# U.S. Department of Education
## *2011 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program*
### *A Public School*

School Type (Public Schools):     ☐     ☑     ☐     ☐
(Check all that apply, if any)    Charter    Title 1    Magnet    Choice

Name of Principal:  Ms. Jacqueline Mammolito

Official School Name:  PS 48 William G Wilcox School

School Mailing Address:     1055 Targee Street

Staten Island, NY 10304-4450

County:  Richmond     State School Code Number:  353100010048

Telephone:  (718) 447-8323  E-mail:  JMammol@schools.nyc.gov

Fax:  (718) 815-3956     Web URL:  http://schoolschools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/31/R048

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

_____ Date _____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*: Ms. Erminia Claudio   Superintendent e-mail: Eclaudio@schools.nyc.gov

District Name: NYC District 31   District Phone:

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

_____ Date _____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Sam Pizzarolli

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

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

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

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

# PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.

3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2010-2011 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.

4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.

5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2005.

6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010.

7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

# PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

**All data are the most recent year available.**

**DISTRICT**

1. Number of schools in the district:     42   Elementary schools
   (per district designation)         10   Middle/Junior high schools
                                    7   High schools
                                    4   K-12 schools
                                63   Total schools in district

2. District per-pupil expenditure:     16692

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:   Urban or large central city

4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school:     7

5. Number of students as of October 1, 2010 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | | | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-------|-----------|-------------|-------------|---|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| PreK | 19 | 16 | 35 | | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K | 35 | 44 | 79 | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 41 | 43 | 84 | | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 45 | 38 | 83 | | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 48 | 39 | 87 | | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 37 | 37 | 74 | | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 25 | 35 | 60 | | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | **Total in Applying School:** | 502 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

|        |                                            |
|--------|--------------------------------------------|
| 0 %    | American Indian or Alaska Native           |
| 20 %   | Asian                                      |
| 4 %    | Black or African American                  |
| 16 %   | Hispanic or Latino                         |
| 0 %    | Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  |
| 60 %   | White                                      |
| 0 %    | Two or more races                          |
| 100 %  | Total                                      |

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2009-2010 school year:    11%

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

| (1) | Number of students who transferred *to* the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year. | 29 |
|-----|-----|-----|
| (2) | Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year. | 25 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]. | 54 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2009 | 506 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4). | 0.11 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100. | 11 |

8. Percent limited English proficient students in the school:                                  12%

   Total number of limited English proficient students in the school:                     42

   Number of languages represented, not including English:                              22

   Specify languages:

   Albanian, Arabic, Bengali, Cantonese, Cham, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Mandarin, Philipino, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Ukranian, Urdu

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:     44%

    Total number of students who qualify:     168

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services:     63%

    Total number of students served:     63

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | Autism | 0 | Orthopedic Impairment |
| 0 | Deafness | 9 | Other Health Impaired |
| 0 | Deaf-Blindness | 23 | Specific Learning Disability |
| 1 | Emotional Disturbance | 30 | Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 | Hearing Impairment | 0 | Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 0 | Mental Retardation | 0 | Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 0 | Multiple Disabilities | 0 | Developmentally Delayed |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

| | **Full-Time** | **Part-Time** |
|---|---|---|
| Administrator(s) | 1 | 0 |
| Classroom teachers | 20 | 0 |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | 8 | 7 |
| Paraprofessionals | 9 | 0 |
| Support staff | 10 | 0 |
| Total number | 48 | 7 |

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:     25:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only high schools need to supply graduation rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any student or teacher attendance rates under 95% and teacher turnover rates over 12% and fluctuations in graduation rates.

|  | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Daily student attendance | 89% | 92% | 92% | 88% | 87% |
| Daily teacher attendance | 95% | 95% | 92% | 94% | 94% |
| Teacher turnover rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| High school graduation rate | % | % | % | % | % |

If these data are not available, explain and provide reasonable estimates.

Since September 2005 to the present time our school population has increased by 20%. The population increase caused a changed in attendance trends. Many of our families take extended vacations during the school year which seriously impacts attendance. Percentages indicated above include pre-kindergarten and kindergarten - both which are noncompulsory. Teacher attendance for the years 2005-2008 was impacted by long term absences due to medical issues, and maternity/restoration of health.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools): Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2010 are doing as of Fall 2010.

Graduating class size:      0

Enrolled in a 4-year college or university      0%
Enrolled in a community college      0%
Enrolled in vocational training      0%
Found employment      0%
Military service      0%
Other      0%
**Total**      **0**%

# PART III - SUMMARY

P. S. 48 is an educational family committed to creating a community of learners. Our community includes students, staff and parents who are actively engaged in the learning process. High quality educational opportunities for success are enhanced by learning the skills of decision making, critical thinking, communication and technology. These skills are necessary in our culturally diverse and technologically advanced world. We realize the necessity for all members of the school community to share accountability for creating a positive supportive education environment. This environment demonstrates clear expectations and academic rigor, creating an atmosphere where students are motivated and work to their fullest potential. We are dedicated to implementing the New Common Core Standards and utilizing data-driven instructional programs in order to achieve successful learning for all students.

As a Collaborative Community Practice School, PS 48 prides itself in being a professional community of learners that shares best practices in teaching and learning with pedagogues throughout the district. Classroom teachers, as well as the Literacy Coach and the Principal participate in rigorous and ongoing Professional Development that is funded by a grant from the Staten Island Foundation and Title 1 funding. Ongoing Professional Development in literacy is provided by consultants from Literacy Support Systems. Sustainability is maintained daily as the Literacy Coach models lessons and mentors teachers who are new to the school as well as facilitate weekly planning meetings on each grade.

Teachers utilize a "workshop model" of instruction throughout the day where comprehension strategies are modeled to teach clear and specific reading, writing and mathematical strategies during each mini-lesson. The architecture of the mini-lesson is designed for direct teaching and demonstration. Conferences and guided strategy lessons are planned to provide our students with clear, precise and targeted instruction. Reading, writing and mathematics instruction is differentiated for all learners.

Academic Intervention services include Wilson and Fundations. P.S. 48 is a model for the School Wide Enrichment Model. Authentic community projects and activities that help students apply academic knowledge are developed by students. Budgetary resources (CFN 409 Professional Development Funds and Title 1) are allocated to enable a partnership with the creators of a School Wide Enrichment Model Program – IIM. The Independent Investigation Method allows both teachers and students to explore differentiated research techniques designed to support each style of learning.

PS 48 is a school that values Arts Education – our current program includes residency programs with The Solomon Guggenheim Museum, ArtsConnection, Dancing Classrooms and Marquis Studios. The PTA funds our twenty week Learning Through Art (Guggenheim) residency program for third and fourth grade classes.

A diverse population of students enables a rich cultural experience for students, staff and families. Monthly parent workshops and family nights celebrate our unique population and Arts programs. The PTA works closely with the Community Education Council and hosts visitations and meetings for members of the CEC.

P. S. 48 is committed to teaching the Golden Rule to all of our students – Treat Others The Way You Want To Be Treated. Students will learn to treat each other with patience, kindness and respect.

P. S. 48 is dedicated to the goal of helping all students succeed in learning. Our work toward reaching this goal is through standards driven instructional programs. It also includes expert professional development for staff and parents as well as collaborative parent and community partnerships.

PS 48 is a Title 1 school that currently retains twenty classroom teachers, four cluster teachers, one literacy coach and nine paraprofessionals. Our student register is 509 students that include 55 IEP and 45 ELL students.

PS 48 follows a balanced literacy program that includes Reader's and Writer's Workshop, Everyday Mathematics, NYC core Social Studies and Foss science curriculum. Teachers use the Independent Investigation Method (IIM) to teach Social Studies units 2-3 times throughout the school year. Teachers model their thinking and clearly articulate specific reading, writing and mathematical strategies within each mini-lesson.

The principle system that is the foundation for all of our professional work is grounded in the belief that assessment drives instruction. We understand that assessment is an ongoing process and that meeting the needs of all learners requires flexibility.

During the months of May and June teachers work together to draft grade specific curriculum units and end-of unit assessments with rubrics. Assessing student work samples is the most critical element of this exercise. Assessment data includes previous performance on standardized exams, Diagnostic Reading Assessments, Everyday Math Unit exams, teacher created tests and conference notes. As teachers begin getting to know the students in their new September class, weekly meetings are held with colleagues to redesign their curriculum maps to ensure they are meeting the needs of all students.

The current 2010-2011 school year is focused on aligning our reading/writing units to the Common Core Standards. New and/or revised units now include mythology, punctuation studies, differentiating our character and non-fiction units more clearly across the grades to include teaching points linked to common core standards.

PS 48 Partners:

- Staten Island Foundation – Literacy Support Systems

- CookShop for K-2 classes and Adult Cookshop

- Dancing Classrooms

- Marquis Studios

- ArtsConnection

- Learning Through Arts (Guggenheim)

- Sundog Theatre

- After-School Enrichment (prior to budget cuts) – Lego robotics, Mosaic, Mural painting, Photography, Junior Detectives (Science), cooking, etc.

# PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

**1. Assessment Results:**

For the 2009-2010 school year results, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the percent of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, 'These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.

This school has participated in the state assessment program (TCB/McGraw Hill) since 2005/2006 and students' scores are reported on levels. The four levels are as follows:

Level 1 - Far below grade level standards

Level 2 - Approaches grade-level standards

Level 3 - Meets grade-level standards (proficient)

Level 4 - Exceeds grade - level standards

Note that prior to the 2005/2006 school year, New York City public schools were tested with two different assessments. In the elementary schools, grade three and five students were tested with New York City generated assessments and grade 4 students were tested with new York State assessments. Because of the unreliability between the assessments administered, the data trends cited here will be from the 2005/2006 school year forward.

PS 48 maintains clear expectations and academic rigor for all students. New York State ELA and Mathematics tests administered to students grades 3-5 indicate student progress from 2005-2009. For the 2010 academic school year, ELA scores for all tested students at PS 48 decreased 14% and 10% in mathematics as compared to an overall NYC decrease of 30 -40%. PS 48 recognizes the disparities for Special Education students and English Language Learners. PS 48 is addressing this achievement gap by providing intense academic intervention services such as extended day (37.5 minute program) as well as after-school academic programs focusing on our ELL and Special Education population.

Over the last four years PS 48 has celebrated a 16% increase in all students scoring at Level 4 (exceeding standards) in ELA. Disadvantaged students scoring at Level 4 indicate a steady gain over the last four years rising from 33% to 82% in Mathematics. For the 2008-2009 school year 96% of all tested students scored at or above Level 3 and Level 4 on the New York State ELA exam. Testing trends at PS 48 indicate a steady increase for African American students scoring at level 3 and level 4 in both ELA and Math. Over the past two years, our third grade special needs population have shown a 22% increase on the New York State Math exam. In addition, PS 48 is extremely proud of our Hispanic or Latino subgroup who have shown a 13% increase moving from zero scoring at Level 4 on the New York State ELA in 2005-2009 to 13% scoring at level 4 in 2010.

PS 48 is a growing school community. Trends indicate a register growth of 25% for the last five years. As our registers increase and the number of Title 1 eligible students increase, PS 48 continues to raise the bar for all students as evidenced by assessment data, New York State Progress Reports, School Quality Review and New York State test scores.

Below, please find the website URL where information for our state assessment results can be found.

http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/data/TestResults/ELAandMathTestResults

## 2. Using Assessment Results:

Students receive small group instruction based on a careful analysis of New York State test scores and classroom assessments. Bimonthly Inquiry Core Team meetings are used to study student work samples and create units of study in reading and writing. On-Demand writing assessments and genre specific end of unit reading assessments are administered monthly. Teachers analyze the results of these assessments to plan future lessons tailored to the needs of individual students. Weekly common preparation periods are scheduled between teachers, the Data Specialist and Literacy Coach. At these meetings, teachers refer to their conference notes and student work samples to group students for small group differentiated instruction based on data. Teachers prepare goals for students in order to become more proficient in all content areas. Goal setting is flexible throughout the school year. In addition, monthly meetings are scheduled for classroom teachers to meet with the ESL Teacher and Service Providers to share information regarding student performance. PS 48 also conducts "vertical grade meetings" in order for teachers to become familiar with the curriculum that students are expected to master across the grades. The School Wide Enrichment Model includes an Independent Investigation Model (IIM) in which students conduct research, gather data and create an independent project based on their own interest. Data from these research projects indicates an increase in social studies performance. Attendance data indicates that stronger attendance incentives are necessary. 100% attendance pizza parties and pencils are currently used as incentives. The New York City Department of Education asks parents and teachers on a yearly basis to complete a Learning Environment Survey. Results from this survey are shared with the entire school community on the internet and data from this survey is instrumental in improving student and school performance. Our school's Learning Environment Survey data show that teachers and parents are highly satisfied with the learning conditions at PS 48.

## 3. Communicating Assessment Results:

PS 48 has a motto – We're more than a school – we're a family! Our families are active partners in the school community. In order to maximize parental involvement, there are multiple opportunities for parents to stay informed about their children's curriculum and academic progress. Within the first month of school, PS 48 conducts a "Curriculum Night" for families where teachers discuss the grade curriculum and demonstrate a typical reading/writing or math lesson. At this meeting, parents are provided with the New York State Standards in order for them to know what is expected of their children at each grade. Providing this information to parents prior to the November Parent-Teacher conferences allows for a more meaningful parent-teacher conference. In addition, there is often regular e-mail between teachers and parents and our PTA. There is also a PTA website which includes curriculum maps, homework assignments and monthly newsletters from teachers. Each month every class holds a publishing party where family members are invited to the classroom to celebrate student writing. The School Leadership Team and PTA meet monthly and all data is shared with families. Parent workshops are offered twice each month facilitated by the literacy coach, parent coordinator and social worker. These meetings offer parents the opportunity to review rubrics and monthly units of study in all subject areas. PS 48 offers Family Fun Night on the last Friday of each month. Open School Week is held twice yearly affording parents the opportunity to visit classrooms to observe the instructional day. New York City schools participate in online Predictive assessments in ELA and Mathematics. Students in grades 3-5 are administered ELA and Math Predictive assessments 3-4 times a year. Results are shared with parents and teachers assign homework online to support the results of the assessments. Students are provided with individual passwords and parents review their child's scores. Information on Acuity includes students'

strengths and challenges so both teachers and parents can assign student work. Follow-up conferences are made with the parents of those students who are not showing adequate progress and individual goals are developed with parental involvement.

**4. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

PS 48 is a Collaborative Community School. Teachers and Principals from throughout District 31 visit classroom instruction at PS 48 to observe best practices in literacy and social studies. After each school visit, time is allotted for teachers to discuss their observations in a collegial setting. Our reader's and writer's workshop is used as a model throughout the district. Teachers from PS 48 visit other schools to provide professional development and assist teachers who are new to the balanced literacy model. Our work with the School Wide Enrichment Model Independent Investigation Method is used as a model for teachers across the country. Two teachers from PS 48 attended a week long institute in New Hampshire to become Trainers in the IIM. These teachers then facilitated professional development to approximately fifty teachers in the district. The Principal participates in a study group based on Elmore's work Instructional Rounds and attends monthly visits to schools observing classroom instruction focusing on problems of practice. Our arts programs are recognized by the New York City Department of Education and we are often called upon to demonstrate how arts are integrated into the curriculum. The Principal is a Cahn Fellow (2009). The Cahn Fellows Program, Teacher's College, Columbia University honors distinguished Principals of New York City and provides opportunities for professional, intellectual and personal growth with the goal of improving school performance. PS 48 is a member of Children's First Network 409, a group of thirty schools who share similar philosophies in education. Our network places a high premium on professional development for school leaders and teachers. Monthly meetings include inter-visitations to other network schools to share best instructional practices. Each school's Inquiry Team attend meetings throughout the year to examine student work and plan for instruction.
Our teachers demonstrate integrity for the profession for teaching by eagerly supporting student teachers from Oneonta College, College of Staten Island, St. John's University, Cortlandt College, Hofstra University and Brooklyn College.

# PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

## 1. Curriculum:

PS 48 uses a standards-based Balanced/Comprehensive Literacy Program of study for all students including ELL and IEP students. Balanced Literacy stresses the essential dimensions of reading through explicit teaching of phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and expressiveness, vocabulary, and comprehension. Daily read-alouds, independent reading time, reading workshop, writing workshop and systematic word study instruction are key features of the approach. Teachers demonstrate the habits and strategies of effective reading and writing though a variety of structures: read aloud, guided reading, shared reading, interactive writing and mini lessons in reading and writing. By coaching students in individual or small group conferences, teachers allow students to successfully and independently apply those strategies to their own reading and writing.

Classroom libraries are the centerpiece of Balanced Literacy. These libraries allow teachers to organize instruction around authentic literature. Extensive use of classroom libraries encourages students to read and write about a variety of topics they know and like. The libraries are designed so that each grade will have a common core of books that span a range of reading levels and cover all kinds of literature from picture books, chapter books, novels, poetry and nonfiction.

PS 48 teaches a writer's workshop based on Lucy Calkins Teacher's College Writer's Project. In Kindergarten, children are introduced to writing their stories through illustrations. By the fifth grade students write rigorous and creative pieces that are assessed based on the Common Core Standards. Students are taught to respond to literature and study different writing genres throughout the school year. Teachers use mentor texts in mini-lessons that highlight an author's particular writing style. Students practice writing as authors. Monthly publishing celebrations include parents and members of the school community.

The Staten Island Foundation awarded PS 48 a literacy grant for our school to work with literacy consultants. These consultants provide month professional development for teachers and assist in aligning curriculum to the Common Core Standards.

PS 48 supplements the mathematics curriculum with constructivist problem solving opportunities for students on all grade levels. Regular and ongoing evaluations using problems that are aligned to the process strands allow the school to determine whether students have a conceptual understanding of mathematical content. Students' constructed responses are assessed using grade appropriate rubrics. Student work is discussed at grade meetings and the math program is adjusted, as necessary, based on students' ability/inability to problem solve. Furthermore, the New York State Curriculum Alignment Committee will review curriculum maps representing all grade levels to update content to include skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, and student outcomes to be attained.

The technology program at PS 48 empowers and prepares our students with the technological knowledge and skills to meet technology standards needed at the college level. Students in grades K-5 use interactive hardware such as iBooks, Windows, laptops data projectors, SMARTboards, Senteos, iPods and digital cameras. Software such as Microsoft Office, PrintShop, Kidspiration and iLife are utilized to create challenging projects that are integrated into all curriculum areas. ESL students use Imagine Learning as a technological program that differentiates instruction for all modalities of the ESL student. Imagine Learning assesses student progress and supplies targeted instruction for ESL students. All classrooms are equipped with laptops and interactive SMARTboards.

PS 48 follows the New York City FOSS Science curriculum. The FOSS Science program emphasizes a hands-on inquiry-based approach to learning. This system engages students as they explore the natural world by providing science experiences that are appropriate to their cognitive development. Trade books

correlated to each science topic are placed in all classroom libraries. There are two science teachers in the school building (lower and upper grade). Students receive science instruction 2-3 times weekly.

PS 48 is a small building with limited space for physical education, yet our Physical Education program is outstanding. Students receive instruction 1-2 times per week and learn the fundamentals and basic skills of basketball, soccer, tennis and paddle ball. Our students are featured in the Might Milers newsletter. Our school also participates in Move to Improve and Step Up to Health. All second grade classes receive an 8 week swim course with the YMCA.

Arts are thriving at PS 48! Third and Fourth grade classes receive Visual Arts instruction with Teaching Artists from the Solomon Guggenheim Museum. Kindergarten and First grade students study Creative Arts with ArtsConnection and Marquis Studios teaches second graders a Circus Arts program. SunDog Theater artists work in fourth and fifth grade classes as they study the Revolutionary War and Civil War. Students write scripts to dramatize history lessons. Other programs include after-school violin and Taiko drumming.

Our visual arts program is integrated into the social studies curriculum. Art Educators from the Solomon Guggenheim Museum work in our third and fourth grade classrooms for a twenty week residency program. Classroom teachers and teaching artists plan their social studies units in September and meet regularly to review student progress.

**2. Reading/English:**

Kindergarten students begin the school year immersed in literacy.  Shared reading, nursery rhymes, pattern books and read alouds are used to teach students the reading behaviors they will need to increase reading achievement throughout their school years. The repetition and rhyme of these texts provides additional support for non-English speaking students as well as engage all students in the behaviors of reading. Teachers use these texts to teach students proper handling of books, left to right reading, punctuation and sight words. The Fundations Wilson Program provides additional support with daily letter sound drills, letter formation, phonics instruction and using letter sounds to form words. Interactive writing and writer's workshop support reading every day.  Students are introduced to the reader's and writer's workshop in Kindergarten. The workshop model consists of a ten minute mini-lesson where students are gathered in a meeting area to observe the teacher demonstrate a reading or writing strategy using a mentor text. Teachers "think aloud" their questions and understandings. Students are encouraged to practice this lesson in their own individual small leveled books as they are in the meeting area and discuss their learning with a reading partner. The teacher carefully listens and records their brief conversations to determine comprehension of the modeled lesson. Students then return to their tables to continue practicing the skill while the classroom teacher meets with individual students on personal reading goals set for students based on data.  As the students move into grades one and two, teachers begin a differentiated word study program using Fountas and Pinnell **Words Their Way** as a mentor text.  The word study program is differentiated for students based on weekly assessments and student interest.  Shared reading is replaced by daily interactive read-alouds that are used to develop conversations and increase comprehension skills. Teachers carefully model their own thinking and ideas aloud as they read books to children. In the reader's/writer's workshop teachers begin to teach month- long units of study teaching children the elements of a story, retelling a story, the main idea of a story, details and inference.  Students are engaged in character studies as they learn about relationships between characters and begin to understand problems and solutions in fiction reading. Students are introduced to a variety of reading and writing genres - fiction, non-fiction, fables, fairy tales and realistic fiction.

As students move into grades 3-5, they are required to read independently to practice a reading strategy for 40-50 minutes each day.  Teachers meet with small groups of students to provide direct strategy lessons and confer with their students. Students are introduced to additional reading genre - engaging mysteries, realistic fiction, legends and historical fiction. Non-fiction periodicals, magazines and poetry are used as additional instructional tools in the classroom to teach deeper comprehension strategies.   Students are taught how to develop theories and they learn to infer and synthesize what

they are reading. The goal of our reading program throughout the grades is for students to develop higher order levels of understanding texts and to demonstrate their proficiency through conversations and writing about reading.

As data is assessed, students who must improve reading skills receive additional support from the IEP teacher, Literacy Coach and ELL Teacher. Students receive small group instruction i before/after school or during a push-in intervention period of the school day.

## 3. Mathematics:

PS 48 uses Everyday Mathematics, which is a research-based curriculum developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project. It is designed around the way children learn mathematics. Once a concept or skill is introduced, the curriculum strategically revisits it over time to reinforce recent and past learning, guides students towards mastery and promotes long-term retention.

In the early grades, students begin the lesson with a math message. During this time, children demonstrate their problem solving skills in their math journals. Everyday Math employs hands-on materials and reinforcement through games. Math games are used throughout each unit to practice and demonstrate knowledge of the content area. The content strands of Everyday Math emphasize algorithms, estimation, mental math and problem solving. Each math unit includes an end of unit math assessment that informs teachers as to the mastery level of the student. To differentiate instruction, selected students are administered the end of unit exam prior to teaching the unit. Students who demonstrate mastery of the content area "compact out" of the lessons and receive enrichment math lessons and/or interest research projects. Both remediation and enrichment opportunities are woven within the math lessons. Teachers meet with small groups of students to assess their work and to demonstrate additional math strategies and content. Our recent New York State test data indicates the need for additional instruction in problem solving. Teachers now support the Everyday Math program using problem solving exemplars. Working in small groups twice a week students are taught a variety of strategies to choose from when solving word problems. These strategies are posted in the room as an easy reference for students. Teachers instruct students to use a problem solving plan - think, plan solve and check. This is a differentiated approach for all learners as there are many entry levels to solve the problem, such as computation and/or conceptual skills.

## 4. Additional Curriculum Area:

PS 48 utilizes the Independent Investigation Method to teach the New York City Social Studies Core Program. Teachers attended summer institutes at the University of Connecticut to receive professional development in gifted and talented education. Two of our teachers deepened their studies and are now trainers and facilitators to pedagogues throughout the district. Teachers and administrators visit our school to study student work and learn the process of IIM.

The Independent Investigation Method (IIM) is a process that engages students of all levels with their own learning, empowering them to become researchers as they study curriculum content. This method engages students in authentic research practices culminating with a project based presentation. Students begin to learn this method at the basic level by participating in a whole class research project that is facilitated by the teacher. As students are introduced to social studies content using trade books, realia, and field trips, they chart their individual goal setting questions and learn the sequential steps to conduct research to gather analyze and share information. Students gather and organize note facts. During this process the teacher is checking research skills and content knowledge acquisition. The information must be organized and used in a small group or individual product to share their new knowledge. As students become more proficient at conducting research the products become more individualized. IIM is differentiated by grade level and ability level.

## 5. Instructional Methods:

The PS 48 learning community strives to differentiate instruction to best meet the needs of all learners. The workshop model of instruction provides opportunities for teachers to teach standardized curriculum in a differentiated manner.   Teachers begin the reader's/writer's workshop by gathering students to the meeting area and begin a ten minute mini-lesson modeling and demonstrating comprehension strategies to the whole class.  Students practice these strategies in their own independent leveled reading books while seated in the meeting area and discuss their books with a reading partner. Teachers carefully listen to the conversations and record student responses as a way of assessing comprehension of the mini-lesson strategy.  Students then return to their seats to continue to read and work on the strategy they newly learned or an individual reading/writing goal the teacher has developed based on assessments and data. As students read at their seats to practice reading strategies, teachers meet individually with students to work on the individual reading or writing goals. The teacher will also meet with a small group of students who are working on a similar goal.

 Our word study program is based on Fountas and Pinnell Words their Way and Fundations. Teachers and students select their own words to study. Students are assessed weekly on spelling and vocabulary. To supplement instruction for struggling students, additional time is scheduled before/after school. The ESL Teacher works in an after school program to provide modified instruction to second language learners. The IEP teacher works with small groups of students during the school day and before/after school. The Literacy Coach provides a push-in model of instruction to work with struggling learners. The components of the workshop model are as follows:

Teacher directed mini lesson 10-15 minutes (20%)
Active engagement 5-10 minutes (13.3%)
Share 5 minutes (6.6%)
Independent practice 30-45 minutes (depending on grade level) (60%)

## 6. Professional Development:

Professional Development for all staff members is a priority at PS 48. Funding for a literacy grant from the Staten Island Foundation supports professional development in reading and writing. Literacy consultants work monthly with teachers and provide demonstration lessons in classrooms. Teachers and consultants develop rubrics based on Common Core Standards and key teaching points that support student performance. In addition, each classroom teacher receives a cycle of professional development with the literacy coach based on personal teaching goals and administrative decisions. Teachers also meet and visit classrooms to observe best practices by colleagues. As stated earlier, teachers attended IIM training in New Hampshire to become teacher trainers. Eight teachers and the Principal attended a weeklong institute at the University of Connecticut to receive professional development in the Renzulli Method of instruction. The Physical Education teacher and Science teacher attend Professional Development offered by the DoE. Teachers meet and plan with ArtsPartners weekly to support Arts and Literacy goals. Professional Development sessions are provided weekly to Para-Professionals to assist with IEP Goals that support student learning. Monthly grade meetings and faculty conferences are used to provide professional development in the area of Phase 1 Special Education Initiatives. CFN 409 provides professional development to teachers in Common Core Standards, Social Studies, ELL, Special Education and Inquiry work.

Data analysis is used to prepare the focus of inquiry at PS 48. After analyzing New York State Assessment results, the Core Inquiry team plans a focus of study for the year to best improve student learning and increase student performance. This team provides the professional development by demonstrating lessons and providing materials to classroom teachers monthly to support instruction. The Inquiry team meets twice a month to examine student work samples to measure student progress.

The Professional Development model at PS 48 is shared with colleagues within the Network.

**7. School Leadership:**

"The most powerful form of learning, the most sophisticated form of staff development, comes not from listening to the good words of others, but from sharing what we know with each other. Learning comes more from giving than receiving. By reflecting on what we do by giving it coherence, and by sharing and articulating our craft knowledge, we make meaning, we learn." Roland Barth

The above statement defines the leadership philosophy at PS 48. Decision making is a shared and collaborative endeavor. Best instructional practices are celebrated and shared within the school community and with colleagues throughout the district. PS 48 is in the process of implementing Instructional Rounds within the school between teachers and the Principal. Accomplishing this new venture requires trust and respect between all parties. All constituents of the school community share a common vision for our school and students and work together to make that vision a reality. The Principal supervises and contributes to the many committees and teams that are in place to improve student performance. The Principal is also asked to mentor new Principals to the New York City Department of Education. The Principal takes an active role in the following teams and committees:

The School Leadership Team is composed of an equal number of staff and parents. The team is an advisory committee to the Principal and meets monthly to discuss school policies, budgeting and staffing.

The PTA executive board meets monthly with the Principal to discuss school/parent involvement. The PTA executive board and the Parent Coordinator play an active role on various school teams and committees

Our School Safety Team meets monthly to discuss any safety issues that affect the school and the team is responsible to create a school safety plan, crisis intervention plan and emergency medical response plan.

The Pupil Personnel Support Team consists of Related Service Providers, Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist and Principal. This team meets twice a month inviting teachers to the meetings to discuss students who are at risk of meeting promotional criteria. Teachers are provided with additional strategies and supports to increase student achievement.

The school Core Inquiry Team meets twice a month to study the patterns and trends of student performance based on classroom data. Based on 2009-2010 data, this year the primary focus of inquiry will use writing to deepen thinking about text. The Cory Inquiry team models lessons and provides materials for all grades 2-5. Student work samples are reviewed at each meeting and lessons are modified to increase student performance.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics        Grade: 3   Test: NYS Math

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2010 Publisher: CTB/McGraw Hill

|  | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing Month | May | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 89 | 100 | 100 | 96 | 93 |
| Level 4 | 52 | 63 | 53 | 51 | 51 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 59 | 64 | 64 | 45 |
| Percent of total students tested | 14 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 12 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 88 | 100 | 100 | 96 | 100 |
| Level 4 | 60 | 58 | 66 | 38 | 37 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 31 | 29 | 40 | 19 |
| **2. African American Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 70 | 100 |  | 100 |  |
| Level 4 | 40 | 50 |  | 42 |  |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 10 |  | 12 |  |
| **4. Special Education Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 91 |  |  |  |  |
| Level 4 | 55 |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| **5. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students tested |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6. Asian** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 89 | 94 | 93 | 100 |  |
| Level 4 | 67 | 81 | 73 | 56 |  |
| Number of students tested | 18 | 16 | 15 | 16 |  |

**NOTES:** There was no available data for certain subgroups in 2005-2009. This is because there were too few students within these subgroups.

11NY16

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading　　　　　　　　Grade: 3 Test: NY State ELA

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2010 Publisher: CTB/McGraw Hill

|  | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing Month | Apr | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 84 | 96 | 93 | 92 | 85 |
| Level 4 | 48 | 38 | 22 | 16 | 17 |
| Number of students tested | 73 | 60 | 65 | 64 | 42 |
| Percent of total students tested | 14 | 13 | 16 | 17 | 11 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 87 | 96 | 88 | 100 | 100 |
| Level 4 | 39 | 43 | 21 | 10 | 13 |
| Number of students tested | 33 | 30 | 33 | 41 | 16 |
| **2. African American Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **3. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 70 | 82 | | 77 | |
| Level 4 | 20 | 27 | | 15 | |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 11 | | 13 | |
| **4. Special Education Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 64 | | | | |
| Level 4 | 9 | | | | |
| Number of students tested | 11 | | | | |
| **5. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **6. Asian** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 93 | 100 | 86 | 91 | 28 |
| Level 4 | 64 | 59 | 36 | 18 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 14 | 17 | 14 | 11 | 10 |

**NOTES:** There was no available data for certain subgroups in 2005-2009. This is because there were too few students within these subgroups.

11NY16

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics          Grade: 4 Test: NY State Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2010 Publisher: CTB/McGraw Hill

|  | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing Month | May | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 87 | 99 | 98 | 91 | 90 |
| Level 4 | 52 | 68 | 45 | 34 | 33 |
| Number of students tested | 78 | 85 | 79 | 71 | 51 |
| Percent of total students tested | 13 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 11 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 90 | 96 | 100 | 100 | 96 |
| Level 4 | 50 | 61 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| Number of students tested | 30 | 31 | 40 | 40 | 13 |
| **2. African American Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **3. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | 100 | | |
| Level 4 | | | 31 | | |
| Number of students tested | | | 13 | | |
| **4. Special Education Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | 80 |
| Level 4 | | | | | 10 |
| Number of students tested | | | | | 10 |
| **5. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **6. Asian** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 89 | 94 | 93 | 100 | |
| Level 4 | 67 | 81 | 73 | 56 | |
| Number of students tested | 18 | 16 | 15 | 16 | |

**NOTES:**  There was no available data for certain subgroups in 2005-2009. This is because there were too few students within these subgroups.

11NY16

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading                    Grade: 4 Test: NY State ELA

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2010 Publisher: CTB/McGraw Hill

|  | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing Month | Apr | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 89 | 97 | 92 | 74 | 86 |
| Level 4 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 23 |
| Number of students tested | 62 | 69 | 60 | 53 | 41 |
| Percent of total students tested | 12 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 11 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 93 | 97 | 89 | 73 | 100 |
| Level 4 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Number of students tested | 28 | 31 | 37 | 33 | 13 |
| **2. African American Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **3. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | 91 | | |
| Level 4 | | | 0 | | |
| Number of students tested | | | 12 | | |
| **4. Special Education Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | 46 |
| Level 4 | | | | | 0 |
| Number of students tested | | | | | 11 |
| **5. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **6. Asian** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 100 | 93 | 93 | 93 | |
| Level 4 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 14 | |
| Number of students tested | 17 | 15 | 14 | 14 | |

**NOTES:**   There was no available data for certain subgroups in 2005-2009. This is because there were too few students within these subgroups.

11NY16

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics                    Grade: 5 Test: NY State Math

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2010 Publisher: CTB/McGraw Hill

|  | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing Month | May | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 91 | 99 | 98 | 97 | 95 |
| Level 4 | 51 | 53 | 57 | 48 | 45 |
| Number of students tested | 78 | 68 | 54 | 40 | 54 |
| Percent of total students tested | 15 | 15 | 13 | 10 | 14 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 89 | 96 | 100 | 96 | 100 |
| Level 4 | 39 | 61 | 35 | 30 | 30 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 31 | 40 | 23 | 33 |
| **2. African American Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **3. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 80 | 100 | 100 | | |
| Level 4 | 40 | 31 | 50 | | |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 13 | 10 | | |
| **4. Special Education Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | 91 | |
| Level 4 | | | | 36 | |
| Number of students tested | | | | 11 | |
| **5. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **6. Asian** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 95 | 94 | 100 | | |
| Level 4 | 55 | 82 | 80 | | |
| Number of students tested | 20 | 17 | 15 | | |

**NOTES:** There was no available data for certain subgroups in 2005-2009. This is because there were too few students within these subgroups.

11NY16

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading          Grade: 5 Test: NY State ELA

Edition/Publication Year: 2005-2010 Publisher: CTB/McGraw Hill

|  | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing Month | Apr | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 75 | 94 | 95 | 81 | 88 |
| Level 4 | 19 | 18 | 13 | 12 | 24 |
| Number of students tested | 77 | 66 | 55 | 42 | 63 |
| Percent of total students tested | 15 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 17 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 59 | 92 | 92 | 79 | 97 |
| Level 4 | 6 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 15 |
| Number of students tested | 36 | 38 | 36 | 24 | 32 |
| **2. African American Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **3. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | 93 | | | |
| Level 4 | | 31 | | | |
| Number of students tested | | 13 | | | |
| **4. Special Education Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | 46 | |
| Level 4 | | | | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | | | | 11 | |
| **5. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| **6. Asian** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 70 | 100 | 94 | | |
| Level 4 | 25 | 27 | 27 | | |
| Number of students tested | 20 | 15 | 15 | | |

**NOTES:** There was no available data for certain subgroups in 2005-2009. This is because there were too few students within these subgroups.

11NY16

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics                              Grade: 0

| | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing Month | May | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 89 | 99 | 99 | 95 | 93 |
| Level 4 | 51 | 61 | 53 | 45 | 44 |
| Number of students tested | 216 | 196 | 179 | 159 | 149 |
| Percent of total students tested | 43 | 43 | 43 | 42 | 39 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 89 | 100 | 100 | 98 | 99 |
| Level 4 | 82 | 53 | 46 | 33 | 34 |
| Number of students tested | 99 | 100 | 105 | 96 | 65 |
| **2. African American Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | 93 | 89 | 88 |
| Level 4 | | | 29 | 12 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | | | 14 | 17 | 17 |
| **3. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 73 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 90 |
| Level 4 | 38 | 40 | 36 | 20 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 29 | 30 | 25 | 24 | 20 |
| **4. Special Education Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 75 | 100 | 100 | 89 | 75 |
| Level 4 | 25 | 30 | 9 | 19 | 20 |
| Number of students tested | 24 | 20 | 22 | 27 | 20 |
| **5. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | 74 | 93 | | |
| Level 4 | | 15 | 43 | | |
| Number of students tested | | 13 | 14 | | |
| **6. Asian** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 93 | 96 | 98 | 97 | 100 |
| Level 4 | 64 | 82 | 82 | 68 | 57 |
| Number of students tested | 52 | 50 | 44 | 34 | 28 |
| **NOTES:** There was no available data for certain subgroups in 2005-2009. This is because there were too few students within these subgroups. | | | | | |

11NY16

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading                    Grade: 0

|  | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Testing Month | Apr | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan |
| **SCHOOL SCORES** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 86 | 96 | 93 | 85 | 85 |
| Level 4 | 26 | 21 | 12 | 10 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 212 | 194 | 177 | 155 | 146 |
| Percent of total students tested | 42 | 42 | 43 | 41 | 39 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **SUBGROUP SCORES** | | | | | |
| **1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 97 | 96 | 77 | 87 | 97 |
| Level 4 | 17 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 15 |
| Number of students tested | 97 | 105 | 99 | 98 | 61 |
| **2. African American Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | | 86 | 72 | 63 |
| Level 4 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students tested | | | 14 | 18 | 16 |
| **3. Hispanic or Latino Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 67 | 91 | 96 | 77 | 95 |
| Level 4 | 19 | 23 | 8 | 8 | 11 |
| Number of students tested | 27 | 31 | 24 | 26 | 19 |
| **4. Special Education Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 62 | 96 | 76 | 59 | 48 |
| Level 4 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of students tested | 24 | 22 | 21 | 27 | 21 |
| **5. English Language Learner Students** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | | 64 | 57 | | |
| Level 4 | | 0 | 7 | | |
| Number of students tested | | 11 | 14 | | |
| **6. Asian** | | | | | |
| Levels 3 & 4 | 86 | 98 | 91 | 93 | 92 |
| Level 4 | 35 | 36 | 21 | 20 | 38 |
| Number of students tested | 51 | 47 | 43 | 30 | 24 |

**NOTES:** There was no available data for certain subgroups in 2005-2009. This is because there were too few students within these subgroups.

11NY16