

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

6-3-2004

Role of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards in the 4th grade classrooms of Salem County, NJ

J. Michael McQueston
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you -
share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

McQueston, J. Michael, "Role of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards in the 4th grade classrooms of Salem County, NJ" (2004). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1195.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1195>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

ROLE OF THE NEW JERSEY CORE CURRICULUM CONTENT STANDARDS
IN THE 4TH GRADE CLASSROOMS OF SALEM COUNTY, NJ

by
J. Michael McQueston

A Report

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Science in Teaching Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
June 3, 2004

Approved by

Date Approved June 3, 2004

ABSTRACT

J. Michael McQueston
ROLE OF THE NEW JERSEY CORE CURRICULUM CONTENT STANDARDS
IN THE 4TH GRADE CLASSROOMS OF SALEM COUNTY, NJ
2003/04

Dr. Randal Robinson
Master of Science in Teaching

The purpose of this project was to examine the role that the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards are playing in the 4th grade classrooms of Salem County New Jersey. Through surveying the teachers of Salem County, the researcher was able to assign a level of comfort and usage of the NJCCCS for each school district and compare that level with student achievement on the 2003 NJASK assessment. Additionally the issues of clarity and parsimony of the standards, alignment to the assessment and professional development opportunities available to teachers were also studied. The hypothesis of the study was that there is no relationship to student achievement on state administered standardized tests and the use of the NJCCCS in teacher's lesson planning. This hypothesis was supported by the study. The study found that the majority of 4th grade teachers in Salem County were comfortable using the NJCCCS; however they were divided regarding the benefits of use.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to all the principals and administrators of the Salem County school districts that allowed me access to their schools and their staff. I also thank the school secretaries who helped with distributing the surveys and making sure the teachers received them.

Additionally I thank all the 4th Grade Teachers in Salem County who contributed their valuable time and effort to make this research possible. Without their participation this would not have been possible. Special thanks also goes out to my cooperating teachers, Laura Mixner, Beth Seibert, and Lynn Harwood, who all provided me with insights and encouragements that helped to make this project a success.

Likewise, I thank all my professors at Rowan, particularly Dr. Tom Monahan, who taught me the prerequisite skills needed to complete this research.

Thanks to Dr. Randall Robinson, my advisor, who worked with me through numerous rewrites, and guided me to the completion of this project. Without his support and aid this project would not be a reality.

Finally, I thank my wife Tara for providing me with all the support, encouragement and love that made it possible to complete this research project and still maintain a family and a normal existence.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	vi
CHAPTER 1: Scope of the Study	
Introduction.....	1
Statement of Research Problem.....	2
Hypothesis.....	3
Limitations and Assumptions.....	3
Definition of Terms.....	5
CHAPTER 2: Review of the Literature	
Introduction.....	6
General Review.....	7
Issues of Clarity and Parsimony.....	10
Issues of Assessment and Alignment.....	12
Professional Development.....	14
Description of the NJCCCS.....	15
Summary.....	16
CHAPTER 3: Procedure	
Introduction.....	18
Description of Subjects.....	18
Data Collection Procedure.....	19

Description of Instrumentation.....	20
CHAPTER 4: Analysis of Findings	
Introduction.....	21
Results in Determining Usage of NJCCCS.....	22
Results for the 2003 NJASK for the School District of Salem County.....	23
Results from Analysis of Level of Usage and 2003 NJASK.....	25
Results Related to Clarity and Parsimony.....	26
Results Related to Assessment and Alignment.....	29
Results Related to Professional Development.....	30
CHAPTER 5: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations	
Introduction.....	32
Summary of the Research Problem.....	32
Summary of the Hypothesis.....	33
Summary of the Procedure.....	33
Summary of the Findings.....	34
Conclusions.....	35
Recommendations.....	36
References.....	37
Appendix A.....	39
Appendix B.....	42
Appendix C.....	44

List of Tables

table	Page
1. Level of Usage of the NJCCCS by School District.....	23
2. Results from the 2003 NJASK by School District.....	24
3. Comparison of Level of NJCCCS Usage and the 2003 NJASK Results by School District.....	25
4. Frequency of Usage and Achievement Scores.....	26
5. Results for Questions Related to Issues of Clarity and Parsimony...	28
6. Results for Questions Related to Issues of Assessment and Alignment.....	30
7. Results for Questions Related to Professional Development.....	31

Chapter 1
Scope of the Study

Introduction

Since the 1990's the state of New Jersey has made a consistent movement towards curriculum standards and standards-based assessment in an effort to improve both the quality and accountability of public education (Achieve Inc., 2000). The New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS) were adopted in 1996 in an attempt to provide clarity and guidance to educators regarding what must be taught and what students must learn. In 1998 the state aligned assessment with the standards in order to glean information about student achievement and to provide the basis for school improvement (Firestone, Camilli, Yurecko, Monfils, & Mayrowetz, 2000). To date, the consequences of standards and testing have been difficult to interpret, even though millions of dollars and countless hours have been spent implementing them (Achieve Inc.).

The implications of the standards on educators have been largely negative. In order for standards to be effective, they must be clear and parsimonious (Gandal & Vranek, 2001). However, this is rarely the case. Curriculum standards are often far too broad in their scope and attempt to include too much content. There is a growing perception that quality of understanding is sacrificed for quantity of material covered (Holt, 2002). Standards are ambiguous, giving only the content to be covered and not the behaviors expected in utilizing the

information. Strict confidentiality in developing operational items on standardized tests, including the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) furthers the difficulty in aligning standards and assessment (Firestone et al., 2000). Yet standards and assessments are used to hold teachers accountable for student performance. Administrators may respond to public pressure by using standardized testing scores as a measurement of teacher quality (Marzano, 2002).

Any attempt to reform education requires a change in teacher behavior. Standards, to be effective, must be embraced and utilized by teachers in their planning and instruction. Teachers must know what is expected of them and have the opportunity to practice the required skills in order for them to make successful changes (Sherman, 2001). Professional development is one way to address this need (Gandal & Vranek, 2001). The purpose of this study was to determine the level of usage of the NJCCCS by fourth grade teachers in the school districts of Salem County.

Statement of Research Problem

It is within the context of this literature and the scope of this study that the following research questions guided this study:

1. Are the teachers of Salem County using the NJCCCS in their lesson planning?
2. From a teacher's perspective are the NJCCCS and the standardized tests used to measure them properly aligned?
3. Have teachers been provided with adequate professional development and resources to enable them to make effective use of the NJCCCS?
4. Has there been any increase in student performance since the inception of the NJCCCS?

5. Are the NJCCCS clear and parsimonious, so that teachers may effectively utilize them?

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study was that there is no relationship between student achievement on the state administered standardized test and the use of the NJCCCS in teacher's lesson planning.

Additionally, the research explored the possibility that the majority of 4th grade public elementary school teachers in Salem County, NJ were not utilizing the NJCCCS in a manner that improves the quality of instruction. Analysis was undertaken to determine if teachers felt that the standards were not an effective means to improve student performance on the standardized tests due to deficiencies in either: (a) the clarity or brevity of the standards, (b) alignment with standardized tests used to measure student performance, or (c) a lack of professional development opportunities to improve their understanding of the standards. It was anticipated that school districts with historically high achievement would still score high on the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge, (NJASK) regardless of the teacher's usage of the NJCCCS in their planning.

Limitations and Assumptions

Within the scope of any study there are certain limitations and assumptions that must be considered. A limitation is any factor that could

negatively impact the results of the study that lie outside the control of the researcher. They include unforeseen circumstances that may arise during the course of the study as well as those foreseen. Additionally, certain assumptions are made regarding the participants and the study and the results obtained from them.

This study was limited in its ability to be generalized due to the small population size and its limited scope and brevity. Other limitations included a lack of response, honesty or cooperation among participants. For example, in looking at the major limitations of the study, each was beyond the control of the researcher to eliminate or minimize.

Inability of the study to be generalized due to its brevity, size and scope was a result of the time constraints of this research project, and the resources available for its completion.

The issue of a lack of response, a dishonest response, or a lack of cooperation among the participant was a limitation to the study in that it was outside the control of the researcher. If participants chose not to respond or cooperate, or chose to be dishonest in their response it could skew the results of the study. Participants' perceptions regarding the study could also negatively impacted the results. If they believed that the survey was connected with the school administration as a means of checking up on participants' adherence to the NJCCCS their responses could be biased.

Standardized test scores from the ESPA and the NJASK were required for the analysis of the data in order to provide meaningful insight about student

achievement. Since these tests are NJ Department of Education developed and administered, all questions of reliability and validity regarding them was outside the scope of this study and it was assumed that they were accurate.

The following assumptions were also made: (a) that teachers were familiar with the NJCCCS, (b) that teachers actually produced lesson plans and they were required to turn them into administration, (c) that teachers reviewed standardized test results of their students, (d) participants were honest in completing the survey and did not use it as a means of expressing displeasure towards administration or NJ Department of Education policies.

Definition of Terms

Alignment: The term alignment for the purpose of this study was defined as a connection between the content and skills enumerated in the NJCCCS and the appearance of items testing that content or skills on the state administered standardized tests.

Brevity: The term brevity for the purpose of this study was defined as containing the correct amount of content to be covered in the available amount of time.

Clarity: The term clarity for the purpose of this study was defined as free from obtuse or vague language and free from subjective interpretation. Clarity could be defined as being able to be understood by professional educators, and that different educators would arrive at the same meaning or interpretation for the same item.

Professional Development: The term professional development for the purpose of this study was defined as an opportunity, on-site or off-site, to access new information, or reinforce old knowledge regarding the NJCCCS and their meaning.

Usage: The term usage for the purpose of this study was operationally defined as including specific NJCCCS in their lesson plans as a means of improving instruction, or to aid in or guide the development of the lesson.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

A review of the pertinent literature related to the use of standards as a means of school reform and as a way of improving educational instruction is contained in the next section of the proposal. The literature provided the foundation for analyzing the following research questions; (a) Are the fourth grade teachers of Salem County, NJ using the NJCCCS in their lesson planning?, (b) Are the NJCCCS and the state administered assessments properly aligned?, (c) Have teachers received adequate professional development and resources to enable them to make effective use of the NJCCCS?, (d) Has there been an increase in student performance since the inception of the NJCCCS? and (e) Are the standards clear and parsimonious enough to be effectively utilized?

The section begins with a *General Review*, which establishes three areas of focus. The first of these addresses the Issues of Clarity and Parsimony. The second section is related to the *Issues of Assessment and Alignment* of the NJCCCS and the NJASK. The third section looks at *Professional Development* opportunities available to teachers in regards to the NJCCCS. A *Description of the NJCCCS* follows and finally the *Questions for Research* are presented.

General Review

Recent educational literature has been largely dominated by the standards movement and the development of state assessments as a means of school reform. Standards are now providing the foundation for school reform (Bruner & Greenlee, 2002). Forty-four states utilize standard-driven models and there is an increasing movement to align assessment with these standards (Firestone, Camilli, Yurecko, Monfils, & Mayrowetz, 2000). New Jersey can be included among them. The New Jersey State Board of Education developed its first strategic plan in 1995 to provide a framework for statewide initiatives aimed at improving education and reforming educational policies. Included in the initiatives was the establishment of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS). With the development and implementation of the NJCCCS in 1996, the state attempted to provide a standardized curriculum for its public schools students. Assessment was also aligned with these standards in 1998 in the form of the ESPA or Elementary School Proficiency Assessment and then in 2003 with the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK). In developing the NJCCCS and the assessments, millions of dollars and countless hours have been spent. Yet there is little data or research to determine if standards have made a difference in student achievement (Hatch, 2002), or if they are even understood by the teachers implementing them (Frazen, Ward, Goatley & Machado, 2002).

In the national educational community there are mixed feelings regarding the standards movement and its effectiveness as a means of educational reform.

A review of the relevant literature finds not two, but many different camps, all with variable views as to the level at which standards should be used and how effective they are. This issue divides teachers and administration, teachers and parents, and even new and veteran teachers (Winkler, 2002). For many, the implementation of standards has been viewed as a top down approach of reform that does not take into consideration the individual needs of the learner or allow the teacher freedom in the classroom (Sherman, 2001). Others see it as a means of ensuring that all relevant material is covered so our students come out of school with a complete and well-balanced education (Marzano, 2002).

Supporters of a standardized curriculum feel that it is an effective means of school reform and provides teachers with the necessary framework for instruction. In fact, it has been suggested that there can be no meaningful improvement in our schools without implementing a standardized curriculum (Marzano, 2002). Standards can also provide teachers with an increased opportunity for common planning and collaboration (Winkler, 2002). With all teachers teaching the same content and skills, teachers at the same grade level can brainstorm to develop lessons that meet the standards and address student need. However, this rarely happens (Kauffman, Johnson, Kardos, Liu & Peke, 2002). A standardized curriculum that clearly defines what content must be taught eliminates the potential for holes to develop in the students' knowledge. It ensures that teachers are not arbitrary in what they cover; figuring that any information they miss will be covered in the next grade (Marzano, 2002). It has been shown that there is typically little vertical integration in most curriculums

and no set standard for determining what content is taught at what grade. In fact many old curriculums were based on textbooks for scope and sequence and not on principles of continuity, integration or developmental abilities of the students (Zenger & Zenger, 2002).

Perhaps the area where standards are perceived to have the most impact is in our expectations for our students and our schools (Blum, 2000). There is a belief among parents, teachers and business that our schools need to be improved. Raising standards is one way to do this. Some teachers using standards and assessment for accountability have begun to expect more from themselves and their students, and they feel that their students are accepting the challenge (Gandal & Vranek, 2001). Others feel that standards greatly undermine the ability of teachers to address the individual needs of our students (Hatch, 2002). There is a belief among some that standards limit teacher's opportunities to incorporate different learning styles in education, in attempting to cover all the content and skills mandated by the standards. While this may have some truth in it, many believe that an effective teacher can still incorporate different instructional techniques in a standards based curriculum in order to meet individual student needs (Doolan & Honigsfeld, 2000).

Within the standards movement there have been three basic calls to improve the effectiveness of any standardized curriculum. First, the standards must be as parsimonious and clear as possible (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). Second, the standards and the assessments that are used to hold students and teachers accountable must be closely aligned (Achieve Inc., 2000). Finally,

teachers must have adequate professional development opportunities and resources available in order for them to understand and successfully implement a new curriculum (Gandal & Vranek, 2001).

Issues of Clarity and Parsimony

Standardized curriculums are criticized as being overly formulaic and requiring too much content to be covered. This is in direct conflict with the concept of parsimony. “In the case of standards, quantity is not quality,” according to Schmoker and Marzano (1999, p. 19). There is a perception among many that quality of understanding is being sacrificed for quantity of material covered (Holt, 2002; Gandal & Vranek, 2001). With any type of policy, there is the hazard of trying to cover too much. It is much harder to trim down and refine than to increase and expand. Many curriculums are now caught in the trap of having included too many suggestions in an effort to not leave anything out, and they have become much too broad in regards to content (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). This has caused dismay in veteran teaches, forcing them to give up successful projects that are driven by student interest, in order to cover all the content required by the standards (Winkler, 2002). Most teachers will tell you that there is just not enough time in the day to cover all the content required. There is a growing demand to make a distinction in the standards between essential and supplemental content. It has been suggested that only 46% of the content requirements found in national and state standards could be classified as essential (Marzano, 2002).

The need for clarity is crucial to successful implementation of a curriculum. Often standards are imprecise and do not provide a clear expectation of what is expected (Gandal & Vranek, 2001). Many include expectations that cannot be measured or are operational in nature and thus subject to a wide range of interpretations (Gandal & Vranek, 2001). Standards developed by subject area specialists often times frustrate the teachers they are trying to serve due to their lack of focus and clarity (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). Even when the standards define a clear behavioral change, there is often little direction on how to achieve them. State standards in New Jersey define expected outcomes but fail to provide specific strategies to meet these outcomes (Tienken & Wilson, 2001). While the lack of direction provides academic freedom for experienced educators, it proves to be detrimental for new teachers who do not have the wealth of information and lesson designs necessary to meet these outcomes. For many new teachers, the standards are obtuse and difficult to decipher, and the objectives are too vague. Many new teachers do not have a clear picture of what is expected of them, or their students (Kauffman et al., 2002).

Another criticism of standard curriculums is that due to the content requirements they limit the learning experiences of the student. There is a clear message in schools that have adopted standardized curriculum; the emphasis must be placed on covering the content on which the students and the school will be assessed. This has the effect of reducing the potentially rich learning experiences to a prescribed series of lessons (Hatch, 2002). According to Maurice Holt (2002, p. 268), "Commitment to standards-led school reform means creating a system of

schools geared solely to the product - test results - and not to the process of creating educative experiences.” This also has the effect of constraining teachers and removing some of the intrinsic rewards associated with teaching (Kauffman et al., 2002).

Issues of Assessment and Alignment

The combination of assessment and standards is believed to provide the foundation for legitimate school reform. Good standardized test scores can earn the respect of our communities and increase students’ feeling of well being (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). However, curriculum and assessment must be carefully aligned in order to be effective. Teachers must feel comfortable in knowing that the curriculum they are teaching will adequately prepare students for the state assessments. There must be no surprises, and teachers should have a clear picture of what will be assessed. In order to maintain security, confidentiality is involved in developing state standardized tests. In the state of New Jersey, strict confidentiality is maintained over test items (Firestone et al., 2000). This makes the job of properly aligning the curriculum to the assessment exceedingly difficult. Teachers do not know exactly which items or topics will be covered on the test, or the manner in which skills will be assessed (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). This causes confusion among teachers. They do not know what aspects of the oftentimes too broad content areas need to be covered or what skills will be the focus of the test. With such a limited amount of time to cover so much content and not knowing what will be assessed causes teacher to run the

risks of leaving something out, or covering some subjects too lightly, and devoting too much time to areas that may not be on the test at all (Kauffman et al., 2002).

Another common problem with state assessments related to alignment is the lack of depth inherent in the test models (Gandal & Vranek, 2002). Standardized tests need to measure the same higher level thinking skills that are being called for in most standards. This means the inclusion of more open-ended questions, more written response and fewer multiple-choice. These changes will prove costly and raise the issue of economic equity among school districts (Firestone et al., 2000).

Curriculum and assessment must also be aligned in order to avoid the phenomena of teaching to the test. This practice, once thought as unprofessional, is now increasing as the stakes for test scores rise (Winkler, 2002). It occurs when teachers realize that their curriculum will not provide adequate opportunity for students to learn the content and practice the skills that are necessary to succeed on the state assessment. Drilling of test taking skills can go on for months and many schools are spending scarce resources on test preparation materials in an effort to succeed (Sherman, 2001). Teaching to the test can result in a further narrowing of the curriculum and an increase in drilling exercises at a sacrifice of more in-depth, higher level learning (Firestone et al., 2000).

There is also the question of how the results of standardized tests are utilized. Accountability is a buzzword in educational circles and connotes a negative view of assessment. Teachers are feeling pressure from administrators

and the community to increase student performance on standardized tests. Tests are being used to determine whether or not teachers are doing their jobs. They have become a means of punishment, not data collection used to assist educators (Meier, 2002). Assessment must be used formatively, as means to improve instruction in order for it to be meaningful (Tienken & Wilson, 2001).

Professional Development

Meaningful professional development is key to the success of the standards movement. Teachers must be made aware of the new standards, assessments, and the implications they will have on instruction (Sherman, 2001). This is one of the biggest challenges in standards-based reform. Teachers must have the necessary training, tools and support in order to enable their students to achieve the lofty goals (Gandal & Vranek, 2001). Often this does not occur or occurs in only a cursory manner. The most common method of disseminating new information and techniques is the one-day in-service, in which many questions are raised that cannot be answered and after which there is little or no follow up (Firestone et al., 2002). Likewise, teacher-training programs typically do not include use of standards and new teachers entering the workplace have had little experience in using content standards, or standardized curriculums (Kauffman et al., 2002). It has been suggested that one of the reasons that state standards and assessments have had little positive impact on teaching is the fact that teachers have had limited opportunities to learn the skills and content required to implement them (Firestone et al., 2002). Studies have shown that

teachers, given the opportunity for meaningful professional development and collaboration, will take full advantage of the resources available (Frazen et al., 2002). In addition to the opportunity for development, there must also be follow up. Administration must provide teachers the chance to continually improve their understanding of the standards and encourage their compliance by reviewing planning materials and offering feedback (Marzano, 2002).

Description of the NJCCCS

The NJCCCS are supposed to provide teachers with a guide to all the content areas that they need to address. The standards themselves are a broad framework of general statements that are supported by the Cumulative Progress Indicators or CPIs (Achieve Inc., 2000). For each standard there is a breakdown by grade level of skills that the students are supposed to be able to perform. These are the CPIs. They provide the teacher with a picture of what skills the students must learn, but not lessons to teach to develop those skills(Achieve Inc.). To find information like this, the teacher must look to the Curriculum Framework (CF), which has sample lesson plans for some of the CPIs (New Jersey Department of Education [NJDOE], 1996). The CF can provide the new teacher with ideas on what to teach, but little direction is given on how to teach it (Achieve).

In regards to assessment, New Jersey has recently introduced the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK). According to a Department of Education brochure, this test is designed by New Jersey educators

from school districts around the state and is closely aligned to the NJCCCS. The same brochure further states that the NJASK will not differ greatly from the ESPA (NJDOE, 2003). This is worrisome, since New Jersey only scores a C+ in the Standards and Accountability section of Education Week's 2003 Quality Counts survey (Education Week, 2003). This survey looks at curriculum and assessment and examines how well the two are linked and aligned (Education Week). Since New Jersey is only scoring a C+, there is obviously room for improvement in aligning assessment with the content standards and a dramatic change in the NJASK would have been better news than little change from the ESPA.

However, the NJCCCS can ensure that all students are taught the content and skills necessary for academic success (Achieve Inc., 2000). Vertical integration within the school district curriculum can be made easier and more effective (Marzano, 2002). Teachers with a deep understanding of the standards can make effective use of their instructional time, by developing plans that incorporate numerous objectives into single lesson. The NJCCCS demand that teachers have high expectations for student achievement, and that we prepare our student to meet these expectations (Blum, 2000).

Summary

In looking at all the literature related to standards and accountability one can begin to form some general ideas regarding the effectiveness of standards in improving public education. Standards can provide the foundation for

improvement provided that they are clearly written, sparse enough to allow for individual learning differences and teaching styles, and closely aligned with the assessments. Teachers must have ample opportunity for professional development so they can be comfortable in their understanding of the standards and so they can be effective in incorporating them into their lesson planning. This is particular true for beginning teachers. Additionally, there must be a system of accountability in which administration takes an active role in supporting the inclusion of standards in the formative steps of curriculum assessment, not just at the summative end point. Finally, there needs to be a balance between meeting the needs of the students and meeting the needs of the public and the political will.

Chapter 3

Procedure

Introduction

In addition to general usage of the standards, three factors seem to detract from their effectiveness as a means of improving educational instruction. These factors; (a) Are the NJCCCS and the state administered assessments properly aligned?, (b) Have teachers received adequate professional development and resources to enable them to make effective use of the NJCCCS?, (c) Are the standards clear and parsimonious enough to be effectively utilized?, are the focus of this research. The hypothesis of this study was that there is no relationship between teachers' usage of the NJCCCS in lesson planning and increased pupil performance on the state administered standardized tests.

Description of Subjects

The subjects of the study were 4th grade teachers in the public elementary schools of Salem County, New Jersey. Only regular education teachers who work in self-contained or inclusion classrooms were included. Special education teachers who provided pullout or separate classrooms services were not included in the study. Likewise, Salem Special Services were not included in this study. In order to insure anonymity, there was no attempt to collect personally identifiable

information from the subjects. Information was collected about the number of years teaching in the fourth grade.

Salem County is comprised of 15 school districts. The survey was distributed to the entire population of 4th grade public elementary school teachers. By selecting the total population (N=41) for the study, the potential for sampling error and bias was eliminated.

Data Collection Procedure

The initial data collection began with calls to the superintendent for each of the districts to secure the proper authorization for administering the survey (see appendix A). Additionally, contact was made with the building principals to secure their consent to distribute the surveys to the 4th grade teachers. Once permission was obtained, the surveys were hand delivered to each school and distributed to the appropriate teachers through the school mail system. Each survey included a cover letter (see appendix B) and self addressed stamped envelope for returning the completed survey. Once surveys were returned by mail, they were sorted by school, to look for non-response and to facilitate data analysis. Follow up for non-response was conducted as needed, with special attention given to potential non-response bias.

The results for the NJASK were recorded from the New Jersey Department of Education website, where they were publicly posted in the New Jersey Schools Report Card for 2003. The scores for each school district in Salem County was identified and organized in a manner to facilitate manual analysis for

relationship. Comparisons were made between the results from the surveys and the results on the NJASK for 2003 (see appendix C).

Description of the Instrumentation

There were two forms of instrumentation for this study. The first was the 25-question survey, which has been specifically designed for this study by the researcher. This survey was field-tested by three, 4th grade teachers in a school district outside of Salem County. This allowed for further modification in order to improve the quality of data collection. The other instrument was the state-developed New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK) that was administered to all 4th grade students in the county in the month of May 2003.

Once the values for the levels of usage of the NJCCCS were assigned for each district and the results from the NJASK were obtained, an analysis was undertaken utilizing the survey results from each district and the district's results on the standardized test. The intent of this analysis was to determine the relationship that exists between teachers usage of the NJCCCS in their lesson planning and student achievement on the NJASK.

Chapter 4

Analysis of Findings

Introduction

Included in this chapter are reports on the findings from the surveys administered to the 4th grade teachers in Salem County New Jersey. The results are analyzed in order to determine if the hypothesis of this study, that there is no relationship between student achievement on the state administered standardized test and the use of the NJCCCS in teacher's lesson planning, was supported.

Additionally, the research explored the possibility that the majority of 4th grade public elementary school teachers in Salem County, NJ were not utilizing the NJCCCS in a manner that improves the quality of instruction. Analysis was undertaken to determine if teachers felt that the standards were not an effective means to improve student performance on the standardized tests due to deficiencies in either: (a) the clarity or brevity of the standards, (b) alignment with standardized tests used to measure student performance, or (c) a lack of professional development opportunities to improve their understanding of the standards.

Of the 41 surveys distributed, 29 were completed by the participants and returned. Teachers from all of the elementary schools for each of the 13 school districts in Salem County participated and are included in the findings.

Results in Determining Usage of NJCCCS

In analyzing the findings from the surveys (appendix A) to determine the level of usage of the NJCCCS in lesson planning four questions were scrutinized. Question 4 asks the participant if they are comfortable using the NJCCCS. Of the teachers surveyed, over 86% felt that they were comfortable using the NJCCCS. Question 7 gathered information about how often teachers referred to the NJCCCS. It is assumed that the more often the teachers are consulting the NJCCCS the more they are using them to guide instruction. Over 58% of the teachers surveyed reported that they used the standards on a weekly basis and an additional 21% used them monthly, as opposed to 21% who claimed to use them yearly or not at all. .

However, question 18 asked the participants if they find the NJCCCS helpful in writing lesson plans. Results for this question were much more dispersed, with only 55.1 % reporting that the NJCCCS was viewed positively for writing lesson plans, and 41.1% viewing them negatively. Finally, question 11 attempted to ascertain the way in which the teachers are using the standards. The standards are designed to drive instruction and provide a point of origin for lesson development, yet over 58% of teachers responded that they wrote their lessons first, and then found the appropriate standards to support it.

By analyzing the responses for each of these four questions for a particular school district, a determination was made to assign a value for the level of usage for each district (see table 1). A Positive overall usage denotes that teachers

responded positively to three of the four questions. A Negative overall usage denotes that teachers responded negatively to three or more questions. Neutral responses for overall usage suggest an even number of positive and negative responses.

table 1

Level of Usage of the NJCCCS by School District

School District	Question 4	Question 7	Question 11	Question 18	Overall Usage
1	Positive	Positive	Negative	Positive	Positive
2	Positive	Positive	Positive	Negative	Positive
3	Positive	Positive	Negative	Negative	Neutral
4	Positive	Positive	Negative	Positive	Positive
5	Positive	Positive	Negative	Positive	Positive
6	Positive	Positive	Negative	Positive	Positive
7	Positive	Positive	Negative	Negative	Neutral
8	Positive	Positive	Negative	Negative	Neutral
9	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Neutral
10	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
11	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
12	Positive	Positive	Negative	Negative	Neutral
13	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Neutral
14	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Neutral
15	Positive	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative

Results for 2003 NJASK for the School Districts of Salem County

The results from the 2003 NJASK for each school district and elementary school in Salem County were recorded from the NJ Department of Education Website under the School Report Card section (see appendix 3). In determining

the schools level of achievement, both the proficient and advanced proficiency scores were combined to provide an accurate picture of students meeting or exceeding the state standards for assessment. The results from each district were then compared with the state averages for both language and mathematics in order to ascertain the schools level of student achievement (see table2). Schools that scored above the state average were considered high achieving, while those who did not meet the average were considered low achieving. If a school scored above the state average in one area, but below in the other, it was considered to be an average achieving school. The state average for language was 77%, while the state average for mathematics was 69%.

table 2

Results from 2003 NJASK by School District

School District	Language Score	Mathematics Score	Student Achievement Score
1	77	69	Average
2	80	73	High
3	75	75	Average
4	78	72	High
5	93	76	High
6	56	60	Low
7	93	72	High
8	76	81	Average
9	73	63	Low
10	68	62	Low
11	90	83	High
12	57	46	Low
13	86	81	High
14	88	78	High

15	28	27	Low
----	----	----	-----

Results from Analysis of Level of Usage and 2003 NJASK

The results from the determined level of usage for each school district (see table 1) was compared with the schools assigned level of achievement from the 2003 NJASK (see table 2). This comparison was undertaken to determine if any relationship existed between teachers' usage of the NJCCCS and student achievement on the state administered standardized tests. The results of the comparison are reported in table 3.

table 3

**Comparison of Level of NJCCCS Usage and 2003 NJASK
Results by School District**

School District	Overall Usage	Level of Achievement
1	Positive	Average
2	Positive	High
3	Neutral	Average
4	Positive	High
5	Positive	High
6	Positive	Low
7	Neutral	High
8	Neutral	Average
9	Neutral	Low
10	Positive	Low
11	Positive	High
12	Neutral	Low
13	Neutral	High
14	Neutral	High
15	Negative	Low

Table 3 demonstrates that there is no clear relationship between teachers' usage of the NJCCCS and student achievement on state administered standardized tests in Salem County New Jersey. While the occurrence of Positive overall usage and high student achievement was the mode with 4 records, it is insignificant, since Positive overall usage also produced low and average student achievement as well. Likewise, Neutral overall usage presented a mixed picture of student achievement, producing high, low and average values. Negative overall usage was linked to low student achievement (see table 4).

table 4

Frequency of Usage and Achievement Scores

Usage/Achievement Scores	Number of Records	Percentage
Positive/High	4	27%
Positive/Average	1	7%
Positive/Low	2	13%
Neutral/High	3	20%
Neutral/Average	2	13%
Neutral/Low	2	13%
Negative/High	0	0%
Negative/Average	0	0%
Negative/Low	1	7%

Results Related to Clarity and Parsimony

As previously discussed the issues of clarity and parsimony regarding the NJCCCS are of major concern to educators. Standards are often obtuse, and fail to provide clear expectations about desired student behaviors. This presents

problems for classroom teachers who must use these standards to develop instructional lessons. Likewise, standards are often laden with too much content, making them cumbersome and impractical for teachers. In order for standards to be effectively used by teachers they must be clear and brief.

Overall the results show that the teachers of Salem County feel that the NJCCCS are not lacking on the issue of clarity. In the survey five questions addressed the issue of clarity in the standards related to student achievement and use by professional educators. Question 12 asked if the NJCCCS provided clear expectations about student performance. Overwhelmingly teachers responded positively with over 75% either agreeing or strongly agreeing. Nearly 80% felt that they could easily find the appropriate standards for their lesson plans according to the responses from question 13. Additionally, question 16 asked if teachers could find the most important NJCCCS to emphasize during instruction and again teachers responded positively with 65% stating that they could. Question 17, related to the Cumulative Progress Indicators (CPI) and expectations of student achievement provided mixed results, with 56% feeling that the CPI accurately reflect what they should expect from their students, and 41% saying the they do not accurately reflect student achievement. Finally, question 21 asked if they felt that the NJCCCS were clear enough to be understood by professional educators. Over 82% of teachers surveyed felt that the NJCCCS were sufficiently clear to be understood by educators (see table 5).

The issue of parsimony, or quantity of content, elicited a negative view of the NJCCCS from the teachers surveyed. Only two questions addressed this

topic. Question 23 asked teachers if they felt they could cover all the material in the NJCCCS in a typical school year. Over 82% felt that they could not cover all the material and 31% reacted strongly. Less than 14% felt that they could cover all the material included in the NJCCCS in a typical year. However, when asked if they felt that the NJCCCS contained the correct amount of content for the fourth grade in question 24, nearly 45% agreed that they did, while 48% felt that they did not (see table 5).

table 5

Results for Questions Related to Issues of Clarity and Parsimony

Question	Number of Positive Responses	Number of Negative Responses	Percentage Positive	Percentage Negative
The NJCCCS provides clear expectations about student performance.	22	5	75.9	17.2
I can easily find the appropriate standards for my lesson plans.	23	6	79.3	20.6
I can recognize the most important NJCCCS and emphasize them during instruction.	19	10	65.5	34.5
I feel the CPI accurately reflect what I should expect from my students.	16	12	55.2	41.4
I feel the NJCCCS are clear enough to be well understood by my professional educators.	24	5	82.8	17.2
The NJCCCS contain the correct amount of content for fourth grade.	13	13	44.8	48.3
I can cover all the material in the NJCCCS in a typical school year.	4	24	13.8	82.8

Results Related to Assessment and Alignment

Standards when combined with assessment provide the foundation for school reform. The NJCCCS are designed to provide the educator with a clear expectation regarding desired student behaviors and the NJASK is designed to measure that behavior. In order for standards and assessment to be affective they must be carefully aligned.

The 4th grade teachers of Salem County did not respond to the issue of alignment with a singular voice. Rather a wide variety of responses were recorded, showing a split in perceptions regarding the NJCCCS and their alignment to the NJASK. Over 82% of teachers surveyed felt that their schools curriculum was aligned with the NJCCCS. However question 14 asked if the NJCCCS would provide an accurate picture of what would be expected from students on the NJASK and only 59% felt that it would. Nearly 38% felt that the NJCCCS did not provide an accurate picture of what would be expected of their student on the assessment. In helping their students prepare for the NJASK, as asked in question 20, 79% of the 4th grade teachers felt that the NJCCCS would be helpful while only 17% felt that it would not. Question 25 asked the teachers if they knew what would be expected of their students on the NJASK and they were evenly split with 48% reporting that they knew what would be expected, while 48% stated that they did not know what would be expected from their students (see table 6).

table 6

Results for Questions Related to Issues of Assessment and Alignment

Question	Number of Positive Responses	Number of Negative Responses	Percentage Positive	Percentage Negative
The NJCCCS provide an accurate picture of what will be expected of my students on the NJASK.	17	11	58.6	37.9
I feel the NJCCCS will help me prepare my students for the NJASK.	23	5	79.3	17.2
I know what will be expected of my students on the NJASK.	14	14	48.3	48.3
My school's curriculum is aligned with the NJCCCS.	24	5	82.8	17.2

Results Related to Professional Development

One of the keys to making standards meaningful to the teachers who must use them is access to adequate professional development. Teachers must be made familiar with the standards and their use in order to utilize them effectively. Two questions recorded information regarding this issue. Question 15 directly asked teachers if their school provided them with adequate professional development related to the NJCCCS. The majority of teachers responded that they did receive adequate professional development with 62% affirming. Close to 80% of the teachers surveyed reported for question 22 that they could get their questions about the NJCCCS answered at their school (see table 7).

table 7

Results for Questions Related to Professional Development

Question	Number of Positive Responses	Number of Negative Responses	Percentage Positive	Percentage Negative
My school provides me with adequate professional development related to the NJCCCS.	18	10	62	34.5
I can get my questions about the NJCCCS answered at my school.	23	5	79.3	17.2

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the general usage of the NJCCCS in the 4th grade classrooms of Salem County NJ and, three factors seem to detract from their effectiveness as a means of improving educational instruction. These factors; (a) Are the standards clear and parsimonious enough to be effectively utilized?, (b) Are the NJCCCS and the state administered assessments properly aligned?, (c) Have teachers received adequate professional development and resources to enable them to make effective use of the NJCCCS?, are the focus of this research. The hypothesis of this study was that there is no relationship between teachers' usage of the NJCCCS in lesson planning and increased pupil performance on the state administered standardized tests. This hypothesis was supported by the data.

Summary of the Research Problem

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Are the teachers of Salem County using the NJCCCS in their lesson planning?
2. Has there been any increase in student performance since the inception of the NJCCCS?

3. Are the NJCCCS clear and parsimonious, so that teachers may effectively utilize them?
4. From a teacher's perspective are the NJCCCS and the standardized tests used to measure them properly aligned?
5. Have teachers been provided with adequate professional development and resources to enable them to make effective use of the NJCCCS?

Summary of the Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study was that there is no relationship between teachers' usage of the NJCCCS in lesson planning and increased pupil performance on the state administered standardized tests.

Summary of the Procedure

The study collected information about the role of the NJCCCS in the 4th grade classrooms of Salem County New Jersey by surveying the entire population, (N=41) of fourth grade teachers. The 25 item survey was developed by researcher and distributed to the teachers in all the elementary schools in the county. Once completed the participants mailed the surveys back to the researcher, upon which the surveys were sorted by school and the results were tabulated. The data was then analyzed using the SPSS program to record frequencies, mean and percentages for each item and school. This information was then compared manually with the results for each school on the 2003 NJASK, which was downloaded from the NJDOE website.

Summary of Findings

The findings from the research supported the hypothesis that there is no clear connection or relationship between teachers' usage of the NJCCCS and student achievement on the state administered NJASK. It was found that the majority of the teachers in Salem County were comfortable in using the NJCCCS and that they were able to find appropriate standards for their lesson, and that they were able to identify the most important standards and emphasize them during instruction. Out of the 15 schools surveyed, the teachers in six of them responded to the use of the standards in a positive way, seven were neutral in their view of the content standards and only one viewed them as negative. When the overall usage was compared with student achievement on the NJASK, it was found that no clear pattern emerged and that student achievement varied from High to Low regardless of the overall usage of the NJCCCS.

The findings of the survey in the area of clarity of the NJCCCS found that the 4th grade teachers of Salem County gave the standards high marks for clarity with over 80% feeling that the standards were sufficiently clear. However when it came to parsimony, the standards scored much lower with 82% feeling that they could not cover the material contained in the standards in a typical school year.

Alignment of the NJASK to the NJCCCS also elicited a mixed response. Over 82% of the teachers felt that the standards would be helpful in preparing their students for the NJASK, however only 59% felt that the NJCCCS provided an accurate picture of what would be expected from their students on the NJASK. Likewise, the respondents were even split over the issue of whether or not they

knew what would be expected of their students on the NJASK with 48% responding positively and 48% negatively.

The school districts of Salem County scored high in the area of professional development. Teachers responded that they could get their questions regarding the standards answered at their school. Likewise 62% felt that their school provided them with adequate professional development opportunities related to the NJCCCS.

Conclusions

The role of the NJCCCS in the 4th grade classrooms of Salem County New Jersey was not clear. It appears that teachers are using them as means of improving the quality of their instruction; however this has not translated into clear improvements in student achievement. Teachers are getting their professional development needs met and are receiving support from their administration in the form of training related to the usage of the standards. Additionally, the standards are written in a manner that can be understood by the teachers using them and they provide a clear picture of what behaviors should be expected from the students.

There appear to be two major issues still hampering the acceptance of the NJCCCS as a means of school reform among the teachers of Salem County. Firstly, the standards are perceived as being too broad in their scope and attempt to include too much information making it difficult for teachers to provide instruction on all the content included in them. Secondly, there are questions

regarding the alignment of the state administered assessment and the standards that they are attempting to measure.

Recommendations

Only one school was determined to have a negative overall usage of the standards. This school had a response rate of only 20% to the survey with only one of the five teachers responding. Additionally, the school also scored the lowest of the NJASK. This fact raises some questions about the teachers' attitudes towards the standards and student achievement. Unfortunately, successive attempts to obtain response were not successful. Perhaps a study of low achieving schools and teachers' usage of the NJCCCS would be worth considering.

References

- Blum, R. E. (2000). Standards-based reform: Can it make a difference for students? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75(4), 90-113.
- Bruner, D. Y., & Greenlee, B. J. (2002). Bringing standards from the state house to the schoolhouse. *Principal*, 81(3), 23-25.
- Firestone, W. A., Camilli, G., Yurecko, M., Monfils, L., & Mayrowetz, D. (2000). State standards, socio-fiscal context and opportunity to learn in New Jersey. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(35). Retrieved October 12, 2003, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n35>
- Galus, P. (2002). How standards enhanced my teaching style. *Educational Leadership*, 59(4), 77-79.
- Gandal, M., & Vranek, J. (2001). Standards: Here today, here tomorrow. *Educational Leadership*, 59(1), 6-13.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). Accountability shovedown: Resisting the standards movement in early childhood education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(6), 457-463. Retrieved October 5, 2003, from <http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=6033815&db=aph>
- Holt, M. (2002). It's time to start the slow school movement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(4), 264-271.
- Kauffman, D., Johnson, S. M., Kardos, S. M., Liu, E., & Peske, H. G. (2002). Lost at sea: New teachers experiences with curriculum and assessment. *Teachers College Record*, 104(2), 273-300. Retrieved October 3, 2003, from <http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=EJ657270&db=eric>
- Marzano, R. J. (2002). In search of the standardized curriculum. *Principal*, 81(3), 6-9.
- Meier, D. (2002). Standardization versus standards. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(3), 190-198.
- Sherman, L. (2001). Taking a second look at standards. *Northwest Education*, 7(1), 2-11. Retrieved October 3, 2003, from <http://www.nwrel.org/nwedu/2001fall/t-second.html>
- Tienken, C., & Wilson, M. (2001). Using state standards and tests to improve instruction. *Practical Assessments, Research & Assessment*, 7(13). Retrieved October 12, 2003, from <http://edresearch.org/pare/getvn.asp?v=7&n=13>

- Ward, N., Goatley, V., & Machado, V. (2002). Teacher's use of new standards, frameworks, and assessments: Local cases of NYS elementary grade teaches. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*(2), 127-148.
- Winkler, A. (2002). Division in the ranks: Standardized testing draws lines between new and veteran teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(3), 219-226. Retrieved October 5, 2003, from <http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=7727013&db=aph>
- Zenger, W. F., & Zenger, S. K. (2002). Why teach certain material at specific grade levels? *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(3), 212-214.

Appendix A

**Survey of Fourth Grade Teachers Usage of the
New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards**

Survey of Fourth Grade Teachers Usage of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards

This survey is being administered as part of a master's degree research project. While your participation is voluntary and you are not required to answer any of the questions herein, your cooperation and participation are important to the success of the project and are greatly appreciated. If you chose to participate, please understand that all responses are strictly confidential and no personally identifiable information is being requested.

1. How long have you held this position? _____

2. Are you required to turn in lesson plans? (Circle one) Yes No

3. How often do you turn in lesson plans? (Circle one)
Weekly Monthly Marking period End of year Never

4. Are you comfortable using the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS)? (Circle One) Yes No

5. Are you required to cite the NJCCCS in your lesson plans? (Circle one) Yes No

6. Does your school have a developed curriculum for each subject? (Circle one) Yes No

7. How often do you consult the NJCCCS? (Circle one)
Never Yearly Monthly Weekly

8. Have you utilized the Curriculum Framework (CF) from the NJ Department of Education for developing lessons? (Circle one) Yes No

9. How many years have you been consulting the NJCCCS for use in creating lessons plans? (Circle one)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

10. Is your schools curriculum aligned with the NJCCCS? (Circle one) Yes No

For each of the following questions please circle one appropriate response.

11. Usually I write my lesson plans first, then find the appropriate NJCCCS.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
12. The NJCCCS provides clear expectations about student performance.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
13. I can easily find the appropriate standards for my lesson plans.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
14. The NJCCCS provide an accurate picture of what will be expected of my students on the NJASK.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
15. My school provides me with adequate professional development related to the NJCCCS.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
16. I can recognize the most important NJCCCS and emphasize them during instruction
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
17. I feel that the Cumulative Progress Indicators accurately reflect what I should expect from my students.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
18. I find the NJCCCS helpful in writing my lesson plans.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
19. My school's administration relies on standards based assessment to evaluate teacher performance.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
20. I feel the NJCCCS will help me prepare my students for the NJASK.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
21. I feel the NJCCCS are clear enough to be well understood by professional educators.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
22. I can get my questions about the NJCCCS answered at my school.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
23. I can cover all material contained in the NJCCCS in a typical school year.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
24. The NJCCCS contain the correct amount of content for fourth grade.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
25. I know what will be expected of my students on the NJASK.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

Appendix B

Cover Letter Accompanying Survey to Fourth Grade Teachers in Salem County, NJ

Michael McQueston
16 East Canal Street, PO Box 601
Alloway, NJ 08001
856-935-7326
bikemcq@hotmail.com

February 28, 2004

Dear Fourth Grade Teacher,

I am a graduate student at Rowan University in the Master of Science in Teaching Program and I am completing my research project. I am writing to you because only you have the information that I need to complete the work. As a fourth grade teacher you can provide accurate information about the role of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards in the classroom.

I am collecting data pertaining to 4th grade teachers' usage of the NJCCCS. Would you please complete the following 25-item survey and mail it back to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by no later than March 30, 2004. The survey should take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. The survey results are anonymous and the data will be used only for this research project. Thank you for your cooperation!

Sincerely,

Mike McQueston

Appendix C

2003 Test Result for the NJASK for Salem County School Districts

Alloway Township School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	50	16%	84%	0%
	District	2001-02	50	16%	84%	0%
	DFG	2001-02	15437	18.7%	76.8%	4.5%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	50	22%	48%	30%
	District	2001-02	50	22%	48%	30%
	DFG	2001-02	15470	29.2%	45.5%	25.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	48	22.9%	72.9%	4.2%
	District	2002-03	48	22.9%	72.9%	4.2%
	DFG	2002-03	15431	17.8%	79.1%	3.1%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	48	31.3%	47.9%	20.8%
	District	2002-03	48	31.3%	47.9%	20.8%
	DFG	2002-03	15381	28.7%	45.9%	25.4%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elmer School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	19	21.1%	68.4%	10.5%
	District	2001-02	19	21.1%	68.4%	10.5%
	DFG	2001-02	9199	24.9%	72%	3.2%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	19	10.5%	52.6%	36.8%
	District	2001-02	19	10.5%	52.6%	36.8%
	DFG	2001-02	9227	37%	42.7%	20.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	15	20%	80%	0%
	District	2002-03	15	20%	80%	0%
	DFG	2002-03	9256	25.8%	72.6%	1.6%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	15	26.7%	60%	13.3%
	District	2002-03	15	26.7%	60%	13.3%
	DFG	2002-03	9254	35.5%	45.1%	19.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elsinboro School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	18	55.6%	44.4%	0%
	District	2001-02	18	55.6%	44.4%	0%
	DFG	2001-02	15437	18.7%	76.8%	4.5%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	18	16.7%	61.1%	22.2%
	District	2001-02	18	16.7%	61.1%	22.2%
	DFG	2001-02	15470	29.2%	45.5%	25.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	16	25%	75%	0%
	District	2002-03	16	25%	75%	0%
	DFG	2002-03	15431	17.8%	79.1%	3.1%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	16	25%	43.8%	31.3%
	District	2002-03	16	25%	43.8%	31.3%
	DFG	2002-03	15381	28.7%	45.9%	25.4%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

Lower Alloway Creek School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	26	15.4%	80.8%	3.8%
	District	2001-02	26	15.4%	80.8%	3.8%
	DFG	2001-02	10963	28.2%	68.8%	2.9%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	26	19.2%	65.4%	15.4%
	District	2001-02	26	19.2%	65.4%	15.4%
	DFG	2001-02	11006	40.2%	43%	16.8%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	18	22.2%	77.8%	0%
	District	2002-03	18	22.2%	77.8%	0%
	DFG	2002-03	11414	30.6%	68.1%	1.4%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	18	27.8%	55.6%	16.7%
	District	2002-03	18	27.8%	55.6%	16.7%
	DFG	2002-03	11412	41.9%	41.6%	16.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Mannington Township School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	23	13%	78.3%	8.7%
	District	2001-02	23	13%	78.3%	8.7%
	DFG	2001-02	10963	28.2%	68.8%	2.9%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	23	30.4%	65.2%	4.3%
	District	2001-02	23	30.4%	65.2%	4.3%
	DFG	2001-02	11006	40.2%	43%	16.8%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	14	7.1%	92.9%	0%
	District	2002-03	14	7.1%	92.9%	0%
	DFG	2002-03	11414	30.6%	68.1%	1.4%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	14	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%
	District	2002-03	14	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%
	DFG	2002-03	11412	41.9%	41.6%	16.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2

Oldmans Township School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	32	34.4%	65.6%	0%
	District	2001-02	32	34.4%	65.6%	0%
	DFG	2001-02	9199	24.9%	72%	3.2%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	32	53.1%	34.4%	12.5%
	District	2001-02	32	53.1%	34.4%	12.5%
	DFG	2001-02	9227	37%	42.7%	20.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	37	24.3%	75.7%	0%
	District	2002-03	37	24.3%	75.7%	0%
	DFG	2002-03	9256	25.8%	72.6%	1.6%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	37	18.9%	64.9%	16.2%
	District	2002-03	37	18.9%	64.9%	16.2%
	DFG	2002-03	9254	35.5%	45.1%	19.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

Penns Grove/ Carney's Point School District
Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	166	41%	57.2%	1.8%
	District	2001-02	166	41%	57.2%	1.8%
	DFG	2001-02	10963	28.2%	68.8%	2.9%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	167	46.1%	40.7%	13.2%
	District	2001-02	167	46.1%	40.7%	13.2%
	DFG	2001-02	11006	40.2%	43%	16.8%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	182	43.4%	55.5%	1.1%
	District	2002-03	182	43.4%	55.5%	1.1%
	DFG	2002-03	11414	30.6%	68.1%	1.4%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	181	53.6%	37%	9.4%
	District	2002-03	181	53.6%	37%	9.4%
	DFG	2002-03	11412	41.9%	41.6%	16.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

**Pennsville School District
Central Park School**

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	36	11.1%	83.3%	5.6%
	District	2001-02	142	19.7%	76.8%	3.5%
	DFG	2001-02	9199	24.9%	72%	3.2%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	37	32.4%	37.8%	29.7%
	District	2001-02	144	36.8%	36.8%	26.4%
	DFG	2001-02	9227	37%	42.7%	20.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	57	14%	82.5%	3.5%
	District	2002-03	168	19.6%	79.2%	1.2%
	DFG	2002-03	9256	25.8%	72.6%	1.6%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	57	19.3%	61.4%	19.3%
	District	2002-03	168	25.6%	50.6%	23.8%
	DFG	2002-03	9254	35.5%	45.1%	19.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that

**Pennsville School District
Valley Park School**

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	55	38.2%	61.8%	0%
	District	2001-02	142	19.7%	76.8%	3.5%
	DFG	2001-02	9199	24.9%	72%	3.2%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	55	60%	29.1%	10.9%
	District	2001-02	144	36.8%	36.8%	26.4%
	DFG	2001-02	9227	37%	42.7%	20.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	63	31.7%	68.3%	0%
	District	2002-03	168	19.6%	79.2%	1.2%
	DFG	2002-03	9256	25.8%	72.6%	1.6%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	63	38.1%	42.9%	19%
	District	2002-03	168	25.6%	50.6%	23.8%
	DFG	2002-03	9254	35.5%	45.1%	19.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

**Pennsville School District
Penn Beach School**

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	51	5.9%	88.2%	5.9%
	District	2001-02	142	19.7%	76.8%	3.5%
	DFG	2001-02	9199	24.9%	72%	3.2%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	52	15.4%	44.2%	40.4%
	District	2001-02	144	36.8%	36.8%	26.4%
	DFG	2001-02	9227	37%	42.7%	20.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	48	10.4%	89.6%	0%
	District	2002-03	168	19.6%	79.2%	1.2%
	DFG	2002-03	9256	25.8%	72.6%	1.6%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	48	16.7%	47.9%	35.4%
	District	2002-03	168	25.6%	50.6%	23.8%
	DFG	2002-03	9254	35.5%	45.1%	19.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

Pittsgrove School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	132	22%	73.5%	4.5%
	District	2001-02	132	22%	73.5%	4.5%
	DFG	2001-02	9199	24.9%	72%	3.2%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	133	32.3%	42.9%	24.8%
	District	2001-02	133	32.3%	42.9%	24.8%
	DFG	2001-02	9227	37%	42.7%	20.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	123	26.8%	71.5%	1.6%
	District	2002-03	123	26.8%	71.5%	1.6%
	DFG	2002-03	9256	25.8%	72.6%	1.6%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	123	36.6%	48.8%	14.6%
	District	2002-03	123	36.6%	48.8%	14.6%
	DFG	2002-03	9254	35.5%	45.1%	19.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility

Quniton School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	34	8.8%	82.4%	8.8%
	District	2001-02	34	8.8%	82.4%	8.8%
	DFG	2001-02	10963	28.2%	68.8%	2.9%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	34	14.7%	47.1%	38.2%
	District	2001-02	34	14.7%	47.1%	38.2%
	DFG	2001-02	11006	40.2%	43%	16.8%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	28	7.1%	92.9%	0%
	District	2002-03	28	7.1%	92.9%	0%
	DFG	2002-03	11414	30.6%	68.1%	1.4%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	28	21.4%	32.1%	46.4%
	District	2002-03	28	21.4%	32.1%	46.4%
	DFG	2002-03	11412	41.9%	41.6%	16.5%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

Salem City School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	83	63.9%	36.1%	0%
	District	2001-02	84	64.3%	35.7%	0%
	DFG	2001-02	19302	39.6%	59.2%	1.2%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	85	76.5%	23.5%	0%
	District	2001-02	86	76.7%	23.3%	0%
	DFG	2001-02	19453	58%	33.1%	8.9%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	103	71.8%	28.2%	0%
	District	2002-03	103	71.8%	28.2%	0%
	DFG	2002-03	19915	45.3%	54.1%	0.6%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	102	72.5%	24.5%	2.9%
	District	2002-03	102	72.5%	24.5%	2.9%
	DFG	2002-03	19923	55.4%	33.7%	11%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Upper Pittsgrove School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	46	13%	82.6%	4.3%
	District	2001-02	46	13%	82.6%	4.3%
	DFG	2001-02	15437	18.7%	76.8%	4.5%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	46	13%	56.5%	30.4%
	District	2001-02	46	13%	56.5%	30.4%
	DFG	2001-02	15470	29.2%	45.5%	25.3%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	52	44.2%	53.8%	1.9%
	District	2002-03	52	44.2%	53.8%	1.9%
	DFG	2002-03	15431	17.8%	79.1%	3.1%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	52	40.4%	48.1%	11.5%
	District	2002-03	52	40.4%	48.1%	11.5%
	DFG	2002-03	15381	28.7%	45.9%	25.4%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2

Woodstown School District

Student Performance Indicators

ASSESSMENTS

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	99	11.1%	80.8%	8.1%
	District	2001-02	99	11.1%	80.8%	8.1%
	DFG	2001-02	12413	14.9%	78.8%	6.3%
	State	2001-02	103507	20.9%	73.1%	6%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2001-02	99	23.2%	45.5%	31.3%
	District	2001-02	99	23.2%	45.5%	31.3%
	DFG	2001-02	12437	22.7%	45.3%	32%
	State	2001-02	103870	31.5%	41.3%	27.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	101	11.9%	83.2%	5%
	District	2002-03	101	11.9%	83.2%	5%
	DFG	2002-03	13012	15.6%	80.2%	4.2%
	State	2002-03	106191	22.3%	73.8%	3.8%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK4) MATHEMATICS		Year	Number Tested	Proficiency Percentages		
				Partial	Proficient	Advanced
All Students details	School	2002-03	101	21.8%	50.5%	27.7%
	District	2002-03	101	21.8%	50.5%	27.7%
	DFG	2002-03	13004	25.6%	47.1%	27.3%
	State	2002-03	106040	32%	42.8%	25.2%

*To protect the privacy of students, the Department of Education suppresses sufficient information to eliminate the possibility that personally identifiable information will be disclosed.

