



## **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 configuration 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 (AYP) or its equivalent 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 AYP requirement or its equivalent in the 2012-2013 school year. Meeting AYP or its equivalent must be certified by the state. Any AYP status appeals must be 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 foreign language courses.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2007 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for that period.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 or 2012.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school's application and/or rescind a school's award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The 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.
10. 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.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

---

All data are the most recent year available.

### DISTRICT

1. Number of schools in the district 40 Elementary schools (includes K-8)  
11 Middle/Junior high schools  
13 High schools  
0 K-12 schools  
64 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 4120

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

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Urban or large central city
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 12
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2012 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	14	22	36
K	32	42	74
1	37	45	82
2	45	38	83
3	35	47	82
4	44	36	80
5	39	37	76
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
<b>Total in Applying School:</b>			<b>513</b>

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 2 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
20 % Asian  
8 % Black or African American  
63 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
7 % White  
0 % Two or more races  
100 % Total

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

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2011-2012 school year: 18%  
This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

Step	Description	Value
(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year.	42
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2011 until the end of the school year.	43
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	85
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2011	479
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.18
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	18

8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school: 22%  
Total number of ELL students in the school: 106  
Number of non-English languages represented: 10  
Specify non-English languages:

The following languages are spoken:

Spanish, Arabic, Bengali, Urdu, Chinese, Mandarin, Sinhala, Vietnamese, Punjabi, Hindi

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 78%

Total number of students who qualify: 400

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

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 17%

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.

<u>1</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>8</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>30</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>42</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>3</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>1</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</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:

	<u><b>Full-Time</b></u>	<u><b>Part-Time</b></u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>26</u>	<u>0</u>
Resource teachers/specialists (e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.)	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
Support staff (e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.)	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>57</u>	<u>0</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:

19:1

13. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>
Daily student attendance	95%	94%	94%	93%	94%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2012.

Graduating class size: \_\_\_\_\_

Enrolled in a 4-year college or university \_\_\_\_\_ %

Enrolled in a community college \_\_\_\_\_ %

Enrolled in vocational training \_\_\_\_\_ %

Found employment \_\_\_\_\_ %

Military service \_\_\_\_\_ %

Other \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Total** \_\_\_\_\_ **0%**

15. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award:

No

Yes

If yes, what was the year of the award?

## **PART III - SUMMARY**

---

P.S. 66 is a small neighborhood Title I school in a diverse socio-economic area dedicated to achieving high standards of academic excellence in all subject areas for all of our students. Our school has three heterogeneously grouped classes per grade K-5 except for Pre-K where we have two. Our mission is “to be a school where all children work hard, make friends with one another, and develop responsibility, truthfulness and respect within a safe learning environment.”

P.S. 66 opened its doors 114 years ago and has been a hallmark of the Richmond Hill community in Queens, New York. Over the years, our reputation for excellence has thrived and flourished. Our goal is to educate and support students toward realizing their full potential as productive members of society. Through high quality, standards-driven instruction, a nurturing environment, and the development of civic, social, and technological skills, we create a community of productive life-long learners.

Our greatest strength lies in our hard working and dedicated staff. One hundred percent of our teachers are state certified and licensed. Our administration is knowledgeable, articulate, collegial, and commanding of respect. Teachers are encouraged to attend a wide array of professional conferences to stay on the cutting edge of education. At P.S. 66, discussions are fostered and opinions and best practices are shared and valued. Decisions are made for the benefit of all our children. Teachers are devoted, caring and patient with our students. They bring out the best in their students, igniting imagination, encouraging talents, and sparking curiosity within a positive risk-taking atmosphere. The culture of our building is one of mutual respect, sincerity, a strong sense of professional pride, collaboration, and, above all, a belief that all children can learn.

Our students encompass a variety of ethnic and racial backgrounds ( Hispanic, 62.48%, American Indian or Alaskan native, 2.13%, Asian, 19.73%, Black, 7.74%, White, 7.16%, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, 0.38% and Multi-racial, 0.38%), resulting in a sense of tolerance and respect that resonates throughout the building. We continue to welcome a large number of children who are English Language Learners (ELL). We are confident that although our children are educated in a 19<sup>th</sup> Century building, they are prepared to succeed in a 21<sup>st</sup> Century world. We try to educate, nurture, and inspire our students to look to the future with optimism and a desire to achieve.

We are an incredible school where a spirit of “family” exists. We envision our school as a community of learners where all members—students, staff and parents,—are actively engaged in the educational process. Staff and parents, as equal partners, are focused on empowering all students with the academic skills and rich civic and social experiences that will enable them to further their educational goals and become active, responsible, and positive members of society. All standards are intended to bring students to high levels of performance to meet the rigors and demands of life. Ongoing dialogue between staff and parents is accomplished through the PTA, the Parent Coordinator and a cohesive School Leadership Team.

P.S. 66 is a place where children want to be and our high attendance percentage is a testament to that. The entire staff is concerned with the welfare of our students. Our children are comfortable and confident in seeking the assistance of any adult in the building in all areas of their academic, social, and emotional growth. We emphasize values such as tolerance, respect, brotherhood, honesty, and truthfulness. We foster the work ethic and encourage, support, and celebrate individuality. Our children are instilled with a sense of spirit and a confidence that says, “Yes, I can excel!”

Over the past few years, we have achieved many significant accomplishments.

- We received an “A” grade in NYC’s annual school progress reports for the past five years, 2008-2012.
- We were named as one of the ten best NYC schools for earning highest marks on the city’s annual school progress reports for 2012.
- The school has made 100% literacy our beacon. With that as our goal, in 2003 we renamed our school after Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis. Her lifetime passion for literacy; her love of good books and a discerning taste for good literature has set the standard to which our students aspire. Our goals emulate Onassis’s own words:

*“Read for escape, read for adventure.....When your imagination is stirred, it can lead you down paths you never dreamed you would travel.”*

- The New York State Business Council has recognized our reading improvement with the esteemed Pathfinder Award of 2002.
- We received the High Performance Gap Closing School Award for school year 2004-2005.
- In 2009, we received the NYS National Title I Distinguished School Award, Category 1 for exceptional student performance for two or more consecutive years.
- Our standardized test scores have demonstrated consistent growth and progress in reading and mathematics. PS 66’s performance trends have been steadily increasing over the years with a total of 84.55% of our students in 2012 scoring at or above grade level in Reading, and 88.8% at or above grade level in Math. Our emphasis is on closing the learning gap.
- A Balanced Literacy Model is utilized in which students are required to take an active role in the lessons.
- Historic Restoration of our building began in 2001 and was completed in 2003. Our building was recognized on the National Registry of Historic Places in 2003. It is also a New York State Historic Site, and the Borough of Queens deemed it a Landmark in 2004. In 2010, we were officially declared a NYC landmark.

## **PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

---

### **1. Assessment Results:**

P.S. 66 participates in The New York State Testing Program for both English Language Arts and Mathematics. The assessments, formerly published by CTB McGraw-Hill and presently by Pearson, are based on the New York State Learning Standards and the Core Curriculum and are designed to measure yearly student progress. Results are reported in performance levels as follows:

**Level 1** – not meeting performance standard. Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level

**Level 2** – meets basic standard of performance. Student performance shows a partial understanding of subject and grade level material.

**Level 3** – meets proficiency standard. Student performance demonstrates an understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

**Level 4** – exceeds proficiency standard. Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of content expected in the subject and grade level.

<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov>

Over the past five years, P.S. 66's performance trends have steadily increased and have met or exceeded NYS standards. We have maintained a "highly effective" growth rating this past year with a growth score of 19 according to the 2011-12 NYS growth data breakdown. Our schools' current status in State Accountability is "reward". Based on our NYS report card, we have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) in ELA, Math and Science for the past five years. All our subgroups also met the AYP requirements.

According to the NYC progress report for our "performance over time" percentile, our 2009 ranking was at the 82<sup>nd</sup>ile; in 2010 it increased to a rank in the 93<sup>rd</sup>ile; in 2011 it continued to increase to the 99<sup>th</sup>ile; and we maintained the 99<sup>th</sup> in 2012.

Our Grade 3, 4, and 5 NYS ELA scores for 2008 showed 86.3% of our students scoring a Level 3 and 4. In 2009 our Level 3 and 4 students rose to 89.6%. In 2010, when NYS raised the cut scores for the basic and proficient performance levels for the ELA, our performance level did fall to 68.9% of our students performing at Levels 3 and 4. However, the following two years showed an increase of students again performing at or above Level 3 to 79.3% in 2011 and 84.5% in 2012.

Our Grade 3, 4, and 5 NYS MATH scores for 2008 showed 96.6% scoring at Levels 3 and 4. In 2009 we reached 99.1% of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4. In 2010, when NYS raised the cut scores for Math performance, 81% of our students scored at Levels 3 and 4. However, the following two years showed an increase of students performing at or above Level 3 to 86.3% in 2011, and 88.8% in 2012.

Based on our NYC Progress Report, we have earned additional credit by closing the achievement gap for students with disabilities and English Language Learners as well as other smaller subgroups. In school year, 2011-12, 56.3% of our ELL students were at the 75<sup>th</sup> growth percentile or higher on the ELA exam. For the same year, our Students with Disabilities (SWD) scored 77.8% at the 75<sup>th</sup> growth percentile or higher on the ELA exam. In math, 58.0% of our ELL population was at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile or higher and of our SWD students 59.3% were at the 75 percentile or higher. Overall, 63.8% of our ELL population

made progress. Although we continue to close the gap between our ELL population and general education students, there still exists a performance gap between the two groups based on 2012's reading results. SWD results showed a very minimal gap of less than 10 percentage points.

At P.S. 66, we have established programs and systems to ensure that every student has the opportunity to make progress and meet State standards.

- At the beginning of the school year, a baseline assessment is given in ELA and Math to determine levels in order to differentiate instruction.
- Unit assessments from our research/standard based systems (*Treasures Reading System and EnVisions Math System*) are administered to diagnose areas of weakness and need for intervention and support.
- Running records are done quarterly to assess student progress and proficiency in reading.
- Extended day for at-risk students (those at Level 1 and 2) provides remediation in reading and math.
- We provide an AM Literacy/Math program four days a week and a PM Academy twice a week for at-risk intervention services for ELLs, SWDs and students in the lowest quartile.
- Academic Intervention Services (AIS) Program targets students at risk, ELLs and students with IEPs. The AIS teachers collaborate with grade/classroom teachers to provide push-in or pull-out support for differentiated small group instruction.
- ELL teachers provide services to all mandated students in and out of the classroom as well as former ELLs to help them through the transition period.
- An Enrichment program is offered to our students who are exceeding the standards.
- Our school utilizes web based computer programs for Grades K-5 entitled *Destination Reading* and *Brain Pop*. *Destination Reading* and *Brain Pop* provide students with ELA and Math resources to supplement their regular classroom instruction. The *Destination Reading* program is correlated to state's standards in English Language Arts and Math. Both these programs provide a home-link to supplement students' regular classroom work. This aids our growth in both subject areas. We use *Rosetta Stone* for an additional teaching tool for our ELL students. *Treasures* has a web based home component for students to reinforce their daily learning.

## **2. Using Assessment Results:**

The Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis School's action plan for improvement and acceleration of student learning is founded on a theory derived from the analysis of school data and, whenever possible, linked to research on effective practice. Teacher teams and individual teachers gather and analyze data that creates a clear understanding of student mastery. They use the data from Acuity, ARIS, ECLAS, EdPerformance, Fountas & Pinnell reading system, *Treasures* weekly and unit assessments, *EnVisions* math program, ELA and Math practice tests, student portfolios, informal testing, classroom observations and conferencing. Our teachers are able to offer students regular feedback on their learning progress through formative classroom assessments and consultation. These formative assessments pinpoint those concepts and skills that have been learned well and any learning problems that still exist.

Based on summative and formative data, our collaborative inquiry teams meet weekly to plan corrective activities and develop best practices involving format, organization or method of presentation. Teaching colleagues often offer new ways of presenting concepts, different examples, and alternative materials.

These corrective activities allow teachers to engage students differently and better provide students with successful learning experiences.

During our Inquiry time and common planning time, teachers work collaboratively to develop rigorous unit plans for the ELA performance task. They administer an initial task and examine the results. They adjust their plans according to the results of their assessments. They also include lessons and activities to teach the concepts. Finally, they administer the final performance task. The results are documented and used for further instruction.

Teachers and administrators use the data from given assessments to plan for small group and inquiry group instruction. They look at students' progress over time and adjust grouping to meet the needs of all children. For students who have met the learning goals, we challenge them with above grade level work.

Teachers differentiate instruction according to the most recent assessments and reteach areas of weakness. Teachers and administrators meet monthly to align current reading and math curriculum to reflect class and grade needs. They plan out test preparation schedules and discuss most recent diagnostic baseline and benchmark results. Teachers plan future lessons to reflect the trends of these tests.

Teachers work in an interdisciplinary manner. They collaborate using an inquiry approach reviewing student data, and sharing work samples of students who are in the targeted groups such as English language learners, students with IEPs, etc. Grade level planning enables the teachers to have a well developed instructional plan to prepare all students for the future. School Leaders and faculty regularly develop teacher pedagogy from a coherent set of beliefs about how students learn best. This ensures that it is aligned to the curriculum, engaging to the students, and differentiated to produce meaningful work products. We modify our assessments to meet the needs of all students. We factor in student interests when planning for instruction. We work in small groups to ensure individualized instruction.

The Literacy Coach supports the professional development needs of the teaching staff. The Coach provides professional development (via class demonstrations, workshops, text-based discussions) for all teachers, including teachers of English Language Learners (ELL), special education, Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT), as well as Resource Room in all areas of English Language Arts (ELA), Math, and other instruction. Ongoing site-based differentiated and diversified Professional Development is tailored to the unique needs of the students and teachers focusing on both the quality and rigor of the curriculum, instruction and assessment. Teachers and administrators have developed a culture of learning in which they share knowledge, including best practices. Through the formation of "book clubs", our staff reads and shares educational literature. Professional development includes a wide range of activities and experiences driven entirely by teachers' needs. The intent is to build capacity to use data and common planning time effectively and to implement best practices.

Assessments administered in math and reading help teachers focus on specific student areas in need of extra instructional support. Those identified students receive intensive guidance and support services in the content areas through AIS, a before and after school program. With these support services, our Level 1 and 2 students have shown a marked improvement.

Based on assessment results and our large bilingual population, we saw the need to expand our ELL program to include three teachers who provide services to grades K-5. A pullout and push-in model is used. The focus is to develop language skills that will enable students to function effectively in their regular classrooms. In addition, the areas of self-esteem and confidence building are emphasized. All teachers who have ELL students are provided with appropriate instructional strategies within the confines of their classrooms. Also, ELL teachers provide additional support and staff development as needed, teaching strategies for use in the classroom.

### **3. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

P.S. 66 has become a model school for our Children First Network. We share our methods and practices with district representatives, principals and teachers from other schools. Aligning our content-rich curriculum to our own standards-based pedagogical methodologies enables us to provide a model of success for our students. Principals and teachers frequently visit our school for “walkthroughs” to observe our teachers’ planning and execution of daily lessons. We also send teachers to other network schools to observe instruction or showcase current trends in curriculum.

Recently, our former Network Leader, held a “Networking through the Cluster” meeting at P.S. 66 to explain how we keep track of our at risk students through data collection and assessment. We also sent our Literacy Team, a group of teachers providing support to classroom teachers, to a neighboring school where a round table discussion took place comparing the beginning of the year assessments with what they would be using to replace the nearly obsolete ECLAS.

The Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis School has many special programs where parents, local officials and others are invited to visit and share in the festivities. Community events aid our success in all areas and establish a positive school culture.

#### **4. Engaging Families and Communities:**

We recognize that family involvement is an essential ingredient for a successful educational program. With the assistance of our Parent Coordinator, Parent Teacher Association and Leadership Team, we strengthen parent and community involvement giving everyone a voice in the school community. We promote participation and positive support of the PTA and parent involvement in our school through active discussions with our School Leadership Team and the UFT Chapter Chairperson as measured by attendance at school meetings.

Through meetings and dialogue, a concerted effort has been made to educate and involve our parents in understanding and assisting their children on the ELA and Math assessments. Although there is a supportive attitude, strategies are needed to enable parents to provide academic assistance, especially with caretakers who are non-English speakers. Through the assistance of our Parent Coordinator, we implement parent workshops in the areas of English Language classes, homework assistance, nutrition, testing awareness, and behavioral strategies.

To ensure that parents are aware of students’ work and achievements, teachers inform parents with a monthly grade newsletter. It explains the goals, activities and achievements for the month. Every class has a management system for student of the week. Our school shares distinguished achievements with parents through “Students of the Month”.

Our International Day provides parents, staff, and students with an opportunity to share information about heritage, customs and food in a collegial manner. During our Career Day, local important figures and parents discuss with students their various careers including education needed, training, etc. We celebrate our annual Literacy Night where parents and students are invited to attend a “Reading Party”. Good literature, cookies, and juice are served.

PS 66 students and parents participate in community outreach programs such as Thanksgiving Food Drives, Jump Rope for Hearts, Pennies for Patients, Toys for Tots, Support our Troops, and “Respect for All” programs.

# PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

## 1. Curriculum:

### Reading/English language arts

A standards-based balanced literacy approach to reading and writing is utilized at P.S. 66. A daily, ninety minute workshop model for classroom teaching is used and generally has three parts: a **mini-lesson** in which information is presented to students, **independent** work time where the teacher confers with students at their seats as they work on their own, and a **share session** where discussion takes place and experiences are shared. Our classroom structure for providing instruction to the unique needs of student groups is the guided reading lesson. The AIS teacher works in small groups with scaffolded lessons to support struggling readers. As literacy experiences progress, this reading partnership culminates in students becoming independent readers. The writing workshop follows the same model and includes daily journal writing.

### Math

Our school uses a standards-based math program. The workshop model is utilized in our math lessons with a mini-lesson, independent work and a share session. Daily problem-based interactive math learning, followed by visual learning strategies, deepens conceptual understanding by making meaningful connections for students and delivering strong, sequential, visual/verbal connections through a visual learning bridge. Ongoing diagnosis and intervention and daily data-driven differentiation ensures that every student has the opportunity to succeed. Our program encourages the use of critical thinking, higher order thinking skills and problem-solving to meet the Math Standards. Manipulatives have been provided for all classrooms.

### Science

In the area of science, we emphasize a hands-on discovery approach with science labs completed by grades 3, 4, and 5. Furthermore, there is a literacy component through which children are able to read books related to themes being studied. This is, once again, consistent with the science standards. Concepts are cyclically addressed. Our two science cluster teachers provide on-going hands on experiments in the lab. Over the past two years, 95% of our fourth graders have met or exceeded the standards for the NYS Standardized test.

### Social Studies

In the area of Social Studies, P.S. 66's curriculum is aligned to the NYS standards. The New York City program utilizing Houghton Mifflin texts is used in Grades K-5. Supplemental materials and approaches used in order to facilitate and enrich the teaching of social studies include: NYS Primary source collections, field trips, research reports, document-based questioning strategies, the use of the library, the use of maps and internet access.

### Visual and Performing Arts

The Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis School implements diverse integrated arts programs through a variety of instructional and cultural initiatives for all students based on the *Blueprint for Teaching and Learning in the Arts*. We incorporate the arts across all curricula areas. Using the curriculum, we integrate music, dance, theater, and art into thematic units offering students hands-on cultural opportunities. Using

residencies provided by arts agencies and field trips, we expose students to theater, drama, dance and music. The students participate in school-based arts festivals during the year.

### **Physical Education/Health/Nutrition**

PS 66 implements a rigorous health and physical education curriculum based on the NYS standards. Students gain knowledge and skills to establish physical fitness, participate in physical activity and maintain personal health.

### **Technology**

Computer technology is an important aspect of PS 66's standard-based curriculum. Our classrooms are outfitted with computer carts as well as desktops. Each room has state-of-the-art Smartboards and document cameras. Professional development is provided for teachers to support classroom needs. Students are taught programs that prepare them for their role in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

### **Literacy through the Social Sciences**

We reserve a period each day whereby the students are offered a unique experience to enhance their Social Studies curriculum. We have supplemented our classroom libraries with informational non-fiction texts that correlate to grade specific themes. Small group book talks are conducted in which children exchange ideas and focus on units of study. They are assigned roles of responsibility such as recorder, moderator, summarizer, illustrator, and connector to encourage thoughtful discussion, a love of reading and an awareness of the world around them.

### **Penny Harvest/Pennies for Patients/Toys for Tots/ Adopt a Platoon/Respect for All**

PS 66 participates in many outreach programs teaching children the importance of making a difference in the community via philanthropy.

This year Penny Harvest is dedicating our donations to recovery efforts after Hurricane Sandy.

Pennies for Patients is a service learning, character education program that gives students experience in making a difference by aiding thousands of children and adults in the fight against blood cancers.

New toys and games are collected to donate to needy children.

Adopt a Platoon is a project where children send our military soldiers in active duty personal care items, candy, gum, etc. to lift their spirits and show that we, at home, care.

The Respect for All program teaches our students about our unique diverse population and acceptance for all.

## **2. Reading/English:**

In the area of reading, we utilize a balanced literacy model and follow the NYC *Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Literacy's Handbook for Educators*. Our focus is to inspire children to read, and to develop comprehension and phonemic awareness. These techniques, in addition to the use of other modalities, facilitate the realization of our school goal: to improve pupil literacy in accordance with the standards. All classrooms have been provided with leveled libraries. Teachers incorporate the classroom library as part of the literacy block. We have purchased additional libraries to supplement the students' appreciation of fine literature.

We use a research-based, comprehensive balanced literacy program called *Treasures*, which includes reading, writing, listening, speaking and comprehension. The *Treasures Reading System* offers a wealth of high quality literature to engage learners. Explicit instruction and ample practice ensure students' growth in reading proficiency. Each week's lesson integrates grammar, writing, and spelling for a total language arts approach. There is a computer component that differentiates instruction. *Triumphs*, the intervention program of the *Treasures Reading System* provides appropriate reading materials and additional practice for at-risk students. Included in the program are validated diagnostic and prescriptive tools to determine needs and put students back on track. Also utilized is *Treasure Chest*, the K-5 comprehensive component of *Treasures* with differentiated instruction for language acquisition for our English Language Learners. Data is used systematically to drive instruction and determine the strengths and needs of our students.

In grades K-2, *Wilson's Foundations*, a phonological/phonemic awareness, phonics and spelling program for the general education classroom, is used. *Foundations* serves as a prevention program to reduce reading and spelling failure. It provides the research-validated strategies that complement other programs to meet standards and serve the needs of all children.

P.S. 66 purchased a life-long subscription to the *Destination Reading* computer program which is a data driven technology. It is used for general education, SETSS and ELL students as tools to individualize student practice in an effort to meet their goals. *BrainPop*, another on line program, is purchased annually. It creates animated standards and curriculum-based content that supports educators and engages students. Both programs can be accessed at home for reinforcement and enrichment, making this a wonderful home to school tool.

Students designated as at-risk participate in small group instruction that takes place in each class in order to realize our school goal of improving literacy. To reduce student-teacher ratio, an At-risk Intervention (AIS) teacher pushes into the classroom. The AIS teacher spends more time individualizing teaching and targeting the individual needs of each child including children with special and language-learning needs. Small group instruction generates greater student involvement and allows more students, including ELLs, disabled and gifted students, with additional individual guided instruction. The school is making progress in improving the reading skills of students performing below and above grade level as evidenced by our ELA scores. We have used these strategies successfully and will continue to do so.

### **3. Mathematics:**

In the area of math, *EnVision Math Common Core System* provides the foundation of our instructional program. The Math Coach facilitates staff development to familiarize all staff with the tenets of this program. This program encourages the use of critical thinking, higher order thinking skills and problem-solving to meet the Common Core Math Standards. Manipulatives have been provided for classroom use. The AIS teachers address the needs of our struggling students. We provide a push-in model for academic intervention services to assist our classroom teachers in meeting the needs of our struggling students in grades K through 5.

We chose *EnVision Math*, a research-based, data driven instructional program because it met the varied needs of students and teachers. *EnVision Math* addresses the wide range of educational issues that teachers face and provides curriculum to meet these needs. Math concepts are developed through interactive and visual learning. Multiple means of assessment are provided to track and remediate our students. It has an engaging on-line component that adds extra resources for content. It also has a home/school connection enabling parents to keep up with the skills being taught. The program is organized around the common core domains so teaching is highly focused, manageable and coherent. It provides teacher support for differentiated instruction.

Our math program challenges students with intellectually and academically rigorous instruction. It reflects a core of knowledge that is important, organized around major concepts, and requiring in-depth

investigation. Teachers make interdisciplinary connections between other subject areas. Our students have an opportunity to evaluate and revise work in collaboration with peers and teachers so that the work ultimately meets the standards. We engage our students individually, in groups, and as a whole class. We make connections through accountable talk and higher level thinking requiring them to raise questions and use reasoning to solve a problem or task.

#### **4. Additional Curriculum Area:**

We established a partnership with Studio in a School combining visual arts with nutrition instruction to motivate children to eat fresh, seasonal produce and make healthy eating choices. Using visual arts workshops and nutrition lessons encourages students to make healthier eating decisions while viewing fruits and vegetables with an artist's eye. Our students sketch and draw these foods with pastels, water color, ink and pen, and colored pencils while tasting these various foods. We proudly display our artwork for all to see.

Furthermore, as part of our pride in our historically landmarked building, we advance, deepen and instill a love for New York and American History in our students. In order to facilitate this, we participate in a collaborative classroom-based program combining the extraordinary collections of the New York Historical Society with the tools and principles of the visual arts. The program combines art history and the visual arts with the study of historical evidence. Our students learn to strengthen their observation and descriptive skills while hands-on art making provides them with tools to visually document what they learned. Our mini-residency artist and teachers choose a theme, examine objects and works of art, and participate in small group work while learning about a particular era in New York and American History. Journals, drawings and words that reflect their learning are maintained. Culminating activities include our own "Museum" where classes, parents and guests peruse these art projects.

#### **5. Instructional Methods:**

The Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis School is a literacy-based school where clear expectations are outlined and understood. Expert instruction is aligned to NYS standards in all curriculum areas. Our curriculum is engaging and differentiated. Our students are challenged, inspired, and provided with extra help where needed.

Our school effectively uses a data driven approach to improve student performance. PS 66 aligns instruction with data gathered by providing for a full time Reading/Math Coach, ELL teachers, SETSS teachers, IEP teachers and AIS personnel. Multiple measures identify and address student weaknesses for general education students, special education students and English Language Learners targeting areas for growth on a continuing basis. For those students not attaining the standard benchmark, an Academic Intervention Plan is developed and implemented. Trends and patterns in our data are analyzed and used to provide individualized instruction. Through collaborative planning and student and parent engagement, we set high goals for improving teaching practice and accelerating each student's learning. Academic Intervention Teachers (AIS) are assigned to each class. These providers are literacy and math specialists and staff developers. They provide small group differentiated instruction to all classes throughout the school day. The workshop model is utilized in all subject areas: a mini-lesson in which information is presented to students, independent time where the teacher confers with students at their seats as they work on their own, and a share session where discussion and experiences are exchanged. Ability-level groups are formed based on data and teacher observation. The AIS and classroom teachers provide intensive and intentional teaching using sound remediation methodologies.

Teachers are required to ensure that instruction is modified and effective in order to facilitate learning. Where possible, our aim is to move away from traditional lesson practices of teaching with one modality (typically linguistic) for all students. Our teachers recognize that students learn in different ways so we utilize lessons with strategies that allow them to process information through multiple modalities.

All teachers participate in grade level teams using collaborative inquiry to hone in on relevant issues and target students for inquiry work and study. There is a common prep planning period for each grade once a week with a Literacy Team liaison. This enables the grade to discuss and plan best practices for the upcoming curriculum. Strategies and assessments are decided upon during these periods. The data specialist provides them with professional development in analyzing data. These sessions have improved the quality of teaching through the sharing of best practices and targeting interventions that improve student outcomes. As the school staff focuses on improving instruction, they may discover instructional practices that are commonly used but ineffective and decide to replace those practices with more effective, research supported ones.

Teachers work in an interdisciplinary manner. They collaborate using an inquiry approach reviewing student data and sharing work samples of targeted students who are English Language Learners, students with IEPs, etc. Grade level planning enables the teachers to have a well developed instructional plan to enable all students to be prepared for the future. School Leaders and faculty regularly develop teacher pedagogy from a coherent set of beliefs about how students learn best. They ensure that it is aligned to the curriculum, engaging, and differentiated to enable all students to produce meaningful work products. We modify our assessments to meet the needs of all students. We take into account our students interests when planning for instruction. We work with our students in small groups to ensure individualized instruction.

Our classrooms may be 114 years old, but they are well provided with modern day equipment. All classrooms have manipulatives, computers, laptops, Smartboards, document cameras and other resources to assist in the delivery of instruction using various modalities.

Our classes visit museums, theaters, historical societies, parks, science centers, and other cultural centers to enhance learning and provide knowledge based experiences to enrich students' lives. This is especially important since our immigrant and economically disadvantaged population may not otherwise be exposed to these experiences.

## **6. Professional Development:**

At P.S. 66 we continually seek to improve teacher instructional performance. Our goals are to build capacity and increase "best practice" instruction, to align instruction to performance standards, and to differentiate instruction to meet students' needs. Professional development priorities are based on school-wide assessments made by the administration and staff. We believe a differentiated professional development plan promotes excellence in instruction.

We support and document teacher performance through formal and informal observations, and monitor that professional development (PD) strategies are continually implemented and reflected in daily lessons.

We promote PD through grade conferences, faculty conferences, study groups on best practices, professional research-based readings, inter-visitations, collaborative planning, and coach modeling. After receiving outside training, teachers turn-key knowledge to the faculty throughout the school year. Teachers, administration, staff developers, mentors and team leaders conduct professional development and demonstration lessons. These sessions provide the staff with strategies to assess and improve student achievement. Our teachers share common preparatory periods where they meet and discuss methodologies to promote student achievement.

The Literacy/Math Coach provides professional development (via class demonstrations, workshops, text-based discussions) for all teachers, including teachers of English Language Learners (ELL), special education, Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT), as well as Resource Room, in all areas of English Language Arts (ELA), Math, and other subjects. Ongoing site-based differentiated and diversified professional development is tailored to the unique needs of the students and teachers, focusing on the quality and rigor of curriculum, instruction and assessment. Teachers and administrators have developed a culture of

learning in which they share knowledge, including best practices. Through the formation of “book clubs” they read and discuss educational literature. Professional development includes a wide range of activities and experiences driven entirely by teachers’ needs. The intent is to build data capacity, use common planning time effectively and implement best practices.

We utilize PD funding to support workshops in reading and math strategies, and visits to other schools. Teachers’ PD is effective in developing the capacity to ensure maximized student performance on all grade levels. Plan books are reviewed to ensure that teachers are scheduling lessons that implement Literacy and Mathematics prototypes, modify instructional plans, and design short and long term plans to foster student learning.

Our administrators and teachers continuously take a critical look at current educational programs to help the school define implications for changes that need to be considered. This leads to the development of educational priorities in support of the school’s vision. Once priorities are established, they are further defined by the development of specific annual goals. Measurable objectives and action plans translate into observable, effective strategies to improve student achievement.

## **7. School Leadership:**

After decades as a teacher, dean and then an assistant principal at a neighboring middle school, the principal was appointed to P.S. 66, in September, 2001. The Principal’s first priority was and still is to establish a supportive and encouraging rapport with the teachers and students of the school. Within a week of assuming her new role, our city was attacked on 9/11. Supporting the students and staff through this tragedy helped to establish the principal as the new leader of our small but well-established school. The principal has high expectations for every child and teacher and encourages respect for our community’s ethnic and socioeconomic diversity. We attribute our school’s success to our connections with parents, and our emphasis on individualized and small group instruction. At P.S. 66, we have established a clear vision for the future development of the school. We use data strategically to make highly effective decisions to enhance learning based on the new Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS).

The responsibilities of the principal as school leader are quite varied: business manager, committee member, meeting with parents, ordering books and materials, scheduling teacher observations, completing reports, etc. It is important that the principal choose staff leaders that will make certain our school’s vision, goals and philosophy are realized.

Our school leadership consists of the principal and one assistant principal. One of our main goals is to create an atmosphere of collaboration. In order to fulfill this goal, the principal developed a “Literacy Team/Cabinet Liaison” consisting of the Coach, two Literacy specialists, AIS teachers, and service providers. They are liaisons to an assigned grade and provide support to teachers in many aspects of the school day. With the team’s help, we establish clear expectations for achievement that are well understood by the students, parents and teachers. The “Literacy Team/Cabinet Liaisons” provide outstanding leadership by involving all staff members in strategic planning and researching exemplary practices and programs. The principal holds all teachers accountable for instruction and differentiates professional development in order for the faculty to design rigorous and engaging curricula.

The School Leadership Team, which consists of administrators, teachers and parents, revisits our Comprehensive Educational Plan to continuously examine our goals and plans. The strategies developed include effective, scientifically-based methods for the delivery of high-quality instruction to all students, including disaggregated subgroups.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: NYS Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2008-2012 Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill/Pearson

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	May	May	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	73	78	74	100	97
Level 4	17	29	35	49	40
Number of students tested	70	78	77	71	72
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	73	77	72	100	97
Level 4	17	30	32	49	40
Number of students tested	63	66	71	71	72
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	7	8	3	5	6
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	74	69	72	100	96
Level 4	15	24	38	46	43
Number of students tested	46	45	53	46	49
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	50	69	Masked	Masked	94
Level 4	5	8	Masked	Masked	22
Number of students tested	20	13	4	8	18
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	70	59	60	100	93
Level 4	0	7	35	44	14
Number of students tested	20	27	20	16	14
<b>6. Asian</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	75	93	Masked	100	100
Level 4	8	47	Masked	80	47
Number of students tested	12	15	9	10	15
<b>NOTES:</b>					
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.					
In academic year 2007-08, there was insufficient data in the African American subgroup to warrant statistics. Although the 2011-12 exam publisher changed from McGraw Hill to Pearson, we did not experience any significant deviation in test results.					

13NY13

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: NYS English Language Arts

Edition/Publication Year: 2008-2012 Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill/Pearson

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	May	Apr	Jan	Jan
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	76	68	81	84	75
Level 4	7	13	28	8	11
Number of students tested	68	76	74	63	71
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	77	66	79	84	75
Level 4	7	14	25	8	11
Number of students tested	61	64	68	63	71
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	7	8	3	4	6
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	82	59	82	78	69
Level 4	7	9	26	7	10
Number of students tested	45	44	50	41	48
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	70	38	Masked	Masked	44
Level 4	5	0	Masked	Masked	6
Number of students tested	20	13	4	7	18
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	61	40	71	73	25
Level 4	0	0	35	0	0
Number of students tested	18	25	17	11	12
<b>6. Asian</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	73	73	Masked	Masked	93
Level 4	9	20	Masked	Masked	20
Number of students tested	11	15	9	9	15
<b>NOTES:</b>					
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.					
In academic year 2007-08, there was insufficient data in the African American subgroup to warrant statistics. Although the 2011-12 exam publisher changed from McGraw Hill to Pearson, we did not experience any significant deviation in test results.					

13NY13

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: NYS Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2008-2012 Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill/Pearson

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	May	May	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	93	90	84	99	94
Level 4	43	41	37	51	55
Number of students tested	75	82	67	78	69
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	93	89	84	99	94
Level 4	40	38	39	51	55
Number of students tested	67	72	62	78	69
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	6	3	3	8	1
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	96	89	80	98	94
Level 4	39	41	32	52	59
Number of students tested	46	54	50	50	51
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	93	Masked	Masked	100	100
Level 4	33	Masked	Masked	22	60
Number of students tested	15	7	9	23	15
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	95	88	71	94	Masked
Level 4	30	12	7	19	Masked
Number of students tested	20	17	14	16	5
<b>6. Asian</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	93	100	Masked	100	Masked
Level 4	50	40	Masked	71	Masked
Number of students tested	14	10	8	17	7
<b>NOTES:</b>					
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.					
In academic year 2007-08, there was insufficient data in the African American and Asian subgroups to warrant statistics.					
Although the 2011-12 exam publisher changed from McGraw Hill to Pearson, we did not experience any significant deviation in test results.					

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: NYS English Language Arts

Edition/Publication Year: 2008-2012 Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill/Pearson

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	May	Apr	Jan	Jan
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	85	83	59	89	97
Level 4	5	3	3	3	4
Number of students tested	73	80	66	74	67
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	85	80	59	89	97
Level 4	3	3	2	3	4
Number of students tested	65	70	61	74	67
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	6	3	3	6	1
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	82	80	55	90	96
Level 4	4	4	4	0	2
Number of students tested	45	54	49	48	50
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	80	Masked	Masked	77	93
Level 4	7	Masked	Masked	0	0
Number of students tested	15	7	9	22	14
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	61	60	31	69	Masked
Level 4	0	0	0	0	Masked
Number of students tested	18	15	13	13	4
<b>6. Asian</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	85	Masked	Masked	88	Masked
Level 4	0	Masked	Masked	6	Masked
Number of students tested	13	9	8	17	7
<b>NOTES:</b>					
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.					
In academic year 2007-08, there was insufficient data in the African American, Asian and English Language Learner subgroups to warrant statistics. Although the 2011-12 exam publisher changed from McGraw Hill to Pearson, we did not experience any significant deviation in test results.					

13NY13

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: NYS Mathematics

Edition/Publication Year: 2008-2012 Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill/Pearson

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	May	May	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	99	90	85	99	99
Level 4	68	40	43	56	54
Number of students tested	78	73	87	73	67
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	99	91	84	99	99
Level 4	68	40	40	56	54
Number of students tested	72	67	80	73	67
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	4	3	8	2	8
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	98	89	85	98	98
Level 4	71	33	40	54	50
Number of students tested	52	54	55	50	40
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	Masked	Masked	86	100	Masked
Level 4	Masked	Masked	38	53	Masked
Number of students tested	9	8	21	15	3
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	93	82	71	Masked	Masked
Level 4	43	29	29	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	14	17	21	6	9
<b>6. Asian</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	100	Masked	89	Masked	100
Level 4	60	Masked	58	Masked	53
Number of students tested	10	9	19	7	15
<b>NOTES:</b>					
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.					
In academic year 2007-08, there was insufficient data in the African American and Special Education Students subgroup to warrant statistics. Although the 2011-12 exam publisher changed from McGraw Hill to Pearson, we did not experience any significant deviation in test results.					

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: NYS English Language Arts

Edition/Publication Year: 2008-2012 Publisher: CTB McGraw Hill/Pearson

	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Testing Month	Apr	May	Apr	Jan	Jan
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	91	88	66	96	88
Level 4	8	5	15	16	6
Number of students tested	78	66	82	67	67
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	90	87	67	96	88
Level 4	8	5	13	16	6
Number of students tested	72	60	75	67	67
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Level 4	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	4	3	8	2	8
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	90	88	70	96	92
Level 4	8	4	15	17	10
Number of students tested	52	49	53	47	39
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	Masked	Masked	57	93	Masked
Level 4	Masked	Masked	14	7	Masked
Number of students tested	9	8	21	15	3
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	64	80	44	Masked	Masked
Level 4	0	0	6	Masked	Masked
Number of students tested	14	10	16	3	8
<b>6. Asian</b>					
Level 3 & Level 4	90	Masked	61	Masked	75
Level 4	0	Masked	22	Masked	0
Number of students tested	10	8	18	7	16
<b>NOTES:</b>					
Masked indicates data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested.					
In academic year 2007-08, there was insufficient data in the African American and Special Education Students subgroups to warrant statistics. Although the 2011-12 exam publisher changed from McGraw Hill to Pearson, we did not experience any significant deviation in test results.					

13NY13