley CRTs
- Teacher-Made Measures
- Portfolio Assessment

# Assessment Schedule:

## T. Baldwin Demarest

- Kindergarten: Portfolio Assessment
- 1<sup>st</sup> Grade : Portfolio Assessment
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade: Portfolio Assessment, Science CRT
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade: NJASK, Otis-Lennon School Ability Test, Writing Assessment
- 4<sup>th</sup> Grade: NJASK

# Assessment Schedule: Charles DeWolf M.S.

- 5<sup>th</sup> Grade: NJASK, Social Studies CRT
- 6<sup>th</sup> Grade : NJASK, Health CRT, Study Skills CRT, Otis-Lennon School Ability Test, Writing Assessment
- 7<sup>th</sup> Grade: NJASK, Science CRT
- 8<sup>th</sup> Grade: NJASK, Algebra CRT

# Northern Valley Criterion-Referenced Tests (CRT)

- Northern Valley teachers
- Northern Valley objectives
- Scored by Office of C&I
- Identifies curriculum objectives

# NV Criterion Reference Test Grade 2 Science

	Possible Score	Regional Mean	Old Tappan Mean
2006	60	54.9	53.8
2007	60	55.58	56.44
2008	60	55.02	54.85
2009	60	55.44	55.63
2010	60	55.92	56.54
2011	60	54.89	57.31

# NV Writing Assessment

## Grade 3

	Possible Score	Regional Mean	Old Tappan Mean
2006	5	3.48	3.5
2007	5	3.38	3.26
2008	5	3.43	3.28
2009	5	3.40	3.30
2010	5	3.41	3.22
2011	5	3.65	3.55

# NV Criterion Reference Test Grade 5 Social Studies

	Possible Score	Regional Mean	Old Tappan Mean
2006	60	51.5	46.7
2007	60	53.09	52.18
2008	60	52.66	50.14
2009	60	52.60	51.57
2010	60	54.08	54.27
2011	New	Test for	2012

# NV Criterion Reference Test Grade 6 Health

	Possible Score	Regional Mean	Old Tappan Mean
2010	50	42.16	44.16
2011	50.00	42.29	43.93
2012			
2013			

# NV Criterion Reference Test Grade 6 Study Skills

	Possible Score	Regional Mean	Old Tappan Mean
2007	25	21.74	22.01
2008	25	21.61	22.86
2009	25	21.50	21.58
2010	25	21.83	22.11
2011	25	21.93	22.35

# NV Writing Grade 6

	Possible Score	Regional Mean	Old Tappan Mean
2005	6	4.02	3.90
2006	6	4.10	3.90
2007	6	3.85	3.94
2008	6	3.34	3.36
2009	6	3.25	3.60
2010	6	3.9	3.48
2011	6	4.0	3.9

# NV Criterion Reference Test Grade 7 Science

	Possible Score	Regional Mean	Old Tappan Mean
2006	100	83	86.3
2007	Pilot Test	No	Data
2008	100	82.12	83.93
2009	100	84.36	88.40
2010	100	83.14	85.43
2011	100	83.87	86.62

# NV CRT Grade 8 Algebra

	Possible	Reg. Mean	O.T. Mean
2005	20	18.00	18.00
2006	20	18.5	19
2007	20	18.77	18.30
2008	20	18.80	18.98
2009	20	18.77	18.37
2010	45	37.2	35.67
2011	45	38.34	36.35

# Understanding NJASK Results

	Score
Partial Proficiency	Below 200
Proficient	200 to 249
Advanced Proficiency	250 or Above

# District Factor Grouping

- Based on research linking socioeconomic factors and school outcomes
- Allows comparisons among districts of similar SES
- DFG composite factors include: income, % of population without high school diploma, % with some college, occupation, population density, unemployment, and poverty

# Factors Impacting Proficiency Percentages

- New Jersey Department of Education adjusted the number of correct responses required for Proficient and Advanced Proficient.
- NJ ASK 2008 for grades 5-8
- NJ ASK 2009 for grades 3 & 4

# Reporting the Results

- Scale score (SS) is designed to allow comparability among different forms of a test. ('08 NJASK 4 vs. '09 NJASK 4)
- Raw scores vs. scale scores
- PP = % Partially Proficient
- AP = % Advanced Proficient
- Old Tappan results compared to DFG-I

# Cohort-DFG-I Comparisons

- The scores for student cohort groups are compared to the DFG-I cohorts based on the year of eighth grade graduation
- Both OT and DFG-I cohort groups vary slightly based on in- and out-migration of individual students during any given year

# NJASK LAL Class of 2010

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	N/A	6.7/6.7	4.8/8.2
NJASK4	<u>227.1</u> /225.1	<u>3.6</u> /8.6	<u>8.1</u> /7.2
NJASK5	230.7/232.2	<u>2.6</u> /3.4	20.2/22.3
NJASK6	<u>218</u> /213.5	<u>18.1</u> /23.5	<u>6.9</u> /4.7
NJASK7	<u>230.9</u> /230.2	<u>8.6</u> /12.7	31.0/31.2
NJASK8	<u>243.4</u> /236.6	<u>0.8</u> /6.0	<u>40.3</u> /32.0

# NJASK Math Class of 2010

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OTPP%/DFG	OTAP%/DFG
NJASK3	NA	<u>8.4</u> /8.5	<u>41.1</u> /38.7
NJASK4	<u>248.7</u> /245.5	<u>6.3</u> /7.7	<u>61.3</u> /56
NJASK5	239.1/240.9	<u>3.4</u> /6.8	39.3/42.9
NJASK6	<u>241.6</u> /234.4	<u>7.6</u> /13.3	<u>40.7</u> /32.9
NJASK7	<u>243.4</u> /232.1	<u>13.4</u> /18.0	<u>47.9</u> /37.1
NJASK8	<u>255.4</u> /238.7	<u>4.9</u> /16.4	<u>62.3</u> /43.9

# NJASK Science Class of 2010

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3			
NJASK4	239.3/240.1	7.2/6.9	37.8/40.8
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8	<u>263</u> /248.6	<u>0.8</u> /5.9	<u>68.9</u> /49.4

# NJASK LAL Class of 2011

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	<u>231.1</u> /226.7	<u>2.9</u> /7.6	<u>9.6</u> /6.3
NJASK4	<u>230.1</u> /225	<u>7.5</u> /8.7	<u>19.6</u> /12.1
NJASK5	<u>218.3</u> .216.6	22.0/19.8	<u>9</u> /8.1
NJASK6	<u>227.8</u> /221.6	<u>10.7</u> /14.8	<u>23.2</u> /13.6
NJASK7	<u>234.8</u> /230.4	<u>12.5</u> /13.8	<u>36.6</u> /31.0
NJASK8	<u>248.8</u> /237.0	<u>2.7</u> /6.2	<u>53.6</u> /34.1

# NJASK Math Class of 2011

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	<u>246</u> /240.4	<u>4.8</u> /5.7	<u>58.7</u> /41.2
NJASK4	246.3/246.8	<u>4.5</u> /6.1	56.2/57.2
NJASK5	<u>241.6</u> /240.4	<u>10.6</u> /11.2	41.6/42.2
NJASK6	<u>244.8</u> /236.7	<u>10.6</u> /14.2	<u>46.9</u> /40.1
NJASK7	<u>244.6</u> /234.0	<u>12.5</u> /18.1	<u>48.2</u> /39.5
NJASK8	<u>257.0</u> /234.8	<u>6.1</u> /17.4	<u>64.3</u> /38.9

# NJASK Science Class of 2011

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3			
NJASK4	<u>245.3</u> /244.2	8.1/6.5	<u>61.3</u> /57.3
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8	<u>260.0</u> /245.2	<u>0.9</u> /6.6	<u>67.8</u> /46.8

# NJASK LAL Class of 2012

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	<u>229.9</u> /226.5	<u>4.4</u> /7.3	<u>19.8</u> /13.7
NJASK4	<u>227.2</u> /224.5	<u>1.1</u> /7.6	4.6/8.7
NJASK5	<u>221.9</u> /220.9	<u>14.1</u> /17.3	13.0/15.5
NJASK 6	<u>223.2</u> /221.2	<u>10.2</u> /17.5	<u>15.3</u> /14.3
NJASK7	<u>230.1</u> /224.1	<u>13.3</u> /17.7	<u>26.5</u> /22.7
NJASK8			

# NJASK Math Class of 2012

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	<u>244.5</u> /242.6	<u>1.1</u> /4.8	42.9/46
NJASK4	<u>250.6</u> /246.8	<u>2.3</u> /6.1	<u>60.2</u> /55.9
NJASK5	240.1/244.4	<u>8.4</u> /10.0	38.9/49.2
NJASK6	<u>243.9</u> /236.6	<u>4.1</u> /13.9	<u>45.9</u> /37.1
NJASK7	<u>244.7</u> /234.8	<u>7.1</u> /17.4	<u>48.0</u> /38.9
NJASK8			

# NJASK Science Class of 2012

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3			
NJASK4	<b><u>252.8</u></b> /245.9	<b><u>1.1</u></b> /5.2	<b><u>64.8</u></b> /55.8
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK LAL Class of 2013

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	<u>232.3</u> /225.7	<u>0</u> /5.9	<u>14.1</u> /8
NJASK4	<u>220.7</u> /218.9	<u>16.3</u> /19.8	12.0/12.1
NJASK5	<u>221.4</u> /218.3	<u>17.3</u> /20.0	14.3/15.8
NJASK6	<u>226.8</u> /220.8	<u>12.0</u> /17.5	<u>20.7</u> /13.4
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK Math Class of 2013

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	<u>245.4</u> /242.2	<u>2.2</u> /5.0	<u>48.9</u> /46.3
NJASK4	<u>242.5</u> /238.1	<u>6.5</u> /13.8	<u>45.2</u> /40.0
NJASK5	246.1/247.4	6.1/8.9	50.5/53.6
NJASK6	<u>240.5</u> /240.3	<u>6.5</u> /10.2	38.7/41.9
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK Science Class of 2013

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OTPP%/DFG	OTAP%/DFG
NJASK3			
NJASK4	<b><u>257.1</u></b> /250.1	<b><u>0</u></b> /2.7	<b><u>77.4</u></b> /63.5
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK LAL Class of 2014

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	<u>218.1</u> /217.3	22.3/20.7	<u>14.4</u> /11.0
NJASK4	217.8/217.8	<u>18.6</u> /22.9	14.7/16.8
NJASK5	215.9/219.0	23.8/19.8	8.9/12.3
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK Math Class of 2014

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OT%PP/DFG	OT%AP/DFG
NJASK3	<i>235.3</i> /242.2	<i>19.0</i> /12.2	<i>35.0</i> /42.3
NJASK4	<i>240.0</i> /244.3	<i>14.6</i> /11.1	<i>43.7</i> /49.8
NJASK5	<i>236.8</i> /250.1	<i>17.8</i> /8.1	<i>43.6</i> /56.8
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK Science Class of 2014

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OTPP%/DFG	OTAP%/DFG
NJASK3			
NJASK4	250.3/251.0	2.9/1.7	<u>64.1</u> /60.9
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK LAL Class of 2015

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OTPP%/DFG	OTAP%/DFG
NJASK3	<u>218.7</u> /214.9	<u>18.4</u> /24.1	10.3/10.7
NJASK4	<u>223.6</u> /218.2	<u>14.3</u> /20.0	<u>18.7</u> /13.6
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK Math Class of 2015

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OTPP%/DFG	OTAP%/DFG
NJASK3	<i>246.1</i> /247.7	<u>7.8</u> /10.0	<u>52.2</u> /51.8
NJASK4	<u>249.7</u> /244.3	<u>5.3</u> /9.3	<u>52.1</u> /46.4
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK Science Class of 2015

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OTPP%/DFG	OTAP%/DFG
NJASK3			
NJASK4	<b><u>263.9</u>/257.7</b>	<b><u>1.1</u>/3.1</b>	<b><u>72.3</u>/64.9</b>
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK LAL Class of 2016

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OTPP%/DFG	OTAP%/DFG
NJASK3	<u>217.3</u> /216.5	<u>20.7</u> /21.1	<u>17.2</u> /12.8
NJASK4			
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# NJASK Math Class of 2016

	SS-OT/DFG-I	OTPP%/DFG	OTAP%/DFG
NJASK3	<u>250.5</u> /248.0	<u>7.7</u> /9.1	<u>59.3</u> /54.2
NJASK4			
NJASK5			
NJASK6			
NJASK7			
NJASK8			

# Year-to-Year Grade Level to DFG Comparisons

- Identifies grade level performance of different cohorts of students
- Provides look at grade level performance over time

# NJASK3 LAL DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP OT/DFG-I	%AP OT/DFG-I
2006	<u>231.1</u> /226.7	<u>2.9</u> /7.6	<u>9.6</u> /6.3
2007	<u>229.9</u> /226.5	<u>4.4</u> /7.3	<u>19.8</u> /13.7
2008	<u>232.3</u> /225.7	<u>0</u> /5.9	<u>14.1</u> /8
2009	<u>218.1</u> /217.3	22.3/20.7	<u>14.4</u> /11.0
2010	<u>218.7</u> /214.9	<u>18.4</u> /24.1	10.3/10.7
2011	<u>217.3</u> /216.5	<u>20.7</u> /21.1	<u>17.2</u> /12.8

# NJASK3 Math DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP OT/DFG-I	%AP OT/DFG-I
2006	<u>246</u> /240.4	<u>4.8</u> /5.7	<u>58.7</u> /41.2
2007	<u>244.5</u> /242.6	<u>1.1</u> /4.8	42.9/46
2008	<u>245.4</u> /242.2	<u>2.2</u> /5.0	<u>48.9</u> /46.3
2009	235.3/242.2	19.0/12.2	35.0/42.3
2010	246.1/247.7	<u>7.8</u> /10.0	<u>52.2</u> /51.8
2011	<u>250.5</u> /248.0	<u>7.7</u> /9.1	<u>59.3</u> /54.2

# NJASK4 LAL DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP OT/DFG-I	%AP OT/DFG-I
2006	<u>227.1</u> /225.1	<u>3.6</u> /8.6	<u>8.1</u> /7.2
2007	<u>230.1</u> /225	<u>7.5</u> /8.7	<u>19.6</u> /12.1
2008	<u>227.2</u> /224.5	<u>1.1</u> /7.6	4.6/8.7
2009	<u>220.7</u> /218.9	<u>16.3</u> /19.8	12.0/12.1
2010	217.8/217.8	<u>18.6</u> /22.9	14.7/16.8
2011	<u>223.6</u> /218.2	<u>14.3</u> /20.0	<u>18.7</u> /13.6

# NJASK4 Math DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP OT/DFG-I	%AP OT/DFG-I
2006	<u>248.7</u> /245.5	<u>6.3</u> /7.7	<u>61.3</u> /56
2007	246.3/246.8	<u>4.5</u> /6.1	56.2/57.2
2008	<u>250.6</u> /246.8	<u>2.3</u> /6.1	<u>60.2</u> /55.9
2009	<u>242.5</u> /238.1	<u>6.5</u> /13.8	<u>45.2</u> /40.0
2010	240.0/244.3	14.6/11.1	43.7/49.8
2011	<u>249.7</u> /244.3	<u>5.3</u> /9.3	<u>52.1</u> /46.4

# NJASK5 LAL DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP OT/DFG-I	%AP OT/DFG-I
2006	<i>225.4</i> /229.1	<u>1.2</u> /4.7	<i>11.8</i> /16.6
2007	<i>230.7</i> /232.2	<u>2.6</u> /3.4	<i>20.2</i> /22.3
2008	<u>218.3</u> .216.6	<i>22.0</i> /19.8	<u>9</u> /8.1
2009	<u>221.9</u> /220.9	<u>14.1</u> /17.3	<i>13.0</i> /15.5
2010	<u>221.4</u> /218.3	<u>17.3</u> /20.0	<i>14.3</i> /15.8
2011	<i>215.9</i> /219.0	<i>23.8</i> /19.8	<i>8.9</i> /12.3

# NJASK5 Math DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP OT/DFG-I	%AP OT/DFG-I
2006	<i>240</i> /241.3	<u>2.3</u> /7.9	<i>27.6</i> /41.2
2007	<i>239.1</i> /240.9	<u>3.4</u> /6.8	<i>39.3</i> /42.9
2008	<u>241.6</u> /240.4	<u>10.6</u> /11.2	<i>41.6</i> /42.2
2009	<i>240.1</i> /244.4	<u>8.4</u> /10.0	<i>38.9</i> /49.2
2010	<i>246.1</i> /247.4	<u>6.1</u> /8.9	<i>50.5</i> /53.6
2011	<i>236.8</i> /250.1	<i>17.8</i> /8.1	<i>43.6</i> /56.8

# NJASK6 LAL DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP OT/DFG-I	%AP OT/DFG-I
2006	<u>228</u> /226.2	<u>7.6</u> /9.8	<u>18.1</u> /17.3
2007	222.2/225.4	<u>7.9</u> /9.5	18/22.9
2008	<u>218</u> /213.5	<u>18.1</u> /23.5	<u>6.9</u> /4.7
2009	<u>227.8</u> /221.6	<u>10.7</u> /14.8	<u>23.2</u> /13.6
2010	<u>223.2</u> /221.2	<u>10.2</u> /17.5	<u>15.3</u> /14.3
2011	<u>226.8</u> /220.8	<u>12.0</u> /17.5	<u>20.7</u> /13.4

# NJASK6 Math DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP SS-OT/DFG-I	%AP SS-OT/DFG-I
2006	<u>231.9</u> /231.6	<u>11.4</u> /13.9	<u>31.4</u> /29.9
2007	231.7/232.4	<u>4.4</u> /10.1	31.1/31.3
2008	<u>241.6</u> /234.4	<u>7.6</u> /13.3	<u>40.7</u> /32.9
2009	<u>244.8</u> /236.7	<u>10.6</u> /14.2	<u>46.9</u> /40.1
2010	<u>243.9</u> /236.6	<u>4.1</u> /13.9	<u>45.9</u> /37.1
2011	<u>240.5</u> /240.3	<u>6.5</u> /10.2	38.7/41.9

# NJASK7 LAL-DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	% PP OT/DFG-I	% AP OT/DFG-I
2006		<u>1.9</u> /6.6	<u>19.0</u> /17.9
2007	<u>231.5</u> /228.9	8.5/7.2	<u>25.5</u> /22.8
2008	<u>234.1</u> /231.1	<u>6.9</u> /13.7	<u>27.6</u> /26.5
2009	<u>230.9</u> /230.2	<u>8.6</u> /12.7	31.0/31.2
2010	<u>234.8</u> /230.4	<u>12.5</u> /13.8	<u>36.6</u> /31.0
2011	<u>230.1</u> /224.1	<u>13.3</u> /17.7	<u>26.5</u> /22.7

# NJASK 7 Math-DFG-I Comparison

	Mean Scale Score SS-OT/DFG-I	%PP OT/DFG-I	%AP OT/DFG-I
2006		<u>15.2</u> /19.0	25.7/26.5
2007	<u>229</u> /226.5	19.4/17.3	<u>37</u> /28
2008	<u>244.7</u> /230	<u>6.9</u> /19.7	<u>48.3</u> /31.8
2009	<u>243.4</u> /232.1	<u>13.4</u> /18.0	<u>47.9</u> /37.1
2010	<u>244.6</u> /234.0	<u>12.5</u> /18.1	<u>48.2</u> /39.5
2011	<u>244.7</u> /234.8	<u>7.1</u> /17.4	<u>48.0</u> /38.9

# NJASK Graduating Class-DFG-I Comparison (Mean Scale Score)

	LAL SS-OT/DFG-I	Math SS-OT/DFG-I	Science SS-OT/DFG-I
GEPA '07	238.6/228.2 <b>(+10.4)</b>	234.5/231.0 <b>(+3.5)</b>	243.8/237.7 <b>(+6.1)</b>
NJASK '08	237.3/231.6 <b>(+5.7)</b>	246.6/236.1 <b>(+10.5)</b>	258.7/248.2 <b>(+10.5)</b>
NJASK '09	236.6/232.2 <b>(+4.4)</b>	246.6/236.1 <b>(+10.5)</b>	260.9/246.3 <b>(+14.6)</b>
NJASK '10	243.4/236.6 <b>(+6.8)</b>	255.4/238.7 <b>(+16.7)</b>	263.0/248.6 <b>(+14.4)</b>
NJASK '11	248.8/237.0 <b>(+11.8)</b>	257.0/234.8 <b>(+22.2)</b>	260.0/245.2 <b>(+14.8)</b>

# Factors to Consider

- Reliability- Large subject domains vs. relatively few test items
- Content validity- Degree to which a test measures the attributes it intends to measure
- Test score precision (Standard Error of Measurement); +/- factor
- Variations in student cohorts

# Student Participation '10-11

- 4<sup>th</sup> Gr. Band- 72 students
- 5<sup>th</sup> Gr. Band- 52
- 6<sup>th</sup> Gr. Band- 50
- 7<sup>th</sup> Gr. Band- 33
- 8<sup>th</sup> Gr. Band- 51
- Fall Chorus- 76
- Spring Chorus- 78

# Student Participation '09-10

- Yearbook- 30 eighth grade students
- Soccer- 22 boys and girls
- Volleyball- 14 girls
- Basketball- 17 boys & 19 girls
- Baseball- 16 boys
- Softball-15 girls
- Track- 85 students
- Spelling Bee- 30 students

# Student Participation '09-10

- Jun. National Honor Society- 40 students
- Drama Club- 40 students
- Student Council- 55 students
- Community Service- Tomorrow's Children Fund, Change a Life Foundation (Uganda Clean Drinking Water), OT Golden Age Club, etc

# Summary

- OT students perform very well in comparison to the state and DFG-I groups
- OT eighth grade exit data are outstanding in comparison to the DFG-I group
- Science scores are an area of strength
- Relative to DFG-I, few OT students are partially proficient in mathematics

# Summary Continued

- Too many students score partially proficient in language arts literacy
- Current 6<sup>th</sup> grade performs below the DFG
- 67 students (11%) achieved the top score (300) on NJASK math section; 4 students scored 300 (<1%) on language arts literacy
- Commitment to differentiated instruction at all levels remains essential

# District Goals 2011-12

- To analyze 2011 NJASK scores to determine students at-risk of scoring Partially Proficient on the 2012 NJASK and provide appropriate supports
- To analyze 2011 NJASK scores to determine students in need of enrichment (top 10% of grade level) and provide appropriate supports

# District Goals 2011-12

- To provide information to parents, students, and staff about the NJ Anti-Bullying law
- To provide information about the District to a broad cross section of the Old Tappan community

# Board Goals 2010-11

- Dedicate BOE meeting time to review and discuss information about progress toward goals
- Learn more about Character Education programs as a possible method of limiting harassment, intimidation, and bullying (HIB)

# District Challenges

- Reduced and varying state aid makes planning difficult
- Increasingly politicized education policy debates & new legislation (teacher evaluation, merit pay, charter schools, etc.)
- Unfunded mandates (e.g. HIB legislation)
- 2% school tax cap (~ \$200K)
- Continued growth of special education costs

# District Challenges Cont.

- Academic needs of non-classified students (enrichment and support services)
- Student assessment changes in 2015 based on Common Core Standards

# District Opportunities

- Declining enrollment provides an opportunity to effectively manage costs
- Declining enrollment may offer opportunities for generating new sources of revenue
- Reduction in energy costs

# District Assets

- Supportive, experienced, professional mid-career staff
- Northern Valley Consortium
- Region III Consortium
- Healthy relationships among school community groups (BOE, Mayor & Council, OTPD, OTEA, PTO)
- Well maintained buildings and grounds