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

Type of School: (Check all that apply) [] Charter [**X**] Title I [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal: Dr. Laverne Nimmons, PhD

Official School Name: PS 335 Granville T. Woods

School Mailing Address:
130 Rochester Ave.
Brooklyn, NY 11213-2429

County: Kings State School Code Number*: 331600010335

Telephone: (718) 493-7736 Fax: (718) 953-4697

Web site/URL: www.schools.nyc.gov E-mail: lnimmon@schools.nyc.gov

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. Evelyn Santiago

District Name: NYC District 16 Tel: (718) 395-3692

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: Vacant Position

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 2004.

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)

15	Elementary schools (includes K-8)
6	Middle/Junior high schools
4	High schools
0	K-12 schools
25	**TOTAL**

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 17483

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

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

[X] 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. 7 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	10	8	18	**6**			0
K	38	28	66	**7**			0
1	40	30	70	**8**			0
2	29	28	57	**9**			0
3	38	37	75	**10**			0
4	29	45	74	**11**			0
5	35	31	66	**12**			0
		TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL					426

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:

1 %	American Indian or Alaska Native
0 %	Asian
86 %	Black or African American
12 %	Hispanic or Latino
1 %	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
%	White
%	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: 36 %

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 until the end of the year.	96
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	59
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	155
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	426
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.364
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	36.385

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 3 %

Total number limited English proficient 12

Number of languages represented: 3

Specify languages:

Creole(Haitian), Spanish, Fulani

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 100 %

Total number students who qualify: 426

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: 20 %

Total Number of Students Served: 85

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	11	Other Health Impaired
0	Deaf-Blindness	40	Specific Learning Disability
9	Emotional Disturbance	29	Speech or Language Impairment
1	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)	2	0
Classroom teachers	28	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	20	0
Paraprofessionals	9	0
Support staff	14	1
Total number	73	1

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 **15 :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	89%	90%	88%	87%	87%
Daily teacher attendance	97%	95%	94%	94%	93%
Teacher turnover rate	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

Our student attendance rate has been below 95% because of the large number of students in foster care, living in shelters (homeless), suffering from asthma and diabetes, the H1N1 Flu epidemic of 2008-2009, the high poverty rate of our families which causes multiple families to live in one dwelling and the economic crises which has left many of our parents unemployed and forced to relocate. Inspite of these challenges we continue to implement interventions and resources to ensure the academic success and educational continuity of all of our students.

Our teacher attendance rate fell below 95% because of the large number of teachers who were experiencing personal and family health related issues, teachers who became pregnant during the 2005-2007 school years and had challenges surrounding their new expanded families. When addressing this drop in teachers' attendance, it was noted that the school's policy is for everyone to have 100% attendance. Due to our support and expecations teachers' attendance has steadly increased and they continue to model good attendance for students.

Granville T. Woods Public School 335 is an elementary school and does not have a drop out rate.

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		%

PART III - SUMMARY

The mission of Granville T. Woods Public School is to provide maximum opportunities for all children and prepare them to become capable and concerned citizens of the world. We create an environment of high expectations and standards which challenge our students to reach their maximum level of performance in all academic areas. Our instructional program supports multiple intelligences and different learning styles. We foster opportunities to create a nurturing learning environment that promotes excellence as well as a love of learning.

Our belief in Brian Camborne's "Conditions of Learning" and Lauren Resnick's "Principles of Learning" support our mission and vision for teaching and learning. We also believe that in order to educate children, we must address the academic, social, emotional and psychological needs of the child; children learn best when they are engaged in meaningful real world and collaborative experiences that are challenging, rigorous and creative; children learn best in a caring community where they feel safe to take risks, to reflect on, and to participate in their learning; given the right support and sufficient time, every child can learn; and learning is best when every person who touches the life of a child works as partners in the education of the child.

This school sits in the heart of Weeksville, the first African American community in New York City. The school has virtually eliminated the achievement gap with a student population that includes immigrants from the Caribbean with limited English proficiency (LEP) and low income children of color living in impoverished conditions. On the 2005-06 New York State exams 53% of the students in grades 3, 4 and 5 attained levels 3 and 4 in mathematics and 37% in English language arts (ELA). There was significant increase in 2008-09 with 97% of students scoring at or above level in math and 87% in ELA. A major milestone occurred when our fourth grade students out performed all the students within the state by making the most gains on the New York State exams in 2009.

What makes the school unique is its collegial teaching and learning environment, the extensive use of data to drive instruction, the cohesive learning atmosphere, the strategically targeted professional development, and a reflective instructional community that embraces all constituents. In addition, part of what makes us unique and successful is the scheduled program design that gives teachers and students 3 to 4 hours of uninterrupted instructional time. Daily common preparation periods accommodate grade level meetings to discuss student data, instructional strategies, and curriculum. This kind of work has become a tradition in our school and has greatly contributed to our achievement.

Beginning in 2004-2005, the school formed learning communities that included coaches, grade level leaders and teachers from each grade level. Through these learning communities the school continues to foster a tradition of data-driven decision making. This has changed how teachers view student needs and how they deliver instruction. Academic goals are set for all students based on data beginning in kindergarten. The strengths and weaknesses are made transparent to students and parents. This has led to increased student engagement and success.

This kind of focused instruction, professional development, and constant review of data were the driving factors that led P.S. 335 to success and made it worthy of becoming nominated as a Blue Ribbon School. The administration, coaches, teachers, parents, and students are excited about our work and achievements. We anticipate continued growth in 2010. We, at P.S. 335, will not rest until all of our students are on or above grade level on all statewide achievement tests.

PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. **Assessment Results:**

P.S. 335 participates in the New York State Assessment System. The performance levels range from 1 through 4 for both ELA and Mathematics. Level 1 means students are functioning far below the assessed state standard grade level expectations, level 2 means students are partially meeting state standards, level 3 means students are meeting grade level standards expectations and level 4 means students are exceeding grade level standards expectations. Students' skills are assessed through students answering multiple choice and extended response ELA and Math items. For more information about our assessment system please visit the NYC and NYS departments of education websites respectively at http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/YearlyTesting/default and http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/osa/.

Our school has made significant gains in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics in grades 3 through 5 over the last five years. In the 2008-09 school year 87.4% of all students were at or above state standards in ELA, a 51% increase from 2005. In Mathematics, 97% of all students were at or above level, a 54% increase from 2005. As a result of targeting the instructional needs of our students, we have successfully increased student achievement for all students including our African American and special needs population.

African American Students

Grade Level	ELA	MATH
Grade 3	Levels 3 and 4 students decreased 3% 06-07, increased 39% 07-08, and increased 9% 08-09	Levels 3 and 4 students increased 6% 06-07, 33% 07-08 but decreased 11% 08-09
Grade 4	Levels 3 and 4 students increased 4% 05-06, 0% change 06-07, 7% increase 07-08, and 35% increase 08-09 There was a17% increase in 08-09 of level 4 students	In 05-06 there was a 4% decrease, a 10% increase 06-07, a 6% increase 07-08 and an 18% increase 08-09 There was a 69% increase 08-09 of level 4 students
Grade 5	Levels 3 and 4 students decreased 29% 06-07, increased 39% 07-08 and increased 36% 08-09	Levels 3 and 4 students decreased 7% 06-07, increased 16% 07-08, and increased 34% 08-09 There was a 5% increase of level 4 students 06-07, 5% 07-08, and 35% 08-09

Special Needs

Grade Level	ELA	MATH
Grade 3	Levels 3 and 4 students decreased 5% 06-07, increased 74% 07-08, decreased 30% 08-09 There was a 40% increase of level 4 students 07-08	Levels 3 and 4 students increased 12% 06-07, 30% 07-08 and decreased 30% 08-09, There was a 11% increase of Level 4 students 06-07 and 29% 07-08
Grade 4	Levels 3 and 4 students decreased	Levels 3 and 4 students decreased 26% 05-06,

	25% 05-06, increased 6% 06-07, 3% 07-08, 41% 08-09 There was a 17% increase of level 4 students 08-09	increased 30% 06-07, 12% 07-08 and 41% 08-09 There was a 50% increase of level 4 students 08-09
Grade 5	Levels 3 and 4 students decreased 17% 06-07, increased 22% 07-08 and 59% 08-09	Levels 3 and 4 students decreased 26% 06-07, increased 45% 07-08 and 38% 08-09 There was a increase of 7% level 4 students 06-07, 2% 07-08, 1% 08-09

There are some disparities in our data that include but are not limited to:

Grade 3 special needs population's level 3 and 4 decreased 30% from 2008 to 2009 in ELA and Mathematics.

- Grade 4 special needs students on levels 3 and 4 decreased 25% in 05-06 in Mathematics
- Grade 5 African American students' levels 3 and 4 decreased 29% in 06-07 in ELA.

All of these disparities have been addressed by establishing collaborative learning communities, external partnerships with exemplary schools and community organizations. Furthermore, ongoing schoolwide high expectations, academic rigor and professional development increased and sustained high levels of student achievement.

2. **Using Assessment Results:**

Assessment data is used to set measurable interim and long term school goals, class goals, and individual student goals. The administration, coaches and teachers work collaboratively to analyze data in order to clearly understand what each student knows, which enables us to monitor student progress. Analysis of data also reveals what support is needed for our sub groups (English language learners and special education population) in order to help them achieve academic success.

Every classroom teacher has a data binder that holds individual student assessment results as well as whole class information. Analysis of reports from binders show students' strengths and weaknesses, guides teachers' decisions on instruction, supports the formulation of small groups and one on one conferencing. In depth analysis of student data affords all of our students opportunities to be provided differentiated instruction.

Decisions are also made to target students for additional support through intervention pull out, extended day, after school, Saturday and vacation programs and lunch time work sessions. Accurate records are kept of student progress for each service provided. Upon reviewing student progress teachers come together to evaluate the effectiveness of each program and plan for future teaching and learning.

In addition, instructional coaches facilitate teachers' development of curriculum maps based on state standards, practice tests and conferring notes. These maps are used as guides to differentiate instruction across all subject areas.

Charts and graphs of goals and progress towards our target are displayed in classrooms and corridors to make our goals transparent to all of our school community. Students, teachers, and parents have formal and informal discussions about the data and the support that's needed to achieve goals. Through conferring and consistent feed back from teachers, students are actively involved in setting personal goals and know their responsibilities towards achieving them. At grade level meetings teachers reflect on student and schoolwide targets.

3. **Communicating Assessment Results:**

Everyone in our school community has high expectations for student performance and a responsibility to help students achieve high standards. Granville T. Woods Elementary School developed a comprehensive strategy for communicating student performance and standardized test scores to everyone in the learning community.

The principal meets weekly with the cabinet which includes the assistant principal, math coach, literacy coach, teacher center specialist, early childhood literacy coach, union representative and the intervention coordinator. Our school leadership team which is comprised of 50% parents and 50% staff meet monthly and work collaboratively with the principal, focusing on the implementation and the development of the Comprehensive Education Plan (CEP) which is disseminated to the staff. The administration attends monthly parent association meetings to report on student performance and school goals outlined in the CEP.

In our school, the administrators, teachers and support staff are committed to communicating student achievement to parents and community support organizations on a regular basis. The principal corresponds through a monthly grade level news letter, parent calendar, daily announcements via school messenger telephone communication and letters keeping parents apprised of the school's activities and information. Bi-monthly progress letters are sent to parents informing them of the current level of performance of their child and specific activities on how to support them at home.

We also articulate to the entire school community a greater understanding of what is expected of students, parents, teachers, administrators and staff. In addition, teacher and parent surveys are given 3 times a year to assess progress and identify questions or concerns teachers and parents may have in reference to school activities, curriculum, homework, school environment, safety, etc. This information has consistently proven to be very valuable in our overall school academic/curriculum development, workshop planning, general school communications as well as parent, teacher and student engagement.

4. **Sharing Success:**

The Granville T. Woods Elementary School shares performance and progress with similar schools. A particular focus has been the partnerships created with schools of similar demographics that have proven success in the teaching of reading and mathematics as demonstrated by consistent high scores on New York State tests. As a result, there have been schoolwide and classroom inter-visitations, intra-visitations and professional development among administrators and teachers to develop best practices in teaching reading, math, science and social studies. We have also partnered with schools on weekend retreats to share best practices in curriculum and instruction among teachers, parents, and administrators.

We will continue to share our triumphs with our colleagues through inter-visitations of schools in our community. As educators, we are focused on professional growth and development. We have established lab sites on each grade at our school to help our learning communities grow and develop as well. These lab sites allow us to foster lasting relationships within and among our staff and with the staff of our school partners. The school's academic success is also shared through our New York City Board of Education web page and site which we are in the process of updating.

Parent-teacher conferences are focused on sharing success and how student academic achievements are sustained through instructional/academic support practices. Effective communication and consistent planning through meetings, study groups and workshops with all constituents play a key role in keeping everyone on task. Visitors to our school find evidence of standards everywhere – student work and student/teacher created rubrics are displayed throughout our building as well as student goals and expectations. Graphs and charts of student progress are displayed by every classroom door as well as in the main lobby of the building so that all who enter are aware of our school's goals and progress.

PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Curriculum:**

The ultimate purpose of our school's programs and instructional practices are to help our students develop higher order thinking skills in all subject areas. We as educators strive to create an environment of high expectations and standards, which challenge our students to reach their maximum levels of performance in all academic areas. Brian Camborne's Conditions of Learning undergirds curriculum and instruction through its seven key components: Immersion, demonstration, expectation, responsibility, employment, approximation and response.

Balance Literacy is the foundation of our instructional approach to teaching and learning in all subject areas. The vehicle of implementation of instruction is the workshop model. The key components of this method are the mini lesson, guided practice, independent work and the share. This approach allows for students to work independently, in partnerships, and in small groups on strategies and content taught. Teachers using this model have ample opportunities to assess students and differentiate instruction.

In K-3 classrooms, our Reading First (RF) curriculum provides a researched based method to address the developmental needs of our early learners. It provides a method to assess and monitor our students' progress. Additionally, teachers obtain necessary data to help inform their instructional practices, ensuring that each student's short term and long term educational goals are met.

Our fourth and fifth graders use Teachers College reading workshop curriculum. It is divided into 4 to 6 weeks units of study which delve into various genres and focus on targeted reading skills and strategies. Vocabulary development is intermingled to further enrich students reading lives. Through partnerships and book clubs, students further develop their critical thinking skills and improve expressive vocabulary. Assessment is ongoing and allows us to tailor our teaching to meet student needs. Reader's workshop is the vehicle used for implementation and differentiation of instruction.

Teachers College writing workshop in grades K through 5 allows our students to cycle through the writing process in various genres such as personal narratives, realistic fiction, poetry, memoir, and essays. Our writing celebrations at the end of each unit allow students to showcase their published pieces. Celebrations may consist of students reading to the whole class, small groups, other classes, to parents, "museum walks", reading café's, and other creative mediums.

Our mathematics curriculum provides students with opportunities to engage in purposeful, problem-based mathematical activities and conversations to enhance their conceptual understanding. The Mathematics workshop is structured in a 120-minute block using *Everyday Mathematics* for students in grades Pre-K- 5. Our Math Coach provides teachers with the professional development necessary to proficiently deliver instruction using the 'Workshop Model' format. Teachers also adjust instruction so that it is aligned with NCTM Standards and NYS Standards benchmarked at grades Pre-K-5.

Our Science program engages students Pre-K through 5 by providing them with challenging inquires that they can relate to and identify in their environment and the world. Students are engaged in hands-on activities that allow them to explore, discover and gather primary research in regards to specific topics and themes studied. Our science program integrates all subject areas through project based activities.

Social studies use a thematic project-based approach to instruction. It begins with Kindergarten focusing on the theme, "Self and Others" and moves to primary grades concentrating on U.S. and world communities. By

grades four and five the focus is on "Local History and Government", and "The United States, Latin America, and Canada" respectively.

Our visual and performing arts program is a year-long collaboration between the teachers of various disciplines, who guide all students while exploring intersections between content areas, dramatic presentations, art, stage design/construction, and technology (computer generated graphics, lighting, music, sound, etc.). Via these avenues, students receive a systematic introduction to the arts, ultimately resulting in their own productions which are demonstrated through readings, discussions, presentations, perfomances and assembly programs.

These approaches are enhanced and developed through field trips, use of technology, visiting authors and partnerships with New York historical society, Bank Street College, Teachers College, Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn Botanical Gardens, the Shubert Theater Group and NYC Arts Connections.

2a. **(Elementary Schools) Reading**:
(This question is for elementary schools only)

Our reading curriculum uses a two-prong approach. Based on data collected we noticed that students in the early grades had poor phonemic awareness and phonics skills. In the upper grades most of the students who were able to decode words, had difficulty with comprehension. As a result of our observations, the decision was made to use the reading approaches outlined below.

In K-3 classrooms, our Reading First curriculum provides a researched based method to address the developmental needs of our early learners by focusing on five key early reading skills: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension strategies. Reading First also provides a method to assess and monitor our students' progress and offer teachers the necessary data to help inform their instructional practices, ensuring that each student's short and long-term educational goals are met.

Our upper elementary students in grades four and five use Teachers College reading curriculum for instruction. The curriculum is divided into units of study which ranges from four to six weeks. All students' needs are met through on- going targeted assessments. This program explicitly allows us to teach reading skills and strategies to students at various reading levels, and one that provides a means to differentiate instruction individually or in small groups. This particular approach to reading provides students the opportunity to read self selected titles in various genres and allows them to learn through books that they love.

The result of our choice is evident in our New York State ELA scores. Our students in grades 3-5 have shown consistent improvement in students performing at levels 3 and 4 which indicates performance on and above level. Our assessment with students in grades K-2 also shows a marked increase in our performance on DIBELS and running records.

The school's choice of these instructional approaches has resulted in persistent and consistent schoolwide academic growth on formative and summative assessments.

3. **Additional Curriculum Area:**

Our mathematics program provides real world application of math. Students are provided opportunities to engage in purposeful, problem-based activities and conversations to enhance their conceptual understanding of mathematical ideas. Teachers focus on meeting the diverse learning styles and needs of students through the use of manipulatives, calculators, small-group work, sharing and multiple hands-on activities. There is an ongoing emphasis to implement writing to learn strategies which enable students to demonstrate analyze and assess their learning.

The Mathematics workshop is structured in a 120-minute block using *Everyday Mathematics* for students in grades Pre-K- 5. Our Math Coach provides teachers with the professional development necessary to proficiently deliver instruction using the 'Workshop Model' format. Teachers also adjust instruction so that it is aligned with NCTM Standards and NYS Standards benchmarked at grades Pre-K-5.

In an effort to foster collaboration, common preps are scheduled to develop curriculum maps and plan for instruction. We also conduct all-day grade level planning sessions. These common preps and planning sessions allow teachers the opportunity to look at student work together, as they accommodate varied ability/learning styles. Following a debriefing with the administration, the common preps once again provide a conduit for teachers to engage, talk and share professional development practices. Further collaboration continues through inter-visitations and learning walks which allow teachers to observe best practices and learn from each other.

The principal, assistant principal, and math coach meet frequently with teachers, assisting them with analysis of student work, planning for instruction, setting goals, assessing and student understanding. The Lab sites support teachers' instructional practices and keep them abreast of current research on teaching Mathematics.

Parent communication is the utmost priority for a successful school community. The school provides opportunities for parents to attend workshops, such as, Family Game Nights, Let's Talk About Math, and Parent assessment meetings that focus on supporting mathematics at home.

4. **Instructional Methods:**

<span lang='EN' style='>Each student has his or her own learning style. While some students learn by seeing, others learn by hearing and others learn by doing. In order to create an effective learning environment that meets all of these different needs, our teachers employ a variety of instructional methods. These methods engage students, and help them truly become learners.
The main vehicle of instruction is the workshop model, where the format is whole class, small group, and then back to whole class. During the first part of the workshop, there is explicit instruction and demonstration via the mini lesson. Students are given the opportunity to practice the strategy taught, independently or in partnerships, as the teacher observes and assess their understanding. The next phase of the workshop allows students to practice the strategy taught, or previous strategies learned, independently or in partnerships. The teacher during this stage is afforded the opportunity to differentiate instruction through conferences with students independently, or by doing guided and/or strategy group instruction.

Within our instruction, students' learning styles and multiple intelligences are addressed using drama, role playing, music, and art. One of our targeted sub-groups, meet weekly as the Boys Writing Club, with a published author to enhance their writing and social skills. Technology, Title 1 Read and Math are also used to supplement instruction to targeted students.

The curriculum is enhanced by a wide range of creative and cultural activities as well as frequent visits to places of interest. We also have on-site visits from theatre and dance groups to enhance our students' learning experiences.

The school's Saturday Academy, which provides academic support for students, has been a valuable resource in differentiating instruction and providing needed support for our struggling students. The instructional methods that we have adopted have contributed to higher performance academically for the student population.

5. **Professional Development:**

Our focus for Professional Development emanates from the needs of the staff. Using school goals, classroom observations, surveys, content standards, and information from data, a differentiated professional development plan is created for the school year. The plan includes core workshops to support new teachers, experienced teachers, best practices, content knowledge, data analysis and interpretation. The plan is a living document and has the flexibility for additional workshops, based on need.

Regular observations allow the team to provide immediate support when issues are noticed. Impact is monitored and additional assistance is given if needed. Professional development is also provided through workshops, lab-sites, learning walks, inter-visitations and one-on-one coaching. Our coaches work individually with teachers in their classrooms, in groups during grade-level meetings as well as through instructional lab-sites. Lab-sites afford the teachers the opportunity to see best practices and develop their craft in a nurturing environment. It also ensures a clear understanding of the expectations of each grade and supports teacher planning. This allows teachers to work collaboratively, and learn instructional strategies from each other.

Within the classroom, coaches scaffold their work with teachers after their initial classroom visit. The work is intensive and engages teacher learning through observation of best practices demonstrated by the coach. Teacher and coach then plan collaboratively and co-teach. The next step in the process is to have the teacher independently implement instructional practices. Articulation sessions then ensue with the teacher and coach to deepen understanding and pedagogy.

Support is given to teachers in analyzing and interpreting data in order to plan for meaningful instruction. This planning occurs individually and collaboratively during grade planning sessions. Because of the focused effort of our professional development team, the instructional practices of teachers have shown marked improvement, which impacts positively on students' achievement.

6. **School Leadership:**

The structure of leadership in PS 335 and the role of the principal have been significant in changing the expectations that teachers have for students. Using a team based approach that consists of the cabinet, grade-level learning communities, school leadership team, curriculum and professional development team creates a collegial and nurturing learning environment. These key teams consist of a facilitator and 6 to 9 members who meet regularly.

The overarching team is the cabinet. All teams feed into this leadership group. It is led by the school principal and is comprised of the assistant principal, union representative, literacy, math and *Reading First (RF)* coaches, intervention coordinator and teacher center specialist. Their primary focus is to establish policies, programs, formulate community based relationships, select targeted resources to improve student achievement.

The grade level teams are led by coaches. They meet weekly to discuss data, instructional strategies, plan and revise units of study, create curriculum maps, share best practices, use a wide range of data to support student learners and set measurable long term and interim goals.

The school leadership team consists of 50% parents and 50% staff. They meet monthly to discuss school activities, assess progress towards developing initiatives, and review and analyze the comprehensive education plan.

The curriculum and professional development team consists of all coaches, administration, and a representative from each learning community. Their primary focus is to design strategically targeted curriculum and professional development that meet the needs of both teachers and students.

The role of the principal is to serve as a transformative, inspirational, instructional, and collegial leader who collaborates with teams of teachers and staff to implement effective instructional programs and practices that best serves the learning community. As one student said, "Our principal believes we can do anything so we work and study hard to achieve."

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: NYSTP

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009 Publisher: McGraw Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	89	62	54	0
% Advanced	31	29	13	7	0
Number of students tested	65	56	82	96	0
Percent of total students tested	33	26	37	41	0
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84		59	58	
% Advanced	13		16	6	
Number of students tested	64		70	69	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	94	61	55	
% Advanced	10	31	12	8	
Number of students tested	58	51	74	85	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50		50	38	
% Advanced	0		11	0	
Number of students tested	12		18	21	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data for a group of students were suppressed if the group had fewer than 5 students. Data for that group and the next smallest group were suppressed to proctect the privacy of individual students.

In 2004-05 state assessments were not administered to this grade.

Subject: Reading Grade: 3 Test: New York State ELA

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009 Publisher: McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	85	69	37	36	0
% Advanced	12	31	0	0	0
Number of students tested	65	55	82	97	0
Percent of total students tested	33	26	19	24	0
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	69	36	42	
% Advanced	13	31	0	0	
Number of students tested	64	53	70	66	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	74	35	38	
% Advanced	10	34	0	0	
Number of students tested	58	50	74	85	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50		6	11	
% Advanced	0		0	0	
Number of students tested	12		18	19	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:
Data for a group of students were suppressed if the group had fewer than 5 students. Data for that group and the next smallest group were suppressed to proctect the privacy of individual students.

In 2004-05 state assessments were not administered to this grade.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 4 Test: NYSTP

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009 Publisher: McGraw Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	81	68	60	66
% Advanced	81	15	17	15	24
Number of students tested	57	80	81	62	67
Percent of total students tested	29	38	37	26	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			67	69	67
% Advanced			16	12	
Number of students tested			76	42	60
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	80	74	64	68
% Advanced	84	15	21	17	
Number of students tested	51	71	68	47	59
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		59	47	17	
% Advanced		0	0	0	
Number of students tested		22	17	12	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Data for a group of students were suppressed if the group had fewer than 5 students. Data for that group and the next smallest group were suppressed to proctect the privacy of individual students. Therefore the Economically Disadvantaged students' data in 2008-09 were suppressed; however since 55 students were tested their performance is not statistically significantly different from the All Students sub-group's performance.

In 2004-05 only grade 4 students took the state assessments and Level 4/Advanced data were not presented separately in the report.

Subject: Reading Grade: 4 Test: NYSTP

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009 Publisher: McGraw Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	53	41	38	38
% Advanced	16	4	0	3	8
Number of students tested	56	79	83	63	66
Percent of total students tested	28	37	37	28	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			40	41	39
% Advanced			0	2	
Number of students tested			78	41	57
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	51	44	44	40
% Advanced	18	1	0	4	
Number of students tested	50	70	70	50	60
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		9	6	0	
% Advanced		0	0	0	
Number of students tested		22	18	12	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Data for a group of students were suppressed if the group had fewer than 5 students. Data for that group and the next smallest group were suppressed to proctect the privacy of individual students. Therefore the Economically Disadvantaged students' data in 2008-09 and 2007-08 were suppressed; however since the number of students tested in each sub group were similar to the number in each year's total students tested their performance is not statistically significantly different from the total students performance.

In 2004-05 only grade 4 students took the state assessments and Level 4/Advanced data were not presented separately in the report.

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 5 Test: NYSTP

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009 Publisher: McGraw Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	63	47	50	0
% Advanced	49	13	7	1	0
Number of students tested	75	72	57	68	0
Percent of total students tested	38	34	26	29	0
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		63		51	
% Advanced		12		2	
Number of students tested		67		51	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	95	61	45	52	
% Advanced	47	12	7	2	
Number of students tested	66	57	44	60	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	52	7		
% Advanced	10	9	7		
Number of students tested	21	23	15		
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Data for a group of students were suppressed if the group had fewer than 5 students. Data for that group and the next smallest group were suppressed to proctect the privacy of individual students. Therefore the Economically Disadvantaged students' data in 2008-09 and 2006-07 were suppressed; however since the number of students tested in each sub group were similar to the number in each year's total students tested their performance is not statistically significantly different from the total students performance.

In 2004-05 only grade 4 students were administered state assessments.

Subject: Reading Grade: 5 Test: NYSTP

Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009 Publisher: McGraw Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	49	16	42	0
% Advanced	13	3	0	3	0
Number of students tested	76	73	58	62	0
Percent of total students tested	38	35	26	27	0
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		50		47	
% Advanced		1		4	
Number of students tested	74	68	54	49	
2. African American Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	55	16	45	
% Advanced	13	3	0	4	
Number of students tested	67	58	44	56	
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested	8	13	12	3	
4. Special Education Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	81	22	0	17	
% Advanced	0	0	0	0	
Number of students tested	21	23	14	6	
5. Limited English Proficient Students					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested	2	3	3	3	
6. Largest Other Subgroup					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested	1	1	1	1	

Notes:

Data for a group of students were suppressed if the group had fewer than 5 students. Data for that group and the next smallest group were suppressed to proctect the privacy of individual students. Therefore the Economically Disadvantaged students' data in 2008-09 and 2006-07 were suppressed; however since the number of students tested in each sub group were similar to the number in each year's total students tested their performance is not statistically significantly different from the total students performance.

In 2004-05 only grade 4 students were administered the state assessments.