



Evaluation of Massachusetts Reading First

## Year 5 Evaluator's Report

A Review of Program Activity: July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007

---

Presented to the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education

April 2008



## Contents

<b>Appendix A: MRFP Assessment Framework .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Appendix B: 2006-2007 ESE Monitoring Instrument.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix C: MRFP Schools – Student Profiles.....</b>	<b>10</b>

## Appendix A: MRFP Assessment Framework

### Massachusetts Reading First Plan Assessment Framework Kindergarten Assessment<sup>2</sup>

COMPONENT	SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER		AS NEEDED	JANUARY	MAY	
	Screening/ Diagnostic Fall Benchmark		In-depth Diagnostic/ Progress Monitoring <sup>+</sup>	Winter Benchmark	Outcomes Spring Benchmark	
	Group	Individual	Individual		Group	Individual
Phonemic Awareness	--	DIBELS • Initial Sound Fluency	DIBELS	DIBELS • Initial Sound Fluency • Phoneme Segmentation Fluency	--	DIBELS • Phoneme Segmentation Fluency
Phonics	--	DIBELS • Letter Naming Fluency	DIBELS	DIBELS • Letter Naming Fluency • Nonsense Word Fluency	--	DIBELS • Letter Naming Fluency • Nonsense Word Fluency
Fluency	--	--	--	--	--	--
Vocabulary	--	--	PPVT-III (listening)	--	--	--
Comprehension	GRADE, Level P • Listening Comprehension	--	--	--	GRADE, Level K, • Listening Comprehension	--

Key: DIBELS: Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills; GRADE: Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation; PPVT-III: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed

<sup>2</sup> Kindergarten assessments are optional, and no kindergarten data will be reported to the U.S. Department of Education.

<sup>+</sup> In-depth diagnostic as needed for at risk students; DIBELS progress monitoring assessments can be administered as frequently as prudent using alternate forms.

### Massachusetts Reading First Plan Assessment Framework Grade 1 Assessment

COMPONENT	SEPTEMBER		AS NEEDED	JANUARY	MAY	
	Screening/ Diagnostic Fall Benchmark		In-depth Diagnostic and Progress Monitoring *	Winter Benchmark	Outcomes Spring Benchmark	
	Group	Individual	Individual		Group	Individual
Phonemic Awareness	GRADE, Level K • Sound Matching • Rhyming	DIBELS • Phoneme Segmentation Fluency	DIBELS	DIBELS • Phoneme Segmentation Fluency	--	DIBELS • Phoneme Segmentation Fluency
Phonics/Word Identification	GRADE, Level K • Print Awareness • Letter Recognition • Same/Diff Words • Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondence • Word Reading (opt)	DIBELS • Letter Naming Fluency • Nonsense Word Fluency	DIBELS GRADE (off level)	DIBELS • Nonsense Word Fluency	GRADE, Level 1 • Word Reading	DIBELS • Nonsense Word Fluency
Fluency	--	--	--	DIBELS • Oral Reading Fluency	--	DIBELS • Oral Reading Fluency
Vocabulary	--	--	PPVT-III (listening)	--	GRADE, Level 1 • Word Meaning (reading)	--
Comprehension	GRADE, Level K • Listening Comprehension	--	GRADE (off level)	--	GRADE, Level 1 • Listening Comprehension • Sentence and Passage Comprehension (reading)	--

Key: CTOPP: Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing; DIBELS: Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills; DRP: Degrees of Reading Power; GRADE: Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation; PPVT-III: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed

\* In-depth diagnostics as needed for at-risk students; DIBELS <sup>progress</sup> monitoring may be administered as frequently as prudent using alternate forms.

### Massachusetts Reading First Plan Assessment Framework Grade 2 Assessment

COMPONENT	SEPTEMBER		AS NEEDED	JANUARY	MAY	
	Screening/ Diagnostic Fall Benchmark		In-depth Diagnostic and Progress Monitoring *	Winter Benchmark	Outcomes Spring Benchmark	
		Individual	Individual		Group	Individual
Phonemic Awareness	--	--	CTOPP • Elision DIBELS	--	--	--
Phonics/Word Identification	GRADE, Level 2 • Word Reading	DIBELS • Nonsense Word Fluency	DIBELS GRADE (off-level)	--	GRADE, Level 2 • Word Reading	--
Fluency	--	DIBELS • Oral Reading Fluency	--	DIBELS • Oral Reading Fluency	--	DIBELS • Oral Reading Fluency
Vocabulary	GRADE, Level 2 • Word Meaning (reading)	--	PPVT-III (listening)	--	GRADE, Level 2 • Word Meaning (reading)	--
Comprehension	GRADE, Level 2 • Listening Comprehension • Sentence & Passage Comprehension (reading)  DRP (optional)	--	GRADE (off-level)	DRP (optional)	GRADE, Level 2 • Listening Comprehension • Sentence & Passage Comprehension (reading)  DRP (optional)	--

Key: CTOPP: Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing; DIBELS: Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills; DRP: Degrees of Reading Power; GRADE: Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation; PPVT-III: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed

\* In-depth diagnostics as needed for at-risk students; DIBELS progress monitoring may be administered as frequently as prudent using alternate forms.

### Massachusetts Reading First Plan Assessment Framework Grade 3 Assessment

COMPONENT	SEPTEMBER		AS NEEDED	JANUARY	MAY	
	Screening/ Diagnostic Fall Benchmark		In-depth Diagnostic and Progress Monitoring*	Winter Benchmark	Outcomes (Outcomes also includes Grade 3 MCAS) Spring Benchmark	
	Group	Individual	Individual		Group	Individual
Phonemic Awareness	--	--	CTOPP • Elision DIBELS	--	--	--
Phonics/Word Identification	GRADE, Level 3 • Word Reading	--	DIBELS GRADE (off-level)	--	GRADE, Level 3 • Word Reading	--
Fluency	--	DIBELS • Oral Reading Fluency	--	DIBELS • Oral Reading Fluency	--	DIBELS • Oral Reading Fluency
Vocabulary	GRADE, Level 3 • Vocabulary (reading)	--	PPVT-III (listening)	--	GRADE, Level 3 • Vocabulary (reading)	--
Comprehension	GRADE, Level 3 • Listening Comprehension • Sentence and Passage Comprehension (reading) DRP (optional)	--	GRADE (off-level)	DRP (optional)	GRADE, Level 3 • Listening Comprehension • Sentence and Passage Comprehension (reading) DRP (optional)	--

Key: CTOPP: Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing; DIBELS: Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills; DRP: Degrees of Reading Power; GRADE: Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation; PPVT-III: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed

\*In-depth diagnostics as needed for at-risk students; DIBELS progress monitoring assessments may be administered as frequently as prudent using alternate forms.

## Appendix B: 2006-2007 ESE Monitoring Instrument

### Implementation of Reading First Schools: 2006 -2007 Year 4 Monitoring Visit

District and School Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

ESE Staff: \_\_\_\_\_

**Critical Element A:**

Leadership for Literacy: Scientifically Based Reading Instruction

Fully Implemented: Yes / No

**Discussion Points:** \_\_ Participation of school leaders in professional development on leadership for literacy; \_\_ use of *Reading First* (RF) funds for purchase of materials aligned with SBRR and payment of salaries to satisfy all critical elements of the project; \_\_ coordination of RF funds with other sources such as Title I to maximize financial resources available for reading instruction; \_\_ dissemination strategies to share RF strategies with non-RF schools; \_\_ leadership roles and responsibilities of district RF staff and school principals; \_\_ continuity of leadership in the district and its RF schools; \_\_ structures for continuous improvement for literacy (e.g., district and school or grade level meetings); \_\_ the school has a full time Reading First Reading Specialist.

Strengths	Continuing Challenges

**Critical Element B:**

Curriculum and Instruction: Three Tiers of Curriculum Delivery

Fully Implemented: Yes / No

**Discussion Points:** \_\_ 3-tiers of curriculum delivery with respect to materials and factors that contribute to variation in service based on student need (e.g. who provides intervention, how often, nature of instructional approach); \_\_ how the 90-minute block is broken into whole and small group instruction, who provides instruction; \_\_ nature of instruction as explicit and systematic; \_\_ nature of supplemental and intensive intervention (e.g., who gets the intervention as related to data, where it occurs, nature of instructional approach, who provides, how often; whether this is in addition to the 90 minutes or part of it); \_\_ implementation of curriculum or instructional approaches that have been the focus of regional or statewide professional development (e.g., Beck's vocabulary, Block's comprehension, Argüelles' English language learner recommendations, Implementation Facilitators' presentations on instructional strategies including reciprocal teaching of comprehension, Torgesen/Rasinski recommendations on fluency, Strickland on differentiated instruction).

Strengths	Continuing Challenges

**Critical Element C:**

Assessments: Screening, Progress Monitoring, Outcomes, In-depth Diagnostics

Fully Implemented: Yes / No

**Discussion Points:** \_\_ Use of specified screening and progress monitoring assessments to drive instructional decision-making; \_\_ use of specified outcomes assessments to drive school and district decisions; \_\_ integration of assessments into the school's 3-tier model; \_\_ use of specified in-depth diagnostic assessments; \_\_ use of specified additional assessments (e.g., curriculum-based assessments, online adaptive formative assessments) and avoidance of over-assessment and redundancies across assessment tools.

Strengths	Continuing Challenges

**Critical Element D:**

Professional Development: School-Based Coaches, School and District PD

Fully Implemented: Yes / No

**Discussion Points:** \_\_ Consistency of message (e.g., federal, state, district, school) on best practices in K-3 reading instruction; \_\_ district dissemination strategies for non-RF schools; \_\_ professional development plan at the district and school levels based on staff needs; \_\_ program-specific professional development; \_\_ roles and responsibilities of school-based coaches; \_\_ qualifications of school-based coach; \_\_ ways in which the assigned Implementation Facilitator has supported the district's and school's local professional development activities

Strengths	Continuing Challenges

**Critical Element E:**

Technical Assistance: District Support for Schools

Fully Implemented: Yes / No

**Discussion Points:** \_\_ District-level data analysis by grade level and subgroups; \_\_ professional development needs assessments and plans; \_\_ targeted support for schools in need of additional help from the Implementation Facilitator or other consultants identified by the district; \_\_ action planning based on monitoring report recommendations

Strengths	Continuing Challenges

Implementation of Reading First:  
Summary of Ratings for 2006-2007 and Action Planning for 2007-2008

**Critical Element**

**Fully Implemented**

YES

NO

A. Leadership for Literacy: Scientifically based reading instruction		
B. Curriculum and Instruction: Three Tiers of Curriculum Delivery		
C. Assessments: Screening, progress monitoring, outcomes, in-depth diagnostics		
D. Professional Development: School-based coaches, school & district PD		
E. Technical Assistance: District support for schools		
Total:		

Year 4 School Category Rating 2006-2007 (Circle the appropriate rating):        1   2   3   4

Year 3 School Category Rating 2005- 2006 (Circle the appropriate rating from prior year): 1   2   3   4

School Category Ratings (see Continuation Policy):

Category 1: A fully implemented *Reading First* project is one that receives a “yes” for each of the critical elements. Category 1 schools have also shown two years of improvement data. These schools should consider further ways to enhance their projects, but they are not required to submit plans for continuation funding in FY08.

Category 2: The school has a fully implemented *Reading First* project, but the school has not shown two years of improvement data. The school must receive technical assistance support for data analysis by the district to target student needs more effectively and provide evidence of this support in its FY08 continuation funding proposal.

Category 3: The school has a partially implemented *Reading First* project as evidenced by one or more “no” responses above, but it has met the improvement criteria. The school must receive technical assistance support from the district to strengthen its Reading First project implementation and provide evidence of this support in its FY08 continuation funding proposal.

Category 4: The school has a partially implemented *Reading First* project as evidenced by one or more “no” responses above AND has not met the improvement criteria. Continued funding in FY08 is contingent upon submission of a detailed plan to address weaknesses in the *Reading First* implementation as well as detailed analysis of student data to target instruction for student needs.

<b>Critical Elements/Priority Needs for 2007-2008</b>
#1
#2
#3

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C: MRFP Schools – Student Profiles

Table C1: Massachusetts Reading First Schools - Student Profiles								
District	School	Enrollment K-3	K-3 Demographics				2006 Grade 3 MCAS	
			SPED	LEP	Low Inc	Non-White	P	W
Athol-Royalston	Sanders Street	140	17.9%	1.4%	51.4%	16.4%	53.8%	2.6%
Boston	Agassiz	361	15.0%	38.8%	0.0%	97.0%	9.9%	25.3%
Boston	Condon	383	21.1%	20.6%	84.6%	80.9%	16.7%	27.4%
Boston	Dever	329	16.1%	30.7%	93.3%	96.0%	30.0%	21.3%
Boston	Eliot	99	24.2%	8.1%	0.0%	61.6%	31.4%	42.9%
Boston	Harvard Kent	278	13.7%	42.4%	94.2%	89.6%	16.9%	25.4%
Boston	Mendell	107	15.9%	9.3%	0.0%	96.3%	26.7%	13.3%
Boston	Orchard Garden	250	13.6%	36.8%	89.2%	98.0%	11.5%	50.8%
Boston	Otis	180	9.4%	49.4%	0.0%	77.8%	37.5%	10.0%
Boston	Perkins	153	15.7%	14.4%	93.5%	81.7%	25.8%	6.5%
Boston	Stone	90	17.8%	5.6%	0.0%	98.9%	44.0%	12.0%
Boston	Tobin	189	12.7%	40.2%	0.0%	97.4%	5.7%	41.5%
Boston	Trotter	317	16.7%	2.2%	80.8%	97.2%	21.5%	36.9%
BRCS	Boston Renaissance Charter School	926	7.6%	3.0%	74.1%	99.4%	44.7%	7.1%
Brockton	Davis	439	7.1%	24.8%	71.5%	70.8%	57.9%	3.2%
Brockton	Downey	302	26.8%	12.3%	76.5%	66.2%	28.1%	22.5%
Cambridge	Haggerty	185	26.5%	3.2%	33.0%	51.9%	55.0%	10.0%
CDC	Community Day Charter School	156	12.8%	30.8%	67.9%	89.1%	41.3%	4.3%
Chelsea	Berkowitz	319	8.8%	19.1%	91.2%	88.1%	38.1%	11.4%
Chelsea	Kelly	345	10.7%	34.8%	88.7%	95.7%	48.4%	12.9%
Chelsea	Early Learning Center (K only)	497	4.6%	26.6%	0.0%	90.5%	n/a	n/a
Chicopee	Bowe	265	15.1%	17.4%	89.4%	57.7%	30.5%	23.7%
Chicopee	Stefanik	283	12.7%	16.3%	87.3%	73.1%	46.0%	4.8%
Fall River	Doran	345	12.2%	36.2%	83.5%	46.4%	17.2%	22.4%
Fall River	Healy	147	10.9%	3.4%	85.0%	36.1%	11.1%	44.4%
Fall River	Laurel Lake	156	6.4%	3.8%	85.3%	53.2%	27.0%	13.5%

\* Enrollment and demographic figures generated through October 2006 SIMS file

<b>Table C1 (continued): Massachusetts Reading First Schools - Student Profiles</b>								
<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Enrollment K-3</b>	<b>K-3 Demographics</b>				<b>2006 Grade 3 MCAS</b>	
			<b>SPED</b>	<b>LEP</b>	<b>Low Inc</b>	<b>Non-White</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>W</b>
Fall River	N.B. Borden	94	5.3%	7.4%	88.3%	53.2%	25.0%	20.8%
Gill-Montague	Hillcrest (K-2)	133	21.1%	3.8%	56.4%	18.0%	n/a	n/a
Gill-Montague	Sheffield (Grade 3)	48	18.8%	4.2%	68.8%	8.3%	36.4%	9.1%
Greenfield	Newton	128	14.8%	6.3%	76.6%	28.9%	60.9%	4.3%
Haverhill	Burnham (K - 2)	104	4.8%	63.5%	66.3%	81.7%	n/a	n/a
Haverhill	Golden Hill	262	10.7%	8.0%	44.3%	28.6%	48.0%	7.8%
Haverhill	Pentucket Lake	313	16.6%	2.6%	45.0%	33.5%	49.0%	9.2%
Haverhill	Walnut Square (K - 2)	128	5.5%	0.0%	17.2%	15.6%	n/a	n/a
Holyoke	Kelly	214	24.8%	39.7%	82.2%	95.3%	11.1%	55.6%
Holyoke	Lawrence	315	19.7%	39.7%	98.7%	94.9%	8.3%	56.3%
Holyoke	White	203	23.6%	25.1%	81.3%	81.3%	25.9%	22.4%
Lawrence	Arlington	383	13.3%	39.2%	93.0%	96.1%	15.0%	37.5%
Lawrence	Frost	402	13.9%	22.6%	68.9%	80.3%	24.1%	15.7%
Lawrence	Parthum	591	11.7%	35.2%	88.3%	88.3%	34.3%	15.2%
Lawrence	Wetherbee	246	12.2%	34.1%	85.4%	91.5%	28.0%	16.0%
LCCS	Lowell Community Charter School	507	5.1%	39.3%	84.8%	85.2%	24.7%	27.1%
Leominster	Fall Brook	412	17.2%	22.8%	33.3%	32.5%	58.4%	5.8%
LFDCS	Lawrence Family Development Charter Sch	301	6.0%	42.2%	86.4%	99.7%	30.0%	5.0%
Lowell	Bailey	357	12.3%	15.7%	48.7%	51.5%	56.2%	13.7%
Lowell	Greenhalge	299	21.1%	29.4%	71.9%	52.8%	34.8%	19.7%
Lowell	Murkland	324	14.8%	53.7%	74.7%	84.0%	22.5%	19.7%
Lynn	Harrington	378	11.1%	63.2%	90.5%	88.6%	12.5%	18.8%
Lynn	Ingalls	325	9.5%	55.4%	93.5%	90.5%	11.8%	28.9%
Malden	Ferryway	369	7.6%	13.8%	55.6%	68.0%	56.0%	8.8%
Methuen	Tenney	614	9.8%	9.4%	37.6%	30.5%	46.5%	8.5%
Narragansett	Baldwinville	166	21.7%	0.6%	30.1%	4.2%	53.2%	4.3%
New Bedford	Carney	316	19.0%	0.0%	77.8%	68.4%	40.0%	8.9%
New Bedford	Hayden-McFadden	379	22.7%	7.1%	94.5%	65.7%	28.0%	13.4%
NHCS	Neighborhood House Charter School	163	10.4%	4.3%	71.2%	73.6%	54.5%	0.0%
North Adams	Brayton	189	14.3%	0.5%	62.4%	18.5%	52.3%	4.5%
North Adams	Sullivan	167	7.8%	1.2%	53.9%	17.4%	47.1%	11.8%
Pittsfield	Morningside	239	14.2%	13.0%	71.1%	33.5%	41.9%	16.1%

\* Enrollment and demographic figures generated through October 2006 SIMS file

<b>Table C1 (continued): Massachusetts Reading First Schools - Student Profiles</b>								
<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Enrollment K-3</b>	<b>K-3 Demographics</b>				<b>2006 Grade 3 MCAS</b>	
			<b>SPED</b>	<b>LEP</b>	<b>Low Inc</b>	<b>Non-White</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>W</b>
Plymouth	South Elementary	540	12.0%	0.0%	13.5%	6.7%	64.5%	3.6%
Plymouth	West Elementary	259	15.8%	0.8%	12.4%	5.0%	62.0%	2.0%
Quincy	Lincoln-Hancock	337	20.5%	20.8%	38.6%	42.4%	43.8%	11.0%
Revere	Garfield	410	20.2%	26.6%	83.4%	80.5%	44.9%	9.2%
RMHACS	Robert M. Hughes Academy Charter School	90	2.2%	1.1%	78.9%	94.4%	20.0%	15.0%
Salem	Bates	209	19.6%	1.0%	43.1%	35.9%	56.7%	9.0%
Salem	Bentley	221	36.2%	20.4%	53.8%	50.7%	52.7%	10.9%
SHCS	Seven Hills Charter School	307	9.8%	7.5%	67.1%	87.9%	31.2%	6.5%
Somerville	East Somerville Community School	267	19.9%	41.9%	89.1%	79.0%	59.4%	1.4%
Southbridge	Charlton Street (2-3)	384	16.4%	6.8%	62.5%	36.5%	43.9%	5.0%
Southbridge	Eastford Road (K-1)	392	14.3%	9.4%	65.3%	28.8%	n/a	n/a
Springfield	Boland	350	17.4%	22.0%	90.0%	80.3%	24.4%	26.9%
Springfield	Gerena	454	19.2%	29.1%	92.5%	91.0%	25.0%	29.3%
Springfield	Homer Street	216	9.7%	14.8%	87.5%	94.9%	31.4%	17.1%
Springfield	Milton Bradley	408	18.4%	22.8%	93.1%	95.6%	25.0%	18.8%
Springfield	White Street	254	10.6%	19.3%	92.5%	85.8%	22.0%	25.4%
Taunton	Walker	154	13.6%	0.0%	60.4%	39.6%	37.2%	7.0%
Ware	Koziol	407	21.6%	1.0%	53.3%	5.9%	46.8%	15.6%
Webster	Middle School (formerly Sitkowski)	135	14.8%	5.9%	48.9%	17.8%	42.9%	13.4%
Webster	Park Avenue	466	23.0%	5.2%	47.0%	20.2%	n/a	n/a
West Springfield	Coburn	234	12.8%	39.3%	75.6%	32.9%	45.3%	2.7%
Westfield	Franklin Avenue	124	17.7%	14.5%	73.4%	47.6%	64.7%	0.0%
Westfield	Highland	215	11.2%	37.2%	53.0%	11.6%	32.0%	8.0%
Westfield	Moseley	121	15.7%	0.8%	60.3%	17.4%	42.9%	0.0%
Worcester	Woodland Academy	236	12.3%	40.7%	82.2%	85.2%	17.4%	23.9%
Worcester	City View School	304	11.5%	27.3%	85.9%	69.7%	14.8%	35.2%
Worcester	Goddard School	369	11.1%	55.0%	98.1%	81.0%	18.5%	29.2%
Worcester	Lincoln Street School	142	4.2%	32.4%	83.1%	77.5%	6.7%	36.7%

\* Enrollment and demographic figures generated through October 2006 SIMS file

<b>Table C2: John Silber Reading Initiative Schools - Student Profiles</b>								
<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>K-3 Demographics</b>				<b>2006 Grade 3 MCAS</b>	
			<b>K-3</b>	<b>SPED</b>	<b>LEP</b>	<b>Low Inc</b>	<b>Non-White</b>	<b>P</b>
Adams-Cheshire Regional	C.T. Plunkett	349	11.5%	0.0%	47.6%	10.3%	41.1%	8.4%
Boston	Bates	172	9.9%	11.6%	74.4%	94.2%	29.8%	19.1%
Boston	O'Donnell	161	8.7%	29.2%	91.9%	78.9%	18.8%	3.1%
Brockton	Huntington	301	8.6%	32.2%	79.4%	77.1%	25.8%	24.2%
Chelsea	Sokolowski	317	12.0%	25.9%	88.0%	92.1%	32.3%	21.9%
Chicopee	Selser Memorial	242	10.7%	14.0%	69.4%	41.7%	25.0%	16.7%
Dennis Yarmouth Regional	Station Avenue	448	13.4%	7.4%	38.4%	23.9%	56.9%	5.2%
Easthampton	Maple	177	18.1%	0.6%	24.3%	14.1%	55.6%	8.3%
Fall River	North End (formerly Silvia)	334	17.4%	20.4%	64.4%	34.7%	23.8%	26.3%
Fall River	Small	100	4.0%	15.0%	83.0%	49.0%	19.4%	12.9%
Gardner	Sauter	248	15.3%	4.8%	35.1%	13.7%	56.1%	2.4%
Gloucester	Fuller	308	22.7%	6.8%	54.2%	13.3%	51.8%	7.1%
Greenfield	Four Corners	174	20.1%	4.0%	54.0%	29.9%	61.1%	11.1%
Haverhill	Silver Hill	182	8.8%	7.7%	52.7%	31.3%	52.4%	9.5%
Holyoke	Morgan	291	20.3%	49.8%	97.6%	96.6%	10.0%	36.3%
Lawrence	Guilmette	384	9.4%	47.7%	91.4%	94.8%	16.0%	37.0%
Leominster	Northwest	503	14.5%	15.7%	43.5%	34.2%	41.9%	15.4%
Lowell	Morey	330	9.4%	40.9%	67.0%	73.0%	26.3%	23.7%
Lowell	Varnum Arts	149	12.8%	36.9%	59.7%	65.8%	29.7%	18.9%
Marlborough	Kane	471	25.3%	19.5%	21.2%	35.2%	63.0%	7.0%
Methuen	Timony	607	9.7%	7.9%	30.6%	32.3%	56.1%	9.4%
New Bedford	Ottiwell	178	15.2%	0.6%	80.9%	33.1%	47.4%	2.6%
North Adams	Greylock	161	8.7%	0.0%	50.3%	11.2%	59.4%	9.4%
Pittsfield	Conte	280	18.9%	8.9%	79.6%	53.9%	66.7%	8.8%
Quincy	Snug Harbor	143	26.6%	35.0%	100.0%	53.8%	39.5%	5.3%
Revere	Paul Revere	222	17.6%	26.6%	63.1%	36.5%	53.2%	14.9%
Salem	Horace Mann	168	19.0%	2.4%	51.2%	39.3%	44.7%	13.2%
Springfield	Brightwood	281	12.5%	35.9%	98.9%	97.9%	36.4%	29.5%
Springfield	DeBerry	198	9.6%	24.2%	94.9%	92.9%	24.3%	24.3%
Taunton	Leddy	156	10.3%	1.9%	57.7%	35.9%	42.1%	5.3%

\* Enrollment and demographic figures generated through October 2006 SIMS file

<b>Table C2 (continued): John Silber Reading Initiative Schools - Student Profiles</b>								
<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Enrollment K-3</b>	<b>K-3 Demographics</b>				<b>2006 Grade 3 MCAS</b>	
			<b>SPED</b>	<b>LEP</b>	<b>Low Inc</b>	<b>Non-White</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>W</b>
Wareham	East Wareham (K only)	74	8.1%	0.0%	25.7%	27.0%	n/a	n/a
Wareham	Hammond (K-1)	158	15.8%	0.0%	51.9%	34.2%	n/a	n/a
Wareham	Minot-Forest (1-3)	273	8.8%	0.0%	41.4%	25.6%	49.6%	7.1%
Westfield	Gibbs	93	10.8%	0.0%	36.6%	8.6%	54.8%	3.2%
Worcester	Canterbury Street	187	15.0%	42.2%	89.3%	73.3%	23.6%	38.2%
Worcester	Chandler Magnet	171	5.8%	69.0%	88.9%	73.1%	9.4%	43.4%

\* Enrollment and demographic figures generated through October 2006 SIMS file

