

U.S. Department of Education
2010 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Type of School: (Check all that apply) Charter Title I Magnet Choice

Name of Principal: Ms. Christie Angrisano

Official School Name: Clinton Street Elementary School

School Mailing Address:
4100 Clinton Street
West Seneca, NY 14224-1604

County: Erie State School Code Number*: 142801060015

Telephone: (716) 677-3620 Fax: (716) 674-7821

Web site/URL: www.wscschools.org E-mail: cangrisano@westseneca.wnyric.org

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*: Mrs. Jean Kovach

District Name: West Seneca CSD Tel: (716) 677-3100

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: Mrs. Carol Jarczyk

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 2009-2010 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 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.
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 (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: (per district designation)
- | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| 7 | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
| 2 | Middle/Junior high schools |
| 2 | High schools |
| | K-12 schools |
| 11 | TOTAL |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 14330

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- Urban or large central city
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
 Suburban
 Small city or town in a rural area
 Rural

4. 10 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

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

| Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total | Grade | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|--|------------|--------------|-------------|-------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK | 20 | 19 | 39 | 6 | 43 | 33 | 76 |
| K | 34 | 31 | 65 | 7 | | | 0 |
| 1 | 32 | 36 | 68 | 8 | | | 0 |
| 2 | 30 | 39 | 69 | 9 | | | 0 |
| 3 | 36 | 39 | 75 | 10 | | | 0 |
| 4 | 52 | 38 | 90 | 11 | | | 0 |
| 5 | 41 | 36 | 77 | 12 | | | 0 |
| TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL | | | | | | | 559 |

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 1 % American Indian or Alaska Native
1 % Asian
1 % Black or African American
1 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
94 % White
2 % 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 past year: 2 %

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

| | | |
|-----|--|-------|
| (1) | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 7 |
| (2) | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year. | 5 |
| (3) | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]. | 12 |
| (4) | Total number of students in the school as of October 1. | 549 |
| (5) | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4). | 0.022 |
| (6) | Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100. | 2.186 |

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 0 %

Total number limited English proficient 0

Number of languages represented: 0

Specify languages:

Our district serves all elementary LEP students in one building. Therefore, prospective Clinton Street Elementary students who meet the LEP criteria do not attend our school.

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 28 %

Total number students who qualify: 155

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

10. Students receiving special education services: 6 %

Total Number of Students Served: 34

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

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <u>1</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>2</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>7</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>2</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>22</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed |

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

| | Number of Staff | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | <u>Full-Time</u> | <u>Part-Time</u> |
| Administrator(s) | <u>1</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Classroom teachers | <u>28</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Special resource teachers/specialists | <u>6</u> | <u>5</u> |
| Paraprofessionals | <u>7</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Support staff | <u>4</u> | <u>6</u> |
| Total number | <u>46</u> | <u>11</u> |

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 middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance | 97% | 96% | 97% | 96% | 96% |
| Daily teacher attendance | 96% | 96% | 95% | 98% | 97% |
| Teacher turnover rate | 6% | 4% | 11% | 12% | 24% |
| Student dropout rate | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Please provide all explanations below.

The 04-05 teacher turn-over rate of 24% reflects several retirements.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

| | |
|--|-----|
| 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 (travel, staying home, etc.) | 0 % |
| Unknown | 0 % |
| Total | 0 % |

PART III - SUMMARY

Students have been happily attending and learning at Clinton Street Elementary School since it opened in 1967. Our school is located in West Seneca, NY, a first ring suburb of the city of Buffalo. We are an economically diverse community and our school is currently assigned Title I status. Clinton is a microcosm of the surrounding area, and by having experiences with those from backgrounds and circumstances different than their own, our students are learning valuable lessons in respect, acceptance, empathy, and tolerance. Our slogan is “Clinton Cares” and the entire school community has a tradition of rallying around character education and service projects, such as the *Relay for Life*, and making blankets for *Project Linus*.

The following vision, mission, and belief statements were developed by staff and parents on our Shared Decision Making Team. These represent our overarching philosophy and goals.

VISION: Success for all students.

MISSION: To promote good character; to encourage excellence in academics, literacy and the arts; and to develop life-long learners in partnership with parents and the community.

BELIEFS: All children deserve a quality education and a healthy, safe environment in which to learn.

Having compared our statements to those of other schools, we realize that they could be considered “variations on a theme.” However, though typical on the surface, we believe that they derive power when coupled with actions that we, at Clinton, take to make them our reality. Using the model developed by Richard DuFour, Robert Eaker, et al., we have grown from a collegial group of educators to a true *Professional Learning Community (PLC)* with high expectations for ourselves. We continually ask the critical questions that guide the work of *PLC*’s: “What do we want students to learn? How will we know if they have learned? What do we do when they don’t learn? What do we do when they already know it?” We use data and information to help us answer those questions, and collaborate to find the best and most effective practices to ensure that all students succeed. We focus on each child’s strengths and use interests as a vehicle to promote engagement. We truly do “whatever it takes” so that every child learns at high levels, whether intervention, extension, or enrichment is required. We consider every domain of children’s development in seeking avenues to accomplish this. Parents are involved, providing insights or working alongside us. Our staff reads, researches, and shares, in order to create new pathways to achieve learning goals if the more traditional approaches are not leading to the desired outcomes.

Although continually striving to improve, we celebrate our accomplishments. We are proud of our state assessment results, which are important indicators of high academic achievement. We are proud of the variety and quality of instruction that facilitates learning in all areas of the curriculum. We are proud of our leadership in implementing inclusion. We are proud that visitors to our school comment on the respectful behavior of our students. We are proud of the accomplishments of individual students, whether cited for acts of kindness, sportsmanship, or academic achievement. We are especially proud of those students who have struggled, but persevered; who excitedly move up several levels in reading; publish their first legible, well-planned writing piece; make a speech at a DARE graduation after years of working on articulation; bring behaviors that disrupt their learning under control; or move from a wheelchair to a walker.

This sense of pride in our school goes hand in hand with deep appreciation for the support of the larger community. We are fortunate to have a Board of Education, superintendent of schools, and other district administrators, who are dedicated to student achievement and support building-level programs. Our town officials and local businesses and organizations support our endeavors. Clinton parents are highly invested in their children’s education. Clerical and maintenance staff ensure a smoothly run school that sets the stage for learning. Clinton faculty and staff are unsurpassed in their commitment. In a take-off on a well known advertisement, the principal is fond of saying “At Clinton, you’ve got the network.” The esprit du corp in our school is tangible and the resulting impact on the lives of children, now and in the future, is what makes us worthy of Blue Ribbon status.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

New York State, like all others in the nation, increased its assessment and accountability measures to meet the mandates of the NCLB Act. Although assessments of student progress toward the state standards in ELA and math had been administered for several years in grade 4, beginning with the 2005-06 school year, the assessment program was extended to include annual measures in grades 3-6. Student proficiency levels have been defined, as follows: Level 1- Not meeting the standards; Level 2 – Partially meeting the standards; Level 3 – Meeting the learning standards; Level 4 – Meeting the learning standards with distinction. Standard score “cut points” are established each year, which determine at which level a student has performed.

Our school has seen increases in student achievement, which can be viewed through different lenses. Examining trend data within grade levels, we have seen some dramatic increases in the combined numbers of students achieving proficiency and mastery levels in math, as follows: grade 3 - an overall increase of 10% over four years; grade 4 – a 22% increase over five years; grade 5 - a 15% increase over four years; grade 6 – an astounding 37% increase over four years. Looking at cohort data, we can also examine trends to determine if a group of students is continuing to achieve state standards at a consistent, increasing, or decreasing rate. For example, 89% of our third graders to take the first math assessment in 2006 were proficient. If we follow that cohort, we see that in grade 4 the next year, 95% were proficient; in fifth grade- 97%, and in grade 6 the group achieved 100% proficiency. It should be noted that because of their achievement last year, in a comparative ranking of all schools in our Western New York region, Clinton Street Elementary was listed as #1. Of the 100% of the students who were proficient, 67% achieved mastery. The mastery rate was the highest among all schools in the area.

While, overall our math scores indicate high levels of learning, we continue to use data to improve achievement of individual students. The only identified sub-group at our school is socio-economic disadvantaged. It should be noted that we do not flag individual students as “disadvantaged”, so all receive needs-based instruction. Proficiency and mastery rates among students in the sub- group show an upward trend across grade levels. For example, from 2006-2009, there was an increase of 20% in proficiency and 6% in mastery for students in grade 3; a 21% increase in proficiency and 29% in mastery at grade 5; and a 60% increase in proficiency and 28% in mastery in grade 6. In the same time period, the achievement in Grade 4 in that sub-group improved from 91% to 100% proficiency and while mastery rates went up and down between 20% and 35%, it is significant that proficiency rates in math for all students have ranged from 90 to 100%.

Similar upward trends in student achievement have been realized in ELA. Our student proficiency rates between 2006 and 2009 have risen as follows: Grade 3 – 72-92%, an increase of 20%; Grade 5 – 84-99%, an increase of 15%; Grade 6- 74-98%, an increase of 23%. Mastery rates at those grade levels show a similar trend. Students who fall within the sub-group have also made gains. Rates of proficiency have increased from 55-86% in grade 3; 55-100% in grade 5; and 60-100% in grade 6. Mastery rates follow the same pattern. The performance among students in grade 4 has been less consistent, increasing and decreasing from 80% to 88% for all students; and from 70-92% for students in the sub-group. Some students, especially those with learning difficulties and specific disabilities have found it difficult to make the transition to more complex reading and writing tasks in the fourth grade curriculum. They also seem to struggle more with the lengthy fourth grade assessment. However, we continue to use the NYS test results and other assessment measures to analyze our instructional practices in the context of student learning needs. We are committed to improving student performance at the fourth grade level. Our school continues to meet annual yearly progress (AYP) goals in ELA , as well as math, at all levels.

Information on the New York State assessment system may found at <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/osa/>

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Assessment data is a critical component of information used at Clinton Street Elementary as we develop curriculum, plan instruction, and respond to students' needs.

At the most global level, we analyze and use group results and trend data from state assessments and other relevant measures to pinpoint curriculum priorities at our school. Working from the broad *New York State Standards* and the more specific, yet comprehensive *Core Curriculum*, our teachers juxtapose assessment results with core content requirements to determine *Essential Common Outcomes* in each content area. This allows us to avoid teaching what the majority of students already know and are able to do, and focus our instruction on content knowledge and associated skills they still need to develop. State assessments yield what we consider primarily summative data, but in this context we have found that a formative application of the same data modifies what we teach each year, based upon the needs of the group.

From this "mega-look" at assessment data, we move toward a more individualized view. Our teachers routinely conduct formative assessments in all areas, which provide insights into each student's learning. Some assessments, such as DIBELS and DRA, are given district-wide and allow us to monitor literacy learning. At Clinton, teachers in each grade level or department also create common formative assessments for units of instruction in order to monitor development of content knowledge and skills. Examples include running records, common writing pieces, or rubrics used to evaluate performance in physical education. Teachers informally and continuously assess student learning through individual conferences, making observations during independent work sessions, or noting answers during simultaneous responses. All of these assessment measures provide individual foci for instruction, which we use to develop plans for every learner at our school, whether for purposes of enrichment, extension, or intervention.

We have adopted an RTI model at our school. Using assessment data is critical in determining the effectiveness of instruction and where we need to make adjustments for all students through Tier 1. For students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention, it helps us to closely track progress, monitor the effectiveness of our interventions, and adjust instruction as needed, in order to accelerate learning and close gaps.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Our teachers regularly confer with every student on assessment data as part of the teaching-learning cycle. This helps students to monitor individual progress toward established outcomes and to continually adjust incremental learning targets. We have found this process especially helpful in motivating students for whom we are trying to close achievement gaps. The primary emphasis is on reading and math, but this approach is utilized in all areas, including the arts and physical education. Parents receive individual children's assessment data, which is reviewed and thoroughly explained during parent-teacher conferences. This face-to-face information sharing is done minimally once per year for those whose children are achieving at or above expected performance levels; more frequently for those whose children are struggling. Quarterly report cards are sent home. These are developmental and standards-based in grades K-2 and have a more traditional "grade" based format in grades 3-6. Reports on individual students' state assessment results in ELA and math for grades 3-6, social studies for grade 5, and science for grade 4, are sent to parents annually. Letters of explanation accompany those reports. As principal, I conduct a session on school-wide assessment results and how they are used each year at meetings of our Shared Decision-Making Team (SDMT) and Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO). I also report that data in the final edition of our school's newspaper each year. Through district presentations and publications, assessment data is provided to all stakeholders in the local community. The greater Buffalo area newspaper and a weekly business journal, *Business First*, provide assessment data and comparative rankings of area schools to the community at large.

4. **Sharing Success:**

We, at Clinton Street Elementary, are committed to success for *all* children and believe that working collaboratively makes that a reality. We furthermore believe that it is a professional obligation to share and learn from one another. Toward that end, we have "opened our doors." Teams of teachers from other schools and districts have visited our school to observe the implementation of our literacy framework and approach to intervention. We have broadcast information on our school's approaches on our local cable channel. Our teachers have served as instructors around effective practices in areas such as literacy and technology integration. Faculty members sit on several district leadership committees (e.g. Curriculum Leadership Cabinet, District Literacy Team) and are represented on regional councils or boards. Through the aforementioned affiliations, we have established multiple forums from which we are able to share our successes and influence the direction of education in our area. If awarded Blue Ribbon status, we would willingly expand our connections to other schools. One of our long-range plans has been to form a consortium of schools that use a similar instructional approach. This would function as a larger professional learning community. Through a relationship with a local college, we plan to conduct more action research that identifies and solidifies classroom practices that meet the criteria of "evidence-based." We would take advantage of the credibility afforded by a Blue Ribbon designation in order to "get the word out" through hosting forums, publishing articles, and making presentations in the community. Of course, if we receive it, we would proudly fly the Blue Ribbon flag, include the designation on our letterhead and publications, and add it to the school name posted on our building. We would hold a big celebration and invite members of the school, district, and local community. The media would be invited to provide the publicity this great honor would warrant.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Our curriculum and instructional program have been developed so that students achieve New York State’s learning standards in all core areas. *Performance Indicators* describe what students should know and be able to do as a result of quality instruction. The *Core Curriculum* further specifies grade-specific competencies. Our district has created an essential curriculum from these documents. Through the lens of student achievement data, we develop and update our school’s curriculum. By adjusting the standards-based curriculum to emphasize data-driven priorities, we ensure that our curriculum is responsive and consistently rigorous in all core areas. The following summaries highlight key elements.

English Language Arts: This is the cornerstone of our instructional program. Students learn that its fundamental purpose is communication. Students move through developmental progressions of skills and knowledge. From the smallest units, such as sounds, letters, word parts, and mechanics; to broader concepts like style, purpose, themes, connections, and inferential thinking, our goal is to ensure that all students are proficient in ELA. We establish benchmarks and hold ourselves accountable for meeting them. Expected reading levels are delineated. Writing progresses from “free writes” with inventive spelling, to multiple genres that follow all conventions. Demonstrations of social norms are expected when speaking and listening. Students use ELA skills across the curriculum and for personal enjoyment. Student book clubs; a student newspaper; a student version of *Shakespeare in the Park*, and PTO family book fairs, are examples of activities that enhance ELA learning.

Math, Science, and Technology: These three core areas are readily combined because of their real-world connections and applications. The common thread is that learning takes place largely through authentic experiences that reinforce what is taught. Technology is infused throughout the curriculum and includes developing procedural skills, as well as knowledge of safe and appropriate usage. Math involves students in learning and applying increasingly complex knowledge and skills to solve real-world problems. Through Inter-connected units in life, earth, and physical sciences, students learn the scientific method and develop creative and critical thinking skills. A math competition, science fair, rocket launches, internet research, and *Earth Spirit Day*, are activities that enhance our curriculum.

Social Studies: The curriculum centers on “big ideas,” e.g. history shapes the present; geography shapes cultures; governments form to maintain societies; and economic systems are needed to deal with scarcity. Students progressively learn these ideas through the study of local, state, national, and world communities – past, and present. Activities that reinforce learning include *Junior Achievement* programs on economics, a student *Living Wax Museum* depicting historical figures, a mini Civil War reenactment, Medieval Faire, and related field trips.

The Arts – Our school strongly supports student involvement and learning in visual and performing arts. We recognize their inherent value for all, as well as their importance for students with special talents. Our curriculum engages students in creating and performing; using media, materials, resources, and instruments; analyzing and critiquing works; and connecting visual and performing arts with various ideas or cultures. Students throughout the grade levels develop high levels of knowledge and technical skill, while deriving personal enjoyment and satisfaction that can be used throughout life. Opportunities abound for our students in the arts, through exhibits, performances, competitions, and clubs. The arts are integrated with other core areas, such as ELA and social studies.

Physical Education and Health - The primary focus is on the development of knowledge and skills that promote lifelong wellness. In all grade levels, students learn the proper form and procedures necessary to safely participate in sports, games and activities that encourage and maintain fitness. Health education

is provided so that students understand the role of nutrition, safe and appropriate choices, and medical care. To provide avenues for further learning and application, we have an extensive intramurals program; before-school physical activities, such as a “Runners Club;” and an annual Wellness Fair.

Library-Media: In addition to integration that supports all areas of the curriculum, specific information and technology skills are taught. Highlights in our state-of-the-art facility include an on-going library loan program from our varied book collection, author studies, book clubs, research projects and technology instruction.

2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

(This question is for elementary schools only)

Clinton Street Elementary School’s reading curriculum is derived from several sources, including those provided by New York State and our school district, which developed an essential curriculum map that set overarching goals for the teaching of reading. From there, our school creates Essential Common Outcomes in reading at each grade level, twice per year. As noted elsewhere in this document, these decisions on annual curriculum priorities are based upon group assessment data for each grade level.

Ten years ago, we adopted the *Four Blocks* literacy framework, developed by Patricia Cunningham, Dorothy Hall, et.al., to guide our planning and instruction. Its balanced multi-method and multi-level approach, designed to meet the diverse needs of learners found in every classroom, met our needs. It is divided into four critical elements (four blocks): *Guided Reading*, *Self-Selected Reading*, *Working with Words*, and *Writing*. We have augmented our instruction through incorporating the work of several leaders in the field, including Richard Allington, Stephanie Harvey and Anne Goudvis, and Lucy Calkins. The framework allows us to use authentic texts, materials, and applications. Using a gradual release of responsibility model throughout reading instruction, students learn through the teacher’s modeling, practice with guidance, independent practice, and application with feedback. We differentiate instruction in all four blocks, based upon student need. *Guided Reading* is the block in which we teach strategies that help students develop comprehension skills. Before reading, mini-lessons on a variety of comprehension strategies appropriate for each grade level are taught. During reading, strategies or skills from the mini-lesson, as well as those cumulatively learned, are applied. After reading, students articulate what was learned and its use for them in understanding what they read. Teachers monitor progress through multiple means of assessment. *Self-Selected Reading* is where students develop fluency, gain additional practice in applying comprehension skills in books at their levels, and develop a love of reading through being allowed to make text choices. It includes a short teacher read-aloud to model fluency, individual conferences where students and teachers discuss books, and quick informal assessments of applied skills that are subtly conducted. In the *Working with Words* block, students develop spelling, decoding, and word analysis skills as they learn rules and patterns. Physical manipulation of letters, movement, and chanting make this block ideal for students with multiple learning styles. A posted wall of sight and anchor words provides a useful resource in for students learning to spell and practice irregular words correctly. The *Writing Block* enhances reading instruction in several ways. The relationship between encoding and decoding is mutually reinforcing in both areas of literacy learning. Students also respond to reading through writing, and use their written pieces as high interest text to read. Through all of their learning activities, students realize that the ultimately goal of reading is to comprehend.

3. Additional Curriculum Area:

Our school’s mission includes encouraging excellence in academics and developing life-long learners. Since basic math skills are important in life, and advanced math skills enable students to pursue higher educational and career opportunities in the future, we identify math as a curriculum area of emphasis that helps us achieve our mission. As is the case with reading, our district developed an essential curriculum map in math to set overarching goals for instruction. This math curriculum is rooted in the state’s core curriculum to help students meet state standards. As previously described, we, at Clinton, then create our own essential common outcomes annually to establish priorities at each grade level in the area of math. We rely on the use of

performance indicators, which describe what students need to do to demonstrate progress toward mastery of the standards in math. Our approach to teaching math is constructivist in nature. As such, the goal is to provide opportunities and experiences that facilitate students' constructing their own understandings of mathematical concepts. This approach is simultaneously skills-based, developmental, and differentiated. Essential skills in numeracy, calculation, and problem-solving are taught through modeling and guided practice. Manipulatives and games enhance learning while promoting enjoyment and confidence – especially important in this often "maligned" curriculum area. The curriculum spirals, so that students revisit key concepts and have multiple opportunities to apply skills to solve increasingly more complex problems throughout the grade levels. Students learn that there is more than one way to solve a problem, which encourages creative and critical thinking. District-wide, we use the *Everyday Math* program from the University of Chicago, which provides many curriculum resources. However, rather than use the program in lock-step fashion, our teachers use their ever-increasing knowledge of content and pedagogy, as well as assessment data, in order to mindfully design lessons that make sure all students are successful in math.

4. Instructional Methods:

Several years ago, we realized that a number of students in the K-2, 12:1:1 special education district classes located in our school were not making much progress. Furthermore, when we analyzed assessment data, we noted that their learning profiles were not that different from many students served through our general education program. With the district's blessing and parental consent, we moved from a self-contained special education model at the primary level to one of inclusion. With that move, came a compelling need to differentiate instruction. We examined our curriculum and identified "the bottom line," i.e. the essential learning for all students. Rather than differentiate "up and down" from a middle ground, which seemed to be the more common approach, we began to only differentiate "up." With this approach, students who struggle learn the same basic concepts and skills as their classmates, while we preserve time in their schedules for intervention. Students who are learning at expected levels continue to be instructed on grade level concepts and skills; those whose learning exceeds expected levels are provided with instruction that enriches their learning. It should be noted that students' groupings are flexible in order to honor their strengths and interests. Serendipitously, the district brought in an outside consultant, Carolyn Chapman, to provide a week-long Differentiated Instruction Summer Institute for two consecutive years. Several teachers from our school attended, and were able to provide turn-key training and support for our teachers in implementing DI. Our curriculum and instructional methods were further modified and supplemented as we addressed learning styles and preferences, multiple modalities, and incorporated student choice. We have seen positive results among students in terms of academic achievement and improved behaviors. Additionally, this has influenced beneficial changes in staff and resource deployment. Classroom teachers have increased their capacity to work with diverse learners in their classrooms. Special education teachers have become "interventionists," whose specialized training is now widely used. Related service providers offer proactive educationally-related services. The expertise of our reading and literacy specialists is now accessible to all. As a result of our differentiated instructional program, our special education classification rate has decreased, while student achievement has increased. Our only identifiable sub-group category is "economically disadvantaged." Through deploying our intervention staff to meet associated needs, student achievement in that group has also increased.

5. Professional Development:

We, at Clinton Street Elementary School, define ourselves as a professional learning community. Inherent in this designation is the belief that the most important professional development occurs through deep, meaningful collaboration around issues of student learning that are aligned with content standards. We meet regularly in teams to share assessment data and information. We use these opportunities to reflect upon and discuss our practices in light of the results we are getting. Teachers whose students experience the most success in learning new knowledge or skills describe the instruction they used to get positive results. Through this collaborative dialogue, their colleagues learn new strategies and are able to replicate effective instruction. This "bottom up" type of professional development is powerful as it validates what works and

creates an impetus for changing what doesn't. We use other professional development vehicles to introduce new school initiatives or address challenges that require acquisition of shared knowledge. One vehicle is professional reading. In a nod toward the popularity of book clubs, we have dubbed this *OPRAHS*; the acronym standing for *Our Professional Readers Achieve Higher Standards*. We have also brought in presenters and consultants on topics that we deemed important to the success of our students. For example, we had recently determined through observation and discussion, that engagement was a problem for a number of students across grade levels. We invited a college professor with expertise in this area to provide a workshop on the topic. Our teachers participate in district offerings through our local teachers' center and staff development office. Finances are limited, but when possible, we send faculty members to conferences that are particularly relevant. Whether our entire faculty reads, listens to a presenter, or attends a workshop or conference, the goal of our professional development is to promote reflection, meaningful dialogue, and inspiration to try new strategies and approaches in our classrooms. This then cycles back to collaboration centered on student learning in response to our teaching.

6. **School Leadership:**

The leadership structure at Clinton Street Elementary is best described as distributive. Each grade level and department autonomously makes decisions within established parameters that address the needs of students. Creativity is encouraged and teachers are invited to challenge status quo, as long as research backs a proposal and students will be the beneficiaries of change. We are organized into teams to accomplish specific purposes. The *Shared Decision Making Team* of faculty, staff, and parents, is our umbrella committee, overseeing the work of all teams toward ensuring student achievement at high levels. The *Parent-Teacher Organization* provides financial and organizational support to supplement our programs. The *Building Curriculum Leadership Council* serves as a clearing house for matters of curriculum and instruction. Our *Four Blocks Literacy Team* supports teachers through staying abreast of instructional improvements and strategies that augment our approach in the critical area of literacy. The *Technology Team* stays "cutting edge" to help teachers harness the power of technology that engages and motivates today's students. Faculty, staff, and parents on the *Character Education* and *Wellness Teams* plan curriculum, service learning, and activities to help students develop the dispositions required to succeed in all walks of life. The *RTI Team* serves as our "think tank." Comprised of the school's "specialists," this team's charge is to do "whatever it takes" and support teachers and parents in helping students overcome the obstacles that interfere with learning. The principal exemplifies the vision of the school, truly believing that every child will succeed. She is very "hands on", especially in the areas of literacy and intervention, and takes a special interest in the progress of students who are struggling. An avid "googler", she encourages teachers to read, research, and design creative interventions to meet the varied challenges faced by struggling students. As an ex-officio member of every school team and the liaison to the district and community, she strives to achieve a balance between being supportive and challenging ideas and decisions, in the best interest of all Clinton students.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3

Test: NYS Math

Edition/Publication Year: Published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | May | Mar | Mar | Mar | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 99 | 96 | 98 | 89 | |
| Mastery | 43 | 34 | 35 | 37 | |
| Number of students tested | 75 | 67 | 68 | 64 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 8 | 3 | 2 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 10 | 4 | 3 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 95 | 90 | 91 | 75 | |
| Mastery | 36 | 24 | 9 | 30 | |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 21 | 11 | 19 | |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

No state testing was administered in math in grade 3 until 2005-06. Students who took the NY State Alternate Assessments (NYSSA) were those in a district 12:1:1 "functional" class housed in our building. These assessments were developed in 06-07. No prior data is available.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3

Test: NYS ELA

Edition/Publication Year: Published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 92 | 81 | 87 | 72 | |
| Mastery | 17 | 15 | 18 | 3 | |
| Number of students tested | 75 | 67 | 68 | 64 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 8 | 3 | 2 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 10 | 4 | 3 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 86 | 67 | 72 | 55 | |
| Mastery | 14 | 10 | 18 | 5 | |
| Number of students tested | 22 | 21 | 11 | 19 | |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

No state testing was administered in ELA in grade 3 until 2005-06. Students who took the NY State Alternate Assessments (NYSSA) were those in a district 12:1:1 "functional" class housed in our building. These assessments were developed in 06-07. No prior data is available.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4

Test: NYS Math

Edition/Publication Year: Published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | May |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 96 | 99 | 95 | 95 | 74 |
| Mastery | 45 | 43 | 40 | 33 | 49 |
| Number of students tested | 67 | 67 | 55 | 79 | 84 |
| Percent of total students tested | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 1 | 9 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 3 | 1 | 10 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 100 | 93 | 90 | 91 | 91 |
| Mastery | 26 | 20 | 30 | 35 | 32 |
| Number of students tested | 19 | 13 | 10 | 23 | 22 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Students who took the NY State Alternate Assessments (NYSSA) were those in a district 12:1:1 "functional" class housed in our building. These assessments were developed in 06-07. No prior data is available.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4

Test: NYS ELA

Edition/Publication Year: Published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan | Feb |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 82 | 88 | 80 | 85 | 87 |
| Mastery | 3 | 12 | 20 | 9 | 30 |
| Number of students tested | 67 | 67 | 55 | 79 | 84 |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 1 | 9 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 3 | 1 | 14 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 79 | 92 | 70 | 78 | 82 |
| Mastery | 5 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| Number of students tested | 19 | 13 | 10 | 23 | 22 |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

Students who took the NY State Alternate Assessments (NYSSA) were those in a district 12:1:1 "functional" class housed in our building. These assessments were developed in 06-07. No prior data is available.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5

Test: NYS Math

Edition/Publication Year: Published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 99 | 97 | 90 | 84 | |
| Mastery | 51 | 48 | 30 | 26 | |
| Number of students tested | 72 | 58 | 77 | 85 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 8 | 5 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 12 | 6 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 95 | 91 | 83 | 74 | |
| Mastery | 40 | 36 | 17 | 11 | |
| Number of students tested | 19 | 11 | 18 | 20 | |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

No state testing was administered in math in grade 5 until 2005-06. Students who took the NY State Alternate Assessments (NYSSA) were those in a district 12:1:1 "functional" class housed in our building. These assessments were revised in 06-07. No prior data is available.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5

Test: NYS ELA

Edition/Publication Year: Published annually

Publisher: CTB-McGraw

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 98 | 83 | 77 | 85 | |
| Mastery | 17 | 7 | 6 | 19 | |
| Number of students tested | 72 | 58 | 77 | 85 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 8 | 5 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 2 | 12 | 6 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 100 | 64 | 78 | 55 | |
| Mastery | 16 | 9 | 6 | 5 | |
| Number of students tested | 19 | 11 | 18 | 20 | |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

No state testing was administered in ELA in grade 5 until 2005-06. Students who took the NY State Alternate Assessments (NYSSA) were those in a district 12:1:1 "functional" class housed in our building. These assessments were developed in 06-07. No prior data is available.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 6

Test: NYS Math

Edition/Publication Year: Published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Mar | Mar | Mar | Mar | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 100 | 97 | 87 | 63 | |
| Mastery | 67 | 47 | 43 | 18 | |
| Number of students tested | 61 | 75 | 80 | 84 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 10 | 6 | 2 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 14 | 4 | 2 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 100 | 88 | 82 | 40 | |
| Mastery | 40 | 47 | 12 | 12 | |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 16 | 17 | 25 | |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

No state testing was administered in math in grade 6 until 2005-06. Students who took the NY State Alternate Assessments (NYSSA) were those in a district 12:1:1 "functional" class housed in our building. These assessments were developed in 06-07. No prior data is available.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6

Test: NYS ELA

Edition/Publication Year: Published annually

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

| | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 | 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month | Jan | Jan | Jan | Jan | |
| SCHOOL SCORES | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 98 | 95 | 75 | 74 | |
| Mastery | 13 | 3 | 10 | 15 | |
| Number of students tested | 61 | 75 | 80 | 84 | |
| Percent of total students tested | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | |
| Number of students alternatively assessed | 10 | 6 | 2 | | |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 14 | 7 | 2 | | |
| SUBGROUP SCORES | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | 100 | 94 | 59 | 60 | |
| Mastery | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students tested | 10 | 16 | 17 | 25 | |
| 2. African American Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 4. Special Education Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 5. Limited English Proficient Students | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |
| 6. Largest Other Subgroup | | | | | |
| Proficiency | | | | | |
| Mastery | | | | | |
| Number of students tested | | | | | |

Notes:

No state testing was administered in ELA in grade 6 until 2005-06. Students who took the NY State Alternate Assessments (NYSSA) were those in a district 12:1:1 "functional" class housed in our building. These assessments were developed in 06-07. No prior data is available.