

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program**

---

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X] Title I    [ ] Charter    [ ] Magnet    [ ] Choice

Name of Principal Ms. Kelli L. McGowan

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Deerfield Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 115 Schoolhouse Road

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Deerfield                      State NY                      Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 13502-1135

County Oneida County                      State School Code Number\* 412902060005

Telephone 315-266-3412                      Fax 315-797-7145

Web site/URL http://www.wboro.org                      E-mail kmcgowan@wboro.org

Twitter Handle \_\_\_\_\_ Facebook Page \_\_\_\_\_ Google+ \_\_\_\_\_

YouTube/URL \_\_\_\_\_ Blog \_\_\_\_\_ Other Social Media Link \_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent\*Mr. David Langone                      E-mail: dlangone@wboro.org  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Whitesboro Central School District                      Tel. 315-266-3303

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board  
President/Chairperson Mr. Thomas Schoen, Jr.  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

*\*Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

## **PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

---

**Include this page in the school’s application as page 2.**

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) 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 a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) 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, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any 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.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.
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** (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

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

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

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city
  - Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
  - Suburban
  - Small city or town in a rural area
  - Rural
3. 7 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade                 | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK                  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| K                     | 29         | 24           | 53          |
| 1                     | 28         | 19           | 47          |
| 2                     | 19         | 27           | 46          |
| 3                     | 22         | 18           | 40          |
| 4                     | 28         | 24           | 52          |
| 5                     | 28         | 35           | 63          |
| 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 Students</b> | 154        | 147          | 301         |

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:      0 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
                                                                                  1 % Asian  
                                                                                  1 % Black or African American  
                                                                                  3 % Hispanic or Latino  
                                                                                  0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
                                                                                  91 % White  
                                                                                  4 % Two or more races  
                                                                                  **100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report 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.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 4%

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

| <b>Steps For Determining Mobility Rate</b>                                                                                     | <b>Answer</b> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| (1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year             | 6             |
| (2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year | 5             |
| (3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]                                                                | 11            |
| (4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1                                                                     | 305           |
| (5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)                                                 | 0.036         |
| (6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100                                                                                        | 4             |

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school:      3 %  
                                                                                  8 Total number ELL  
 Number of non-English languages represented:      6  
 Specify non-English languages: Russian; Spanish; Ukrainian; Bosnian; Hindi; Gujarati
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:      31 %  
                                                                                  Total number students who qualify:      92

If this method is not 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.

9. Students receiving special education services: 11 %  
26 Total number of students served

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>2</u> Autism                | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| <u>0</u> Deafness              | <u>0</u> Other Health Impaired                 |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness        | <u>18</u> Specific Learning Disability         |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>4</u> Speech or Language Impairment         |
| <u>1</u> Hearing Impairment    | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| <u>1</u> Mental Retardation    | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities | <u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed               |

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>Number of Staff</b> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Administrators                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 1                      |
| Classroom teachers                                                                                                                                                                                              | 17                     |
| Resource teachers/specialists<br>e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.                                                                  | 10                     |
| Paraprofessionals                                                                                                                                                                                               | 4                      |
| Student support personnel<br>e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc. | 2                      |

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 18:1

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

| <b>Required Information</b> | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance    | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       | 97%       |
| High school graduation rate | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        | 0%        |

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

| <b>Post-Secondary Status</b>                  |    |
|-----------------------------------------------|----|
| Graduating class size                         | 0  |
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university    | 0% |
| Enrolled in a community college               | 0% |
| Enrolled in career/technical training program | 0% |
| Found employment                              | 0% |
| Joined the military or other public service   | 0% |
| Other                                         | 0% |

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

Yes                      No X

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

## **PART III – SUMMARY**

---

Our mission at Deerfield Elementary School, as a community of students, educators, staff and families is to build a strong foundation for lifelong learning that ensures each student's academic success as well as physical, social, and emotional well-being in a safe, nurturing, and stimulating environment. Our goal is to make certain that each student achieves his or her personal goals as a contribution to the greater good of society through a system characterized by a holistic approach to teaching, learning, and student development through the integration of academic and co-curricular experiences. Our energetic staff is dedicated to the Common Core Standards and research based instructional practices. We participate in on-going professional development. We support the dynamic use of innovative technology. We encourage active participation of all members of the community in the education of students.

Our highest priority is our students; we are a student-centered school. We strive for our students to become effective communicators; skilled at reading and writing to complete interdisciplinary tasks. Our rigorous curriculum ensures that our students will be able to organize and present ideas with confidence; and be skilled at listening for a variety of purposes. We focus on teaching our students to become responsible citizens. Our students are taught to understand and address the political, environmental, and civic demands of society; have global awareness; choose ethical courses of action; appreciate cultural diversity; work in groups effectively; respect different viewpoints; and contribute to the community, in and out of school. We teach our students to become self-directed individuals with high self-esteem, to maintain physical and mental wellness. We strive for our students to be able to cope with change and persevere toward goal attainment. They are encouraged to initiate ideas, make intelligent choices, and set personal goals and priorities. Our students are inspired to develop and demonstrate independent learning skills.

Our entire school community; faculty, staff, parents, and students are committed to create a student-centered learning environment where every child has the opportunity to grow. We set high standards for learning. Our active and supportive Parent Teacher Association holds fundraising events allowing them to sponsor special programs to enhance the educational program at Deerfield. Events include hosting guest speakers for educational presentations, sending students on field trips to enjoy the arts, and sponsoring a magnificent Parent as Reading Partners (PARP) program. We encourage our students to be productive citizens who are kind, caring, and respectful sourcing the Josephson Institutes' Six Pillars of Character: Trustworthiness, Respect, Caring, Fairness, Citizenship, and Responsibility; as well as, the School and Counseling by Heart's, I Care and Peace Scholar Rules.

We make certain that our curriculum is directly aligned to the New York State Common Core Standards to ensure that our students are college and career ready. Our curriculum maps are horizontally and vertically aligned to ensure guaranteed viable curriculum across the District. The culture of our school is student-centered and data driven. To create this culture we structure our daily operational procedures and instructional practices around a master schedule that includes common planning time for grade level teachers to share best practices implementing professional learning communities. Each student receives ninety-minutes of uninterrupted English Language Arts instruction and sixty-minutes of uninterrupted math instruction per day. The content areas, science and social studies, are taught collaboratively within the English Language Art and Math instruction. To support ELA and math instruction, we adopted the Storytown Balanced Literacy Program and the Envisions Math Program. Both programs are aligned to the Common Core Standards.

We maintain a strong instructional program implementing a data driven philosophy where every child is given the support necessary to be successful. Each student is closely monitored using daily performance activities, quick checks, checklists, topic tests, and quarterly benchmark assessments. Additionally; third, fourth and fifth grade students are monitored through the New York State assessments. Any student who performs below set standard-based criteria receives research based interventions through our Response to Intervention (RTI) process and is closely monitored by the school's Teacher Support Team.

Our RTI process takes a three-tiered approach to providing services and interventions to students with learning/behavioral problems at increasing levels of intensity. Students continue to be closely monitored using individual performance data throughout the process. Progress monitoring data is used to make decisions about the need for further research based instruction and/or interventions in general education, in special education or both. We continually reflect upon our instructional program and strive to remain in a constant state of motion to improve and stay current in a society that is forever changing.

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

---

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

A. The New York State English Language Arts and Mathematics assessments are administered yearly to all students in third, fourth, and fifth grade. These assessments are part of a state and local effort to improve learning for all students by measuring results uniformly for all students and schools. Individual student results on the grade level tests are valuable in assessing each student's yearly progress toward attaining the ultimate goal of graduation and to create appropriate educational plans. Additionally, each student's outcome on the grade level assessments is used to determine the need for Academic Intervention Services. This data tells us if the school and/or the school district is meeting expectations. It also indicates where we may need to adjust instruction in order to improve learning. The students will receive a leveled score on each assessment based on individual performance. The scores are based on the following performance criteria: Level 1: Below Standard, Level 2: Meets Basic Standard, Level 3: Meets Proficiency Standard, and Level 4: Exceeds Proficiency Standard. There is also a scaled score within each level. The state sets a scaled score cut point. Any students who fall below the cut point, qualify for Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in that content area. Typically, this would be any student who earn less than Level 3 on the NYS Assessment. Academic Intervention Services are provided to small groups of students in several sessions per week ranging from 30-60 minutes for 9-12 weeks, and can be repeated as needed. AIS includes general education instruction plus specialized intervention provided by Title 1, paraprofessionals, and special education staff for students already classified. These interventions are not accommodations to existing curriculum, rather, they are instructional programs targeted to remediate a specific skill and include close progress monitoring. The level of AIS services provided is driven by individual student performance data.

B. At Deerfield Elementary, we clearly understand the importance of using data to plan and drive instruction. It is not just about creating charts and graphs to identify students' performance. It is about analyzing and using the data to make informed decisions regarding instruction. We use data to identify each student who does not meet proficiency and closely analyze their performance to provide targeted, research based interventions to close the gap. Over the past five years there were significant gaps in achievement for the economically disadvantaged subgroup at third grade. By the time the students reached fifth grade, the gap for students meeting or falling below proficiency, was no longer significant between the total number of students tested and the economically disadvantaged subgroup in both ELA and Math.

In 2009-2010, the New York State Education Department raised the English Language Arts and Math cut scores required to meet the Basic and Proficient performance levels, resulting in a statewide drop in the percentage of students who met previous proficiency, a Level 3 or Level 4. The New York State Commissioner of Education explained that this was not an indication that the students learned less or performed poorly. Instead, the lower number of students meeting proficiency was a reflection of the new higher standards set by the New York State Department of Education.

In the 2012-13, there was an anticipated statewide decline in English Language Arts and Math grades 3-8 assessment scores. These were the first to measure the Common Core Learning Standards. As expected, the percentage of students who scored within the proficiency level was lower than in 2011-2012. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. John King, has communicated to the public that these results do not reflect a drop in performance. However, they do reflect a raising of standards and will create a new baseline of student learning.

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

At Deerfield Elementary School, we frequently collect and analyze data to plan instruction. We begin by determining every child's baseline performance in ELA and mathematics; progress is closely monitored throughout the school year. Data determines how we deliver instruction to meet each child's needs. Everyday we reflect and modify if necessary; asking, "Does the instructional plan need to be modified or are the students on track?" Data collection begins before a child enters kindergarten with the Developmental Indicators for the Assessment of Learning (DIAL-4) and continues throughout grade five. Data collection

tools include: grade level curriculum checklists; Dynamic Indicators of Beginning Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS); Blachman and Tangel, Road to Reading Assessment; Storytown and Envisions Topic Tests; Early Literacy Assessments; Fountas and Pinnell, Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA 2); Cognitive Achievement Test (COGAT), Quarterly Benchmark Assessments; and the New York State Assessments.

All assessment data is closely analyzed. The principal segregates the data on spread sheets and then meets with all grade level teachers, reading and math specialists, and special education providers to review the data; including, examining each child's performance and the grade level's performance on specific skill areas. Using daily quick checks, weekly assessments, and benchmark data teachers modify instruction to meet the needs of each student. The data is used by classroom teachers and support staff to plan and provide prescriptive instruction. Modifications vary from tweaking individual student's lessons and assignments to modifying or re-teaching whole groups. Differentiated instruction is an essential component of our elementary instructional program. Classroom teachers work closely with support staff.

Individual students are closely monitored; if there is a gap in performance the student will be recommended for a review by the Teacher Support Team. The team meetings are scheduled several mornings a week to analyze specific students' strengths and weaknesses based on their individual performance. Parents are encouraged to attend the meeting to discuss their child's performance and discuss instructional plans. The need for Academic Intervention Services (AIS) is based on data. The team determines the intensity level and frequency of research-based interventions the student will require in order to close the gap. For example, a student with a low "Words Correct per Minute" rate on a fluency assessment will work directly with the Reading Assistant 2-3 times a week to improve this specific skill. Each student's progress is closely monitored implementing our 3-Tier Response to Intervention program. The groups fluctuate based on need of support. Enrichment activities are also built in to the instructional program. Students who perform in the significantly above average range on the Cognitive Achievement Test (COGAT) participate in an enrichment program. Data collected throughout the year is used to place students in above grade level reading classes. As a school community, we work diligently to utilize assessments as a means to identify strengths and weaknesses, in an effort to drive instruction so that we may achieve maximum student results. Parents are frequently updated on their child's performance. Performance data is frequently shared with parents and members of the community; including school report cards, progress reports, parent conferences, PTA Parent Presentations, newspaper reports, and at Board Meetings. We understand that frequent, open communication fosters success. Our goal is to establish a strong educational foundation by creating a partnership with parents.

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

The District offers great opportunities for sharing successful strategies within our school and across the district. At the building level, all teachers have grade level common planning time to plan, share instructional ideas, problem solve, and review data. Faculty meetings and weekly newsletters focus on updated educational research and ideas to maintain a positive environment. The principal supports and highly encourages teachers to observe their colleagues to share best practices; including new instructional techniques, approaches to differentiated instruction, and research based best practices in action. Quarterly data meetings provide teachers with an opportunity to have mee with AIS teachers, special education teachers, and therapists to analyze and interpret individual student's data. At these meetings, strategies to differentiate instruction and implement research based interventions are shared by professionals across the disciplines. Our goal is to tailor instruction to meet every child's needs.

All classroom teachers and special area teachers are highly encouraged to collaborate with their District colleagues. District Grade Level Teams and Departments meet monthly. These network meetings allow teachers the opportunity to engage in professional dialogue with their colleagues about their profession. Topics of focus often include: the latest trends in education; CCLS; new regulations, requirements and mandates; assessments and data. Also, teachers are afforded opportunities to teach classes to other professionals on a specific skill or area in which they have excelled.

Our communication and relationship with parents is also an integral part of the sharing process. In order for us to achieve maximum results, our school makes every effort to inundate parents with both common core information and assessment results to support and encourage their part in the learning process. At Deerfield, we believe knowledge is power. This community based approach assists in bridging the gap between home and school and offers yet another avenue for students to achieve at their highest performance level.

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

At Deerfield Elementary, our staff knows that a great school is first and foremost about relationships. Relationships between and among all those involved in our school community including students, their families, teachers, school support staff, and administrators. Our goal when engaging families and stakeholders is to lay a foundation for trusting relationships by building a rapport both personally and professionally within the Deerfield Elementary School community. With that foundation, true learning and achievement can take place, both academically and socially. This creates a culture where people truly feel welcome and enjoy spending their time.

In the current uproar of hot topics in education including changing curriculum and uncertainty about high pressure standards, we feel that positive, ongoing communication with families guided us through a smooth transition into the Common Core movement. When the shift towards Common Core was drafted, about three years ago, we immediately began our plan. We evaluated what we already taught, determined what we need to be change and include, and planned what steps to take to make it a smooth transition. We began by informing families and providing information of changes that they would be seeing in their child's education. This strengthened their trust and support and allowed our school to gradually implement changes in a comfortable manner with encouragement from home. Informational sessions were presented for parents at PTA meetings. Teachers and staff took extra time and care to explain to parents not only what the changes were, but how each change was meant to benefit their children. We took several opportunities to share this information with parents; including Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, Principal's Share Sessions, Newsletters, and good old fashioned heart to heart conversations. We wanted our parents to know that we value each and every student as an individual.

Deerfield Elementary prides itself on using the school as a hub of the community. To fulfill our desire for strong relationships within our school community we have many events where families and community members are invited into the school to socialize and celebrate. To name a few, we participate in Parents as Reading Partners Program, Science Extravaganza, a Wax Museum, Family Fun Nights, Valentine's Day Dances, Common Core Night, Under the Moon, Deerfield's Got Talent, and countless others. While our list of "extras" is quite wide-ranging we keep in mind that the goal of each event is to continue to foster and build those lasting relationships that nurture and promote optimal learning.

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

---

### **1. Curriculum:**

Deerfield Elementary School sets high expectations for all students through full implementation of the Common Core Curriculum, using research based instructional practices. The Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) are internationally benchmarked and evidence based. The CCLS provide a consistent set of rigorous expectations for what all students should learn and be able to do, to ensure that every student is on track for college and career readiness. Common Core instructional support is derived from a variety of educational tools; including Harcourt's Storytown Balanced Literacy Program, Pearson's Envisions Math Program, Bill Davidson's Math Sprints, research based supplemental resources, and district created materials. Technology is fully integrated throughout the instructional day; including interactive Smartboard lessons, Visual Learning Bridges, PowerPoint, Microsoft Word, Sumdog, and IXL Math. The students enjoy opportunities using iPads, laptops, and personal computers in our technology lab.

Our reading program is skill-based, strategy-focused, data-driven, and aligned to the CCLS. Primary (K-2) reading instruction focuses on teaching students the early literacy skills. The Harcourt Reading Series ensures daily practice of the 5 Key Components of Reading. Teachers provide whole group and small group instruction. Additional support is given by the Reading Specialists in 1:1 and small group settings. A combination of whole and small group instruction creates opportunities for both homogenous and heterogeneous grouping of students for literacy centers. During this time, explicit instruction is provided, followed by both independent and paired practice of previously taught early literacy skills. Once the students have a solid early literacy foundation, guided reading instruction is implemented to teach them how to read for information.

At the intermediate level (3-5), the emphasis shifts focus to reading accurately and fluently in order to attain higher level comprehension skills. Reading instruction focuses on teaching students to implement reading skills and strategies to comprehend a wide variety of text. Students read a balance of literary text from all genres to ensure that they can understand complex texts. Comprehension and fluency is the main focus of intermediate reading instruction. Students struggling with these concepts receive reading support from the Reading Specialists.

We take an interdisciplinary approach to teaching the Social Studies and Science standards by integrating the standards into both math and ELA instruction. Several content areas and a variety of learning standards are taught in one rich lesson. The ELA standards require students to closely read rigorous text and respond in writing. CCLS require our students to write for a variety of purposes, including: to express an opinion/point of view, a statement of information, and to compare and contrast. Therefore, the teacher may require students who are learning about the water cycle (science) to demonstrate their knowledge of the discipline by writing a sequential writing piece. This interdisciplinary approach fosters simultaneous teaching of ELA and science standards. For example, the lesson may require students to use academic vocabulary and support their ideas with evidence based facts from high-quality literary and informational texts to describe the water cycle. In addition, Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) Science Kits are utilized to provide our students with hands-on opportunities to experiment with science. Social Studies instruction is often enhanced with guest speakers and field trips. The Merry-Go-Round Performers present "Once Upon a Longhouse" every year to our students. Field trips include The Baseball Hall of Fame, Local Community Buildings: The Fire Department, The Farmer's Museum, Beaver Sprite, and the Butterfly Garden.

Special area classes also participate in the interdisciplinary approach to teach the standards. Math, ELA, Social Studies, and Science standards are reinforced in library, physical education, art, and music. For example, in library the students may use technology to research the water cycle on the web, in physical education they may participate in a fitness course that simulates the water cycle, in art they may create a model to the water cycle, and learn to sing a scale incorporating a water cycle jingle in music. Math concepts are frequently incorporated in special area instruction, including counting, measuring, and math content vocabulary.

Our math program focuses on explicit instruction of the Big Ideas; it is data driven and aligned to the CCLS. To support our math instructional program we use a variety of tools. A primary source is Pearson's Envisions Common Core Math program, a research-based program and aligned to the CCLS. Knowing that a solid math foundation requires students to know their math facts fluently, we implement Bill Davidson's Math Sprints. Sprints are math speed drills that are aligned to the Common Core, aligned to individual lessons, and written to account for a large range of math skills. They provide efficient, focused practice on learned topics and exposure to number sequences and patterns. Sprints help students build math fact fluency. To create a strong math foundation, we also help our students develop a solid understanding of why we use specific math strategies to solve math problems. We scaffold instruction to build on prior knowledge. Our curriculum pacing charts are vertically and horizontally aligned to teach the standards to ensure our students are college and career ready.

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

At Deerfield Elementary School, we fully implement the New York State Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy. To support instruction, all teachers K-5, use Storytown, a researched based, balanced literacy program. The administration, in conjunction with teachers, chose to adopt this program because the lessons focus on Common Core State Standards in a very logical and sequential manner. Our intermediate teams use supplemental materials, such as Ready New York and Crosswalk Coach to enhance and support instruction in an effort to meet the needs of all students and provide additional support when needed. Data is frequently collected and reviewed to monitor all students' progress. Students who are consistently exceeding grade level expectations are placed in above level reading groups. Students who are performing below expectations are provided services according to our 3-Tier Response to Intervention (RTI) program. These services range from re-teaching of a specific skill or lesson by the classroom teacher, to AIS services, to Special Education services. Every student is provided intervention services or enrichment based on his or her individual performance data.

To ensure consistency across the grade level, teachers use a team approach. During common planning time, they meet as grade level teams to plan instruction, review data, share strategies and best practices, and ensuring that all students needs are met. Teachers implement differentiated instruction and/or provide targeted research based interventions when classroom instruction is not meeting the student's needs. If this level of support does not produce results, then a teacher support team meeting is scheduled in order to glean professional opinions, guidance, and support from a variety of colleagues to better support student success and/or have students advance to the next tier of intervention services.

Every student's performance is closely monitored using Reading Comprehension Assessments, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy (DIBELS), as well as, beginning and end of year local area assessments. The data provides the teacher with clear information to determine which students may be in need of differentiated support or enrichment. The data is shared with parents to keep them well informed and to foster strong relationships between school and home. When students demonstrate a need for support, our Reading Specialists use a variety of research based practices and programs to provide more intensive support. We often use Ready New York and Road to Reading in an effort to provide a more prescriptive and comprehensive system of support to increase student success. Reading Specialists and Classroom Teachers frequently communicate and share data to monitor each student's progress. They share ideas on how to optimally engage struggling students. Students who receive more intensive Tier-2 interventions continue to receive Tier-1 interventions, to maximize assistance and produce the best results possible for each student. Detailed progress monitoring charts are kept and shared among both teams of teachers as well. These probes help with early intervention and help reduce the need for more intensive reading support in later years.

## **3. Mathematics:**

The Envisions math program is used to support instruction. This program was selected by the District math committee because of its multi-faceted approach to teaching math. Each topic comprehensively teaches a common core domain and each lesson within a topic addresses individual strands of the common core. New

topics are introduced during whole group instruction. Lessons begin with a spiraled learning activity to help keep newly taught math concepts fresh in the students' minds. Next, the students are given the opportunity to apply the newly learned skills through guided practice. The lessons are engaging to students and enhanced with interactive technology. The students participate in hands-on instruction using manipulatives to build concrete knowledge. Then, they have an opportunity to practice independently to demonstrate understanding while the teacher closely monitors them. Finally, a Daily Quick Check is administered at the close of each lesson to monitor each child's level of comprehension. Differentiated homework is assigned at the conclusion of each lesson based on each child's performance on the quick check. Teachers assign activities using an online program at [Pearsonsuccessnet.com](http://Pearsonsuccessnet.com) that is accessible from home. This site provides students an opportunity to practice their skills at home. Also, both parents and students can view that day's interactive lesson from home. This helps parents understand how the topic was taught and exposes them to the same math content vocabulary that is used in the classroom. Bill Davidson's Math Sprints are used to strengthen and improve each student's math fact fluency.

To ensure that every child is acquiring foundational math skills, daily instruction is progress monitored and data driven. As needed, students are provided additional support, including remediation and differentiated instruction, and/or targeted interventions through our 3-Tier RTI program. Forms of assessment include Daily Quick Checks, Envision Topic Tests, and Quarterly Benchmark Assessments. Each student's individual level of growth and achievement determines the student's instructional plan. Students who do not meet quarterly grade-level expectations are provided Response to Intervention (RTI) services and their progress is monitored weekly. Students who exceed grade-level expectations are provided enrichment activities in order to continually challenge and enhance their higher level thinking. The Quarterly Benchmark Assessments are rigorous and aligned to the NYS CCLS.

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

With the high demands of the CCLS, we understand the importance of integrating curriculum across all content areas and supporting instruction throughout every aspect of the students' day. Our mission is to ensure that all students can effectively use technology to gain knowledge and information. Our Library Media Specialist (LMS) works cooperatively with classroom teachers to incorporate the Information Fluency Continuum Standards within the CCLS. Together they review upcoming topics to determine how to best support the students. They select materials, resources, and online sources to support instruction of the content. Then, they determine the best methods to teach their students how to access the information.

Specific library media center skills are introduced at the kindergarten level and then developed to a deep understanding throughout the child's elementary years. Focus skills include: Information Literacy, Media Literacy, and the Ability to Use the Library Media Center. Initially, the students learn the general organization of the library, how to distinguish between fiction and non-fiction materials, and how to present facts to answer questions. They gain basic understanding of computer hardware and software, as well as, learn how to navigate electronic resources with guidance. By the end of their time at Deerfield Elementary students are able to acquire background information, assess questions, evaluate print and electronic information, use various note-taking strategies, form an opinion using text-based evidence, and cite sources used within research. Students also learn how to use select search engines to find appropriate information for research projects and present information clearly using a variety of formats.

Within the library media class, students are presented information in a variety of ways, using both print and electronic sources. Students are provided opportunities to work with the information presented, in both small group activities and independently. They are consistently held responsible for the retention of information and the transfer of prior knowledge to new situations. The skills taught in the Library Media Center are essential skills that can be transferred to various learning situations across all content areas.

## **5. Instructional Methods:**

At Deerfield Elementary, differentiated instruction is implemented to meet the various needs of each student. Through extensive data collection, all students are closely monitored and provided lessons at their instructional level. When students work independently, they begin by setting a personal goal in the form of an “I can...” statement. For example, “I can correctly solve 52 single digit addition problems in one minute.” Students who perform consistently above grade level qualify to participate in the gifted and talented program for enrichment activities that often infuse technology. Additionally, these students receive enrichment through above level reading groups and challenge math activities using interactive technology. Beginning in kindergarten, all students are taught to monitor and chart their performance. Students are encouraged to compete against themselves and strive to improve his or her personal best.

Students who perform below grade level are closely monitored by their classroom teacher and our Teacher Support Team. These students are provided with strategic, research-based interventions to target and improve areas of weakness. Differentiated reading instruction is provided based on the student’s performance on the DIBELS, DRA2, and weekly reading comprehension assessments. Reading lessons are taught at their personal instructional level implementing our balanced literacy program. Differentiated math instruction is based on the student's performance on Envisions Math Topic Tests, Daily Quick-Checks, and Quarterly Benchmark Assessments. The "quick-check" indicates the individual's level of understanding of the newly taught concept. Students who score with less than seventy-five percent accuracy on the quick-check are provided Tier-1 remediation on the topic. That same day, the students work one-on-one or in a small group with their teacher. Tier-1 interventions include re-teaching of concepts, modified assignments, and varied instructional support tools within the classroom. If necessary, further differentiation is provided through Tier-2 AIS. Tier-2 interventions are implemented when Tier-1 strategies have been deemed insufficient. Typically, these students are struggling on benchmark skills and require additional instruction to achieve grade level expectations. Students who do not respond favorably to the Tier-2 interventions are referred to the Committee on Special Education for further evaluation. This may lead to Tier-3 special education interventions. Throughout the process, parents are always well-informed of their child’s performance and encouraged to attend Teacher Support Team meetings.

## **6. Professional Development:**

Our Professional Development Plan focuses on enhancing instructional strategies, strengthening leadership, and promoting professional and personal growth and development to allow us to support our students along their educational path to becoming college and career ready. We have identified three major goals. First, to create a school community that is supportive of the social, emotional, behavioral and academic needs of a diverse student population. Our second goal is to utilize research based instructional and classroom management strategies to improve individual student achievement. The third goal is to design, improve and effectively integrate information literacy and technology throughout the teaching and learning process.

The district uses My Learning Plan to monitor professional development opportunities and participation. This program is also used by district administrators to monitor the 175 hour requirement for teachers with provisional certifications, the 75 hour requirement for teacher assistants with Level III certificates, and the participation requirement for long-term substitute teachers.

Professional Development is fostered in a variety of ways. Teachers are selected to serve on District Level Professional Development Committees and provide turn-key training to their elementary colleagues. We support participating in Professional Learning Communities where teachers share their knowledge of best practices and new strategies. All teachers are encouraged to observe one another to share instructional strategies and classroom management systems.

Before the implementation of our new math and ELA programs, our teachers received extensive professional development to ensure smooth implementation. This year, teachers are participating in on-going staff development regarding: The Power of “I can...” statements, Bill Davidson’s Math Sprints, and the NYS Common Core Learning Standards. To stay abreast of the latest technology, our Computer

Technology Assistant provides monthly mini-sessions on new advances to support instruction. Also, the Principal includes a sidebar in our weekly newsletter that encourages grade level discussions on specific common core standards by incorporating a "To Do List" and focus questions. Faculty meetings also serve as a venue to communicate education updates, changes in curriculum and assessment, and to highlight best practices.

Additionally, we have a District Mentoring Program for new teachers. The program, STEPS (Support to Ensure Professional Success), is an induction process designed to help all new teachers receive the support they need for successful transition into their new teaching positions in Whitesboro. Our program includes ongoing professional development and mentoring from highly trained staff dedicated to achieving district goals.

## **7. School Leadership**

The leadership style at Deerfield Elementary is based on the philosophy that it takes a united team to provide children with the necessary opportunities to reach their highest level of growth and achievement. This is a shared leadership philosophy, one which requires the building principal to create a culture where teachers are empowered to promote positive change and foster growth. It is a culture where everyone works together towards the greater goal, to provide a strong educational foundation that will allow each and every child at Deerfield Elementary to achieve his or her maximum potential and to become college and career ready.

At Deerfield Elementary, there is a professional climate of trust and respect. The principal, teachers, parents, staff, and students collaborate to do what is best for children. To establish this culture, we embrace open communication. We listen to one another, in an effort to understand all perspectives and learn from each other. One of the greatest leaders in history, Martin Luther King Jr. said, "Seek first to understand, then to be understood."

We set building-wide goals and work together for the greater good. Our principal begins the school year with a detailed review of the previous year. The conversation is data-based. We celebrate success, and identify our strengths and weaknesses. We use this information to set goals for the upcoming school year and create a plan of action. Together, we determine how we will use our best attributes to strengthen our weakest link. Our principal maintains our focus on the goal through weekly newsletters, conversations with individual teachers and grade level teams, walk-through observations, evaluations, faculty meetings, and professional development. She encourages all teachers to focus on targeted self-reflection to strengthen their instructional practices. She serves as an instructional resource in our building, keeping teachers informed of best practices and researched based strategies. Teachers are encouraged to take risks and to work together to tap into each other's professional strengths within a Professional Learning Community. As a shared leadership team, our teachers serve as Building Team Leaders on District Level Committees in ELA, Math, and Writing, hold building level training sessions to share best practices, and actively participate in Professional Learning Communities. Together we create a culture that is student-centered, data driven, and educationally sound in an effort to remain in a constant state of forward motion to improve.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** NYS Testing Program-Math-Gr.3

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** (2009-2012) CTB McGraw-Hill; (2012-2013)

Pearson

| School Year                                                                  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                                                                | Apr       | Apr       | May       | May       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>                                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 72        | 87        | 84        | 78        | 98        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 30        | 39        | 35        | 34        | 29        |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 50        | 61        | 55        | 58        | 62        |
| Percent of total students tested                                             | 100       | 98        | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 63        | 78        | 100       | 59        | 93        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 50        | 28        | 0         | 18        | 33        |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 8         | 18        | 5         | 17        | 15        |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 1         |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>                                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |

|                                                                     |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                 |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>        |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            | 74 | 86 | 88 | 96 | 98 |
| % Level 4                                                           | 33 | 41 | 37 | 35 | 29 |
| Number of students tested                                           | 46 | 56 | 51 | 57 | 56 |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>                    |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>11. Other 1: Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b> |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |

**NOTES:** In 2009-2010, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores required to meet the Basic and Proficient performance levels, resulting in a statewide drop in the percentage of students who met previous proficiency, a Level 3 or Level 4. The New York State Commissioner of Education explained that this was not an indication that the students learned less or performed poorly. Instead, the lower number of students meeting proficiency was a reflection of the new higher standards set by the New York State Department of Education.

In 2009-2010, we only had 4 third grade students who received special education services, therefore the percentage of students achieving a level 3 and/or level 4 was not reported.

In the 2012-13, there was an anticipated statewide decline in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math grades 3-8 assessment scores. These were the first to measure the Common Core Learning Standards. As expected the percentage of students who scored within the proficiency level was lower than in 2011-2012. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. John King, has communicated to the public that these results do not reflect a drop in performance. However, they do reflect a raising of standards and will create a new baseline of student learning.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** NYS Math Gr 4 Assessment

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** (2009-2012) CTB McGraw-Hill; (2012-2013) Pearson

| School Year                                                                  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                                                                | Apr       | Apr       | May       | May       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>                                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 69        | 91        | 63        | 64        | 91        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 30        | 53        | 13        | 25        | 35        |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 61        | 53        | 56        | 61        | 69        |
| Percent of total students tested                                             | 100       | 98        | 100       | 97        | 100       |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 58        | 80        | 38        | 58        | 83        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 11        | 20        | 6         | 33        | 8         |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 19        | 5         | 16        | 12        | 12        |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 17        | 38        |           | 25        | 69        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 8         | 13        |           | 13        | 0         |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 12        | 8         | 2         | 8         | 13        |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 0         | 2         | 3         | 2         | 1         |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 1         | 1         | 0         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>                                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 1         | 0         | 1         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |

|                                                                     |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>        |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            | 70 | 94 | 64 | 64 | 93 |
| % Level 4                                                           | 29 | 55 | 13 | 25 | 34 |
| Number of students tested                                           | 56 | 49 | 55 | 55 | 67 |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>                    |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>11. Other 1: Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b> |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |

**NOTES:** In 2009-2010, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores required to meet the Basic and Proficient performance levels, resulting in a statewide drop in the percentage of students who met previous proficiency, a Level 3 or Level 4. The New York State Commissioner of Education explained that this was not an indication that the students learned less or performed poorly. Instead, the lower number of students meeting proficiency was a reflection of the new higher standards set by the New York State Department of Education.

In 2010-2011, we only had 2 fourth grade students who received special education services, therefore the percentage of students achieving a level 3 and/or level 4 was not reported.

In the 2012-13, there was an anticipated statewide decline in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math grades 3-8 assessment scores. These were the first to measure the Common Core Learning Standards. As expected the percentage of students who scored within the proficiency level was lower than in 2011-2012. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. John King, has communicated to the public that these results do not reflect a drop in performance. However, they do reflect a raising of standards and will create a new baseline of student learning.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5  
**Publisher:** (2009-2012) CTB McGraw-Hill; (2012-2013)  
Pearson

**Test:** NYS Math Gr 5Assessment  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year                                                                  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                                                                | Apr       | Apr       | May       | May       | Mar       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>                                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 45        | 68        | 71        | 65        | 96        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 20        | 21        | 25        | 31        | 53        |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 51        | 57        | 65        | 71        | 55        |
| Percent of total students tested                                             | 98        | 98        | 100       | 99        | 100       |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             | 2         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 20        | 44        | 73        | 55        | 100       |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 0         | 19        | 20        | 9         | 56        |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 5         | 16        | 15        | 11        | 9         |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 17        | 0         | 29        | 21        |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 0         | 0         | 14        | 7         |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 6         | 6         | 7         | 14        | 2         |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 0         | 2         | 0         | 1         | 0         |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 1         | 0         | 1         | 1         | 0         |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>                                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 0         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |

|                                                                     |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>        |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            | 48 | 70 | 67 | 65 | 96 |
| % Level 4                                                           | 21 | 21 | 26 | 32 | 53 |
| Number of students tested                                           | 48 | 56 | 57 | 69 | 53 |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>                    |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>11. Other 1: Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b> |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |

**NOTES:** In 2008-2009, we only had 2 fifth grade students who received special education services, therefore the percentage of students achieving a level 3 and/or level 4 was not reported.

In 2009-2010, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores required to meet the Basic and Proficient performance levels, resulting in a statewide drop in the percentage of students who met previous proficiency, a Level 3 or Level 4. The New York State Commissioner of Education explained that this was not an indication that the students learned less or performed poorly. Instead, the lower number of students meeting proficiency was a reflection of the new higher standards set by the New York State Department of Education.

In the 2012-13, there was an anticipated statewide decline in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math grades 3-8 assessment scores. These were the first to measure the Common Core Learning Standards. As expected the percentage of students who scored within the proficiency level was lower than in 2011-2012. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. John King, has communicated to the public that these results do not reflect a drop in performance. However, they do reflect a raising of standards and will create a new baseline of student learning.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** NYS Assessments Gr3-ELA

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** (2009-2012) CTB McGraw-Hill; (2012-2013) Pearson

| School Year                                                                  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                                                                | Apr       | Apr       | May       | Apr       | Jan       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>                                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 50        | 73        | 75        | 59        | 84        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 10        | 10        | 24        | 24        | 11        |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 50        | 62        | 55        | 58        | 62        |
| Percent of total students tested                                             | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 75        | 42        | 60        | 41        | 80        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 0         | 5         | 0         | 18        | 13        |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 8         | 19        | 5         | 17        | 15        |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 0         | 18        | 30        |           | 60        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 0         | 0         | 0         |           | 0         |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 5         | 11        | 10        | 4         | 5         |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 0         | 4         | 4         | 6         | 2         |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         | 1         |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>                                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 0         | 1         | 0         | 1         | 0         |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |

|                                                                     |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>        |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            | 52 | 73 | 75 | 59 | 84 |
| % Level 4                                                           | 2  | 11 | 24 | 24 | 9  |
| Number of students tested                                           | 46 | 56 | 51 | 57 | 56 |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>                    |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 3  | 2  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>11. Other 1: Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b> |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |

**NOTES:** In 2009-2010, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores required to meet the Basic and Proficient performance levels, resulting in a statewide drop in the percentage of students who met previous proficiency, a Level 3 or Level 4. The New York State Commissioner of Education explained that this was not an indication that the students learned less or performed poorly. Instead, the lower number of students meeting proficiency was a reflection of the new higher standards set by the New York State Department of Education.

In 2009-2010, we only had 4 third grade students who received special education services, therefore the percentage of students achieving a level 3 and/or level 4 was not reported.

In the 2012-13, there was an anticipated statewide decline in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math grades 3-8 assessment scores. These were the first to measure the Common Core Learning Standards. As expected the percentage of students who scored within the proficiency level was lower than in 2011-2012. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. John King, has communicated to the public that these results do not reflect a drop in performance. However, they do reflect a raising of standards and will create a new baseline of student learning.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4  
**Publisher:** (2009-2012) CTB McGraw-Hill; (2012-2013) Pearson

**Test:** NYS Grade 4 ELA Assessments  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year                                                                  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                                                                | Apr       | Apr       | May       | Apr       | Jan       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>                                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 47        | 74        | 57        | 67        | 84        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 16        | 15        | 2         | 2         | 7         |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 62        | 53        | 56        | 63        | 69        |
| Percent of total students tested                                             | 100       | 98        | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 35        | 60        | 38        | 69        | 58        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 10        | 0         | 0         | 8         | 8         |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 20        | 5         | 16        | 13        | 12        |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 0         | 25        |           | 25        | 46        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 0         | 0         |           | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 12        | 8         | 2         | 8         | 13        |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 0         | 2         | 3         | 2         | 1         |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 1         | 1         | 0         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>                                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 1         | 0         | 1         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |

|                                                                     |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>        |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            | 48 | 71 | 58 | 64 | 86 |
| % Level 4                                                           | 16 | 16 | 2  | 2  | 8  |
| Number of students tested                                           | 56 | 49 | 55 | 56 | 67 |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>                    |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 2  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>11. Other 1: Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b> |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 2  | 3  | 0  | 5  | 0  |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |

**NOTES:** In 2009-2010, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores required to meet the Basic and Proficient performance levels, resulting in a statewide drop in the percentage of students who met previous proficiency, a Level 3 or Level 4. The New York State Commissioner of Education explained that this was not an indication that the students learned less or performed poorly. Instead, the lower number of students meeting proficiency was a reflection of the new higher standards set by the New York State Department of Education.

In 2010-2011, we only had 2 fourth grade students who received special education services, therefore the percentage of students achieving a level 3 and/or level 4 was not reported.

In the 2012-13, there was an anticipated statewide decline in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math grades 3-8 assessment scores. These were the first to measure the Common Core Learning Standards. As expected the percentage of students who scored within the proficiency level was lower than in 2011-2012. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. John King, has communicated to the public that these results do not reflect a drop in performance. However, they do reflect a raising of standards and will create a new baseline of student learning.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA  
**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5  
**Publisher:** (2009-2012) CTB McGraw-Hill; (2012-2013) Pearson

**Test:** NYS ELA Gr 5 Assessment  
**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

| School Year                                                                  | 2012-2013 | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing month                                                                | Apr       | Apr       | May       | Apr       | Jan       |
| <b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>                                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 49        | 59        | 49        | 57        | 95        |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 20        | 0         | 0         | 19        | 21        |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 51        | 58        | 65        | 72        | 56        |
| Percent of total students tested                                             | 98        | 100       | 100       | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students tested with alternative assessment                        | 1         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| % of students tested with alternative assessment                             | 2         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| <b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>                                                       |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b> |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 20        | 35        | 47        | 17        | 100       |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 5         | 17        | 15        | 12        | 9         |
| <b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>                               |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     | 17        | 0         | 14        | 13        |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    | 0         | 0         | 0         | 0         |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 6         | 6         | 7         | 15        | 2         |
| <b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>                                  |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 0         | 2         | 0         | 1         | 0         |
| <b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>                                        |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 1         | 0         | 1         | 1         | 0         |
| <b>5. African- American Students</b>                                         |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    | 0         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 0         |
| <b>6. Asian Students</b>                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 4                                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                                                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>                          |           |           |           |           |           |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                                     |           |           |           |           |           |

|                                                                     |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  |
| <b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>        |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>9. White Students</b>                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            | 52 | 61 | 47 | 57 | 94 |
| % Level 4                                                           | 21 | 0  | 0  | 20 | 20 |
| Number of students tested                                           | 48 | 56 | 57 | 70 | 54 |
| <b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>                    |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>11. Other 1: Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</b> |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| <b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>                                         |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 3 plus % Level 4                                            |    |    |    |    |    |
| % Level 4                                                           |    |    |    |    |    |
| Number of students tested                                           |    |    |    |    |    |

**NOTES:** In 2008-2009, we only had 2 fifth grade students who received special education services, therefore the percentage of students achieving a level 3 and/or level 4 was not reported.

In 2009-2010, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores required to meet the Basic and Proficient performance levels, resulting in a statewide drop in the percentage of students who met previous proficiency, a Level 3 or Level 4. The New York State Commissioner of Education explained that this was not an indication that the students learned less or performed poorly. Instead, the lower number of students meeting proficiency was a reflection of the new higher standards set by the New York State Department of Education.

In the 2012-13, there was an anticipated statewide decline in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math grades 3-8 assessment scores. These were the first to measure the Common Core Learning Standards. As expected the percentage of students who scored within the proficiency level was lower than in 2011-2012. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. John King, has communicated to the public that these results do not reflect a drop in performance. However, they do reflect a raising of standards and will create a new baseline of student learning.