

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

[X] Public or [] Non-public

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

Name of Principal Mrs. Bridget Finder

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

Official School Name Glenwood Landing Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 60 Cody Avenue

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

City Glen Head State NY Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 11545-1234

County Nassau County State School Code Number* 28-05-01-06-0002

Telephone 516-277-7601 Fax 516-277-7603

Web site/URL http://www.northshoreschools.org/Glenwood-Landing/index.html E-mail finderb@northshoreschools.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*Dr. Edward Melnick E-mail: melnicke@northshoreschools.org
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name North Shore Central School District Tel. 516-277-7801

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 Dr. Herman Berliner
(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):
- 3 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 1 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 1 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 5 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	31	29	60
1	28	29	57
2	25	31	56
3	31	35	66
4	40	35	75
5	37	29	66
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
Total Students	192	188	380

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 4 % Asian
 - 2 % Black or African American
 - 7 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 85 % White
 - 2 % 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: 3%

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

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	Answer
(1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	3
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	9
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	12
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	397
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.030
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	3

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %
3 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 3
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish, Mandarin, Turkish
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 4 %
 Total number students who qualify: 16

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: 15 %
58 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>6</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>24</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>4</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>2</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>22</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Hearing Impairment | <u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury |
| <u>0</u> Mental Retardation | <u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| <u>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:

	Number of Staff
Administrators	1
Classroom teachers	19
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	19
Paraprofessionals	6
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	3

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 20:1

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

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	95%	98%	96%	96%	96%
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

Post-Secondary Status	
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

Glenwood Landing School (GWL) has a shared vision referred to by the community as ROAR (Responsibility, Opportunity, Achievement, and Respect). This vision statement is an outgrowth of the district mission statement (www.northshoreschools.org) that was written with the involvement of over 200 community residents, district leaders and employees, and trustees of a board of education that guides the school district. The purposefully selected words of both statements illuminate our commitment to addressing the varied intellectual and social/emotional needs of students while empowering them to become collaborative, inquisitive members of society.

The Glenwood Landing Community, made up of students, parents, teachers and staff, aspires to:

- Empower students to become responsible citizens who actively contribute to our society.
- Create opportunities for students to communicate and collaborate as reflective, creative critical thinkers who are passionately engaged in their own learning.
- Provide differentiated support and challenge within a rigorous instructional program to foster each student's optimal growth and achievement.
- Respect and honor the dignity and worth of others, our environment, and ourselves.

Over a two-year period through meetings, community forums, and classroom activities involving the students, parents, and faculty, common shared beliefs and values were identified to establish the guiding principles that would serve as the touchstone of all decisions and actions governing the school. In order to explain and incorporate the spirit of ROAR within the student body, we created a program called Dignity Diplomats (DD). Through this program, fourth and fifth grade students are trained to work with, educate, and inspire other students to live by the spirit of ROAR. By serving as positive role models who exude responsibility, opportunity, achievement, and respect, these students teach ROAR to others. This shared vision has become a guidepost for all students. Students are recognized with ROAR awards, prominently displayed in our main hallway, for living according to all four principles of the shared vision. Teachers fully embrace and implement the school vision through their design of standards-based lessons that promote opportunities for students to think critically, communicate and collaborate, and demonstrate creative thinking.

Our vision has become an integral part of our school and its numerous traditions. These traditions are the mainstay of our community, even at a time when education is rapidly changing. Among those traditions, many of which have been upheld since the school began as a one room schoolhouse in the late 1800s, are our month long reading and writing celebration CREW (Curious Readers and Enthusiastic Writers), the original songs that have been collaboratively written by teachers and students, and our school wide assemblies at which students share their learning experiences with peers on all grade levels. The auditorium has, in its own way, become part of our traditions as the sacred space and hub of our community where all of our school's meaningful events are held. It has served as the gathering place where the destitute have been nourished during the Great Depression as well as the central meeting location where people gathered to discuss how best to support our own victims of Hurricane Sandy. Our traditions, woven into the fabric of our school community, have enhanced the daily learning experiences of GWL students past and present.

We recognize that people, not just traditions alone, make a school what it is. The success of a school is contingent upon the involvement of all stakeholders. GWL relies upon the talents of parents, grandparents, and local businesses, as well as external resources, in the development of curricular and extracurricular activities. For example, through financial donations and the manual labor of numerous volunteers, GWL has been able to construct a Japanese garden that is used by all students as a place of reflection. Currently, members of a committee representing all constituencies of our school, along with financial benefactors, are in the process of building an outdoor classroom that teachers will be able to use as a setting to host authentic learning experiences that incorporate Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and 21st Century Skills (www.p21.org).

It is our longstanding history and the rich traditions of a school that is guided by a set of visionary beliefs and future possibilities for its students that position GWL as a formidable applicant worthy of a National Blue Ribbon Award. Yet, without the involvement of the school's community, the staff's dedication and love for our children, and the quality of our teachers who are dedicated to the academic, social, and emotional growth of children, our history, traditions and vision for students would be lifeless. These are the people who inspire and challenge students to be reflective, critical-thinkers actively engaged in their own learning through a rigorous academic program. Ultimately, they embody the characteristics of Blue Ribbon quality in ways that are often ahead of the times and atypical of traditional elementary schools.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) In GWL, the only standardized assessments used to evaluate student performance are the New York State (NYS) Grades 3-8 Math and ELA exams required by law. Student performance results are classified into one of four categories relative to grade level standards:

Level 1 – Well Below Proficient

Level 2 – Below Proficient

Level 3 – Proficient

Level 4 – Exceeding

Our district expectations mirror those of NYS; namely, that all students should be performing at Levels 3 or 4. For the few students who score at Levels 1 and 2, support services are provided to help students better comprehend the content, skills, and understandings of the curricula and, as a result, improve their performance on these State exams. Though some effort is made to support students who perform at Level 3 to reach Level 4 performance, our district board of education and administration encourage us to spend more time in assessing student learning through performance-based assessments, which provide a more comprehensive view of students' learning progressions and growth. That being said, we do review students' performance on the NYS exams as a means of monitoring alignment of our curriculum and guiding our instruction according to the grade level Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS).

Two other standardized assessments are administered at the third and fifth grade levels [the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogATs) and the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), respectively]. However, those exams are used solely for benchmarking, diagnostic, and instructional purposes and not for evaluation of student performance.

All educators analyze the quantitative data from this rich variety of assessments along with day-to-day qualitative data to help them better understand and address the learning needs of all of our students.

b) Our board of education and superintendent have clearly expressed their views regarding the annual New York State Grades 3-8 Testing requirement. They believe that, though the information received from the results of students' performance on these exams is important to review, it is only one piece of student performance data and should be recognized as such and in conjunction with all other student performance data. These leaders also recognize that standardized exams (atypical of the type of assessments to which our students are accustomed) provide a single snapshot, at a single moment in time, of students' achievement. The most important information gained from the results on these exams is in regards to the alignment of our curricula as it relates to State Standards and the efficacy of our educators instruction related to those standards. The board has created a policy and authored a "white paper" related to State exams and the amount of time taken from the classroom to prepare students for these exams. Despite this lack of emphasis on these exams, our students do remarkably well. The percentage of our students receiving a score of proficient (Level 3) and exceeding proficient (Level 4) combined have annually surpassed the percentage of students in the county in these levels (on the average of 12% per year for the last five years on both the NYS ELA and mathematics exams at every grade level 3-5).

Looking at the State exam results from the past five years only partially tells our story of stellar performance. Our scores on virtually all grade level math and ELA exams showed an upward trend for three to four years prior to 2008-2009 (except on the Grade 5 ELA exam where no trend was established and the Grade 4 math exam where scores remained flat). What is amazing about this history is that the combined percentage of students scoring a Level 3 & 4 began in the high 80% range on all grade levels for ELA (5th grade started at 92%) and the 90% range for math on all grade levels (5th grade started at 84%). This is often difficult to do as, some would contend, moving a high performing school to higher levels of performance is more difficult than moving a low performing school to higher levels of performance. The two plunges in our State score results are seen in the 2009-2010 and 2012-2013 school years. Schools'

score results across the State suffered the same fate those years (see notes on data tables provided). After the setback in 2009-2010, however, our school reestablished an upward trend for two years on the grade 3 ELA and math exams but no trend on other grade levels in either exam.

In 2012-2013, the number of students in our school ranged from 66-77 students per grade. So it is difficult for us to rely on percentages as a measuring stick when comparing the performance of subgroups to that of the full student body. Our only subgroup that is larger than ten students is our disabled students at grades 3 and 5 with 18 and 15 students, respectively. Our school hosts the self-contained classrooms for all three elementary schools. Of course, these students, who are among those who struggle most with their learning, are counted in this subgroup. However, the performance of every individual student is important to us, so we look to provide each student whose performance compares poorly to that of the typical child at GWL with individual support and extra-help through the services of our Academic Intervention Services (AIS), Response to Intervention (RtI), and special education teachers.

2. Using Assessment Results:

GWL has a systematic approach to assessment. The principal, curriculum directors, and teachers analyze our students' performance on all assessments and use the information learned from their analyses to guide instruction, address curriculum gaps, and support student learning.

Students take the mandated NYS ELA and math tests. Individual plans for AIS are created for students who score below the State standard. Likewise, enrichment plans are created for those students whose performance excels beyond grade level standards. In addition to these mandated exams, we use other assessments to guide our work with students.

A district-created, literacy profile that includes a battery of measures is used to help assess our students' ability to read and write. The literacy profile differs at each grade level, but typically includes: the Fountas and Pinnell benchmarks (www.heinemann.com/fountasandpinnell/default.aspx), components of DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills www.dibels.uoregon.edu), and Foundations end-of-unit assessments (www.foundations.com). Teachers join with a team of building professionals to review student performance results on these exams. They create academic improvement plans for each individual student, regardless of his/her performance. This same procedure is followed based on student performance on assessments after each unit of study in Mathematics.

Some assessments are used at specific grade levels. For example, all third grade students take the CogATs (www.riverpub.com/products/cogAt/details.html). Teachers and our School-wide Enrichment Specialist (SWES) study students' results to determine who would benefit from enrichment outside of the prescribed curriculum. Fifth grade students sit for MAP diagnostic assessments (www.nwea.org/products-services/computer-based-adaptive-assessments/map). Information from these exams is used to develop individual learning plans. This is accomplished through our collaboration with E-Spark (<http://esparklearning.com>), a company that creates a tailored learning profile account for each student. Using iPads, students access their app-based accounts to engage in activities designed to develop and enhance learning in math and reading.

Using results from the abovementioned assessments, as well as anecdotal information from teachers, our Interdisciplinary Support Team (IST) regularly meets to discuss students who may require interventions beyond what can be supported in the classroom. The building psychologist and assistant director of elementary special education are present at IST meetings and help determine whether or not evaluation for special services is necessary. Students who qualify for special services are reassessed yearly. Results from the GMADE (Group Mathematics Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation www.pearsonassessments.com/learningassessments/products/100000692/group-mathematics-assessment-and-diagnostic-evaluation-g-made-g-made.html) and GRADE (Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation www.pearsonassessments.com/learningassessments/products/100000646/group-reading-assessment-and-diagnostic-evaluation-grade-grade.html) supplement all the other data we have from sources already delineated to determine the least restrictive program and related services package for each student.

We share results of student performance on assessments in various forums. Annually, the superintendent presents a report on student achievement. The principal discusses general performance of students in her building at various parent meetings. Additionally, teachers discuss individual student performance with parents during parent/teacher conferences. Parents who request a consultation with the principal to review their child's performance on tests are also accommodated.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

As one of three elementary schools in the district, we are committed to maintaining our individuality but at the same time aligning our curriculum and instruction across schools to prepare students for a smooth transition to our district's middle school. Departmentalized by curricula, directors and principals facilitate multiple opportunities for teachers across the district to share best practices.

As a district, we dedicate professional development time to sharing strategies and lessons amongst the three elementary schools. Teachers post their work to a common folder found on the district's technology server. Expert teachers are encouraged to share their skills informally or even through formal professional development opportunities referred to as Collegial Circles. Other venues where teachers are encouraged to share their best teaching practices include: department meetings, new program trainings, Professional Learning Teams (PLTs), and faculty meetings.

At monthly grade-level planning days, teachers gather to discuss the CCLS and how they are addressed in their curriculum. Teachers then collaborate in designing ways to best teach the concepts inherent in their units of study. After teaching their lessons, teachers commonly review student work and assessment data to determine the efficacy of shared lessons and to determine what instructional shifts need to be made in their practice to better support student learning.

The principal, who is a member of the district's administrative team, presents the work she is doing toward accomplishing her professional goals and the goals set forth by the superintendent of schools. Upon stating a problem of practice in reaching her goals, she solicits feedback from the other members of the administrative team whose suggestions she takes under consideration. This formal practice is guided by a protocol. The principal engages in this shared practice twice during the year.

Finally, through its membership in the Tri-State Consortium (TSC), GWL participates with an organization of critical friends from high-achieving school districts in Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York. As members of this organization, school districts request participating districts to conduct evaluations of each other's curricular programs. As a result of those reviews, teachers are able to share their best practices and learn from other professionals what they can do to consistently improve their practice.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Many students who have sensed the spirit of community at GWL have returned to our town as adults to raise their children in the school they attended. Part of what creates that sense of community is the school's outreach to involve parents and community members in the affairs of the school.

The School Community Association (SCA) – a parent/teacher organization – raises money to help fund experiences that enrich our curriculum. The SCA has helped to sponsor many events such as our: National Circus Project, science fair, talent show, guest authors, and back-to-school barbeque social.

The Shared Decision-Making Committee (SDM) provides another opportunity for community involvement. Faculty, administrators, and parents on this committee seek to identify areas in which the school can make improvements and then set out to accomplish the goals the committee sets. For example, the SDM recommended revisions to the structure of our Back-to-School Night to highlight the work of special area teachers along with the work of classroom teachers.

Special workshops bring parents into the school to gain first hand knowledge of new academic programs. Administrators and teachers engage parents in hands-on activities experienced by their children during the school day. At these meetings, parents learn about web-based support programs available to support their children.

Through daily emails and teacher and school websites, parents are kept connected to the school. Many teachers also use email to provide parents with “Ask your child about...” prompts to use in conversation with their children. These discussion prompts enable parents to be part of what their children are learning at school.

Opportunities are available for parents to get involved in major school projects. For example, parents were invited to take part in building an outdoor learning space made possible by a \$10,000 donation to the school. This space enables students to engage in hands-on explorations. Part of the outdoor classroom contains garden boxes used for growing food that is harvested and served in the cafeteria. In other areas of the outdoor classroom, there are viewing boxes where students study plant growth and microscope tables in order to study various parts and aspects of plants.

Parents and the local community also get involved in initiatives that engage students in helping those outside their immediate community. These opportunities are sponsored by the school’s Community Service Club in annual events such as our holiday toy donation drives, the UNICEF collection, and Hoops for Hearts.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

The core curriculum of our school is guided by the grade level standards of the Common Core and the anchor standards for college and career readiness. In a district where, on the average, 98% of our graduates advance to higher-level education, while others enter the work force, we ensure our students have a rich academic background in all disciplines. Our curriculum is written by our district administrators and teachers using a backward design approach that begins with looking at what we want students to learn as a result of their studies and then proceeds to a focus on the content, skills, understandings, essential questions, and transfer goals of each discipline's educational and professional standards. The curriculum of every subject area emphasizes the teaching and learning of the inherent concepts of the discipline. Along with the important requisite information students need to learn to deepen their understanding of those concepts, our curricula engages students in researching and grappling with unanswerable, rich, and complex essential questions related to those concepts. We espouse an interdisciplinary curriculum to help students appreciate the interconnectedness of every discipline and that what is learned in one subject area is often directly related to and impacts the understanding of other disciplines. We strive to create a curriculum that not only reflects grade level professional learning standards (e.g. CCLS), but one that reflects how those standards relate to the world on a local and global level.

English Language Arts is taught through the Teachers College Reading and Writing units of study, which are directly aligned with the Common Core Learning Standards. Reading workshop includes a whole class lesson, small group instruction, and individualized guided practice. Students practice strategies on their personal reading levels in a variety of genres. Through process writing, students apply skills and strategies acquired to produce pieces written in various genres.

Mathematics in grades K-2 is taught using the authentic Singapore math curriculum called Math in Focus, while students in grades 3-5 are learning through the use of the Go Math! program.

In science, students are engaged in studying concepts outlined in the Science Technology Concepts units.

District designed curricula aligned with national standards have been created for social studies, visual and performing arts, and physical education/health. As a result, our K-5 curriculum provides the crucial foundation for students to achieve excellence in their later studies.

Our social studies curriculum is seamlessly integrated with literacy units to provide opportunities for students to participate in high quality interdisciplinary units of study.

Students study general music, instrumental music and visual arts in classes taught by highly qualified, certified arts specialists. In addition, the arts specialists collaborate with classroom teachers to design and implement interdisciplinary units of instruction that tackle big ideas and allow students to use their learning to explore and solve complex problems. Students present their work in concerts, art exhibitions, and culminating performances throughout the school year. The Arts Angels, a parent booster club for the arts, provides resources to enrich students' arts learning experiences.

Our physical education curriculum teaches students the concepts of body, space, effort, and relationships while promoting fundamental movement skill competence. Cognitive concepts of power, balance, agility, reaction time, strategy, and tactics, give way to conversations on how to apply the skills and movements learned. Students learn how to become lifelong movers and to enjoy living a healthy and active lifestyle.

Our comprehensive health education curriculum engages grades one through five in meaningful conversations about mental, physical, and emotional health topics. Students develop personal, social, and interpersonal skills that are essential for maintaining their overall wellness.

Assessments are an integral part of our curriculum; in fact, they drive the curriculum in that we assess student understanding of what we believe (guided by the professional standards) is important for them to learn. Our school has embarked on a building-wide endeavor to create interdisciplinary performance-based assessments (PBA).

In addition to the core curriculum, students in many grade levels have been given the change to participate in PBAs which the school designs to engage students in authentic learning of grade level and professional standards. Judged through a performance-based assessment, teachers are able to assess not only students' acquisition of curricular content and skills, but the conceptual understandings students are engaged in exploring. This type of curriculum adds life to all learning standards.

2. Reading/English:

a. The foundation for our reading instruction is the units of study from the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project (TC – www.readingandwritingproject.com). Reading instruction is provided using the architecture of a mini-lesson within the framework of the workshop model. We chose this approach to reading instruction to provide students with multiple opportunities for personal reflection and collaboration with their classmates. The TC units of study provide both rich content and a focus on building students' foundational skills.

Starting in Kindergarten, and continuing through third grade, teachers' daily instruction involves multi-sensory phonics and spelling based on the Wilson Foundations program. In grades four and five, teachers incorporate the Language CCLS, as well as Rebecca Sitton (www.sittonspelling.com) and Words Their Way (www.pearsonschool.com/index.cfm?locator=PSZw84&PMDbSiteId=2781&PMDbSolutionId=6724&PMDbSubSolutionId=&PMDbCategoryId=3289&PMDbSubCategoryId=28139&PMDbSubjectAreaId=&PMDbProgramId=82341) to customize whole-class and small group grammar and spelling instruction.

To support the needs of their learners, teachers choose high-interest read alouds for their mini-lessons in order to model a skill or strategy. Then, through 1:1 conferring and small group instruction, teachers plan their instruction around students' individual needs while supporting them in setting and meeting their personal reading goals. Through classroom leveled libraries and the use of strategy reference charts co-constructed during mini-lessons, students are encouraged to build independence and agency as readers. As such, teachers support the full spectrum of learners and create multiple access points for students to learn the skills and strategies for reading grade-level texts.

Educators continually analyze student data in order to adjust their instruction toward promoting each child's individual development and growth as a reader. Tri-annually at Data Day Meetings, teachers present their students' reading benchmarking data. At those meetings, teachers collaboratively determine how to support all levels of learners. Suggestions for differentiated lessons and collaboration with the school's enrichment specialist are often the means used to provide high-level students with the challenge they require to further their growth. Also during these meetings, some students are identified for Tier 1 reading support. Classroom teachers are usually able to support these students through early morning, small group reading instruction. Tier-2 and Tier-3 reading support is provided through classroom pullout services. Tier-3 students also attend a before- or after-school reading session we refer to as our Reading Detectives Program where the RtI teacher and literacy coaches provide targeted and systematic small group reading instruction.

3. Mathematics:

Mathematics curriculum and instruction are guided by the school vision, which aspires to provide students with differentiated support and challenge within a rigorous instructional program while providing opportunities for creativity, collaboration, communication, and critical thinking according to the shifts of the Common Core Learning Standards of Mathematical Content and Practice (CCLS-M).

Our curriculum delineates learning progressions of what students are expected to know, understand, and be able to do at each grade level. The curriculum outlines essential questions such as, "How can you represent

and solve problems?” and “How do numbers represent and define value?” and understandings like, “The context of a problem determines the reasonableness of a solution” and “Operations create relationships among numbers” for students to explore as they develop their understanding of concepts, principles, and processes and proficiency with skills.

The instructional approach, based upon the Singapore Math framework, fosters not only the acquisition and application of mathematical concepts and skills in a range of situations, including non-routine and real-world problems, but also metacognition and positive dispositions.

Instructional methods employ a concrete-pictorial-abstract approach: students develop their understanding of concepts such as addition starting with the exploration of concrete objects, like interlocking cubes; connect the materials to pictorial representations, such as number bonds; and finally, visualize the representations when solving problems abstractly. Instruction is designed around engagement in problem solving, movement toward more independent and less teacher-guided ownership of work, and a focus on the articulation of thinking. The collaborative review of common assessments provides information about learning to guide instruction.

Teachers differentiate instruction so that students explore concepts through problems of varying complexity and number ranges based upon knowledge of individual learners. Classroom teachers, a Math AIS teacher, an enrichment specialist, and student interns from a local university work together to design differentiated learning opportunities based upon interest and readiness to enhance individual growth, confidence, and passion that are implemented during both large and small group instruction. At a given time, students in a third grade classroom might consider different problems and number ranges as they learn division, a second grader might work with an intern to hone fact fluency, a few fourth graders might work with the enrichment specialist on a project requiring analysis of data from cafeteria composting, and three identified fifth graders might work with the Math AIS teacher to refine number sense to support the division of decimals.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Unique to only a handful of school districts, our students are engaged in learning a world language from kindergarten through fifth grade (and beyond). All students study Mandarin in kindergarten through second grade. When the students enter third grade, they have the option to continue with their study of Mandarin or change their study of language to Spanish.

Students receive world language instruction twice in a six-day cycle for thirty minutes. Our teaching of languages focuses on communication skills and cultural knowledge. Through a communicative approach, the utility of the language is emphasized over the pure academia of the study of language. And by studying other people’s cultures, students’ eyes are opened to seeing that there are many more similarities between people than differences.

Components of three out of four tenets of our school vision are enhanced by the study of a world language:

- Empowers students to become responsible citizens who actively contribute to our (global) society.
- Creates opportunities for students to communicate and collaborate as reflective, creative critical thinkers.
- Promotes respect and honors the dignity and worth of others.

Through the study of a world language, students transcend their local community and become members of a much broader world community. Learning a second language empowers students to be active, contributing members of the global community. When students learn about other people’s culture and how to speak their language they are better able to relate to people on a personal level and therefore understand them.

In a global community, students learn not only about how they matter, but how others in the world matter. With increased understanding of those who seemed dissimilar to them, our students gain a respect for and honor the dignity of others as well as themselves. It is our hope as a school community that, ultimately,

through the study of world languages and cultures, our students will seize future opportunities to collaborate with those around the world as critical thinkers and problem solvers on the global stage.

5. Instructional Methods:

Teachers' instruction engages students in constructing understanding of concepts through collaboration as reflective, creative, and critical thinkers. All teachers strive to foster each student's optimal achievement of a rigorous academic program. Toward this end, differentiated instruction plays an integral role in addressing the learning needs of all students. Teachers receive ongoing training in planning and implementing differentiated lessons. Study groups are used to further teachers' understanding of differentiated instruction.

Interdisciplinary instruction is also a hallmark of our school. A unique schedule allows time for professionals to collaborate in planning cross-curricular units and lessons. Formal training in creating and implementing performance-based assessments promotes the concept of interdisciplinary learning.

Through the collection and analysis of data, a collaborative approach is once again used when identifying students in need of intervention. The IST makes instructional recommendations to maximize students' success based on individuals' learning styles, interests, and readiness levels. Case managers are assigned to each student to review students' progress and report feedback to the IST.

Students classified by the Committee on Special Education (CSE) are placed in settings that match their instructional needs. A self-contained classroom provides the smallest student to teacher ratio (15:1:1) with individualized learning as a focus. Integrated co-teaching classrooms, resource room, and related services and therapies also support identified students at their current academic level.

Whereas AIS and RtI services provide instructional support necessary for struggling learners below grade level expectations, our SWES program provides instructional support and curricular extensions to students in need of enrichment. SWES provides these opportunities through such alternative learning experiences as engineering clubs, mock-trial debates, and special projects (e.g. the researching and construction of a Japanese Outdoor Classroom). SWES also provides push-in support to classroom teachers.

Technology is utilized as a tool to enhance instruction and address students' learning needs. Classrooms and workspaces have SmartBoards and document cameras. SmartTables, iPads, laptops, and a computer lab complete the array of technology devices and spaces for teacher use with students. Learners of all levels can be found researching, presenting, and interacting with the technology available to them. Students use iPad apps to reach and motivate all modalities of learners - kinesthetically, students are able to manipulate their way through the app; visually, students are stimulated through use of color and design; auditorally, students are given the option of listening and hearing content while simultaneously viewing it.

6. Professional Development:

The professional development our school offers its teachers takes many different forms. For example, learning about, understanding, and adopting the practices attributed to the Common Core Learning Standards and other professional standards are required of all educators. This professional development is offered during summer workshops and through guided planning sessions throughout the school year. Similarly, it is important that all teachers learn about and implement quality differentiation to meet the individual learning needs of all students. To this end, the district embarked upon a three-year, capacity-building initiative that ultimately trained everyone in the school (and district) in understanding and adopting the practices of differentiation. Each summer, a workshop in differentiated instruction is offered by our administrators for members who are new to our school/district and for the few educators who were not trained in the initial years of this endeavor. Similarly, those who are engaged in writing district curriculum are required to take part in learning about curriculum design that embraces developing students' conceptual understandings of what they study. This framework of curriculum development is closely aligned with the professional work and teachings of Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe.

The district has also had the great fortune of participating in formal learning about, and implementation of, performance-based assessments. This professional development is occurring under the adept guidance and facilitation of nationally renowned Giselle Martin-Kniep. Alongside several cohorts of teachers and administrators who have learned from Dr. Martin-Kniep, our district is participating with other districts, as part of the Tri-State Consortium (TSC), in training a capacity building team to teach about and encourage implementation of performance-based assessments throughout the district. The principal of the Glenwood Landing School is a key player in this endeavor as are several teachers in the building.

Every Monday, the principal coordinates, designs, and conducts professional development for the entire faculty focused on building goals and furthering best teaching practices. Much of that professional development of late has been devoted to the implementation of the Common Core Learning Standards recently adopted by New York State.

Finally, data from the various sources that describe student performance and achievement are studied each year. From that analysis, professional development is offered to teachers to support them in improving student learning as measured by these data sources.

7. School Leadership

Based on the belief that all children can learn, the principal aspires to empower each teacher with a sense of efficacy and passion for promoting the limitless growth of each learner. To purposefully guide collective action toward creating this reality, common, core values and beliefs were identified to establish a shared vision for student learning (ROAR). This vision serves as a guidepost for all decisions and actions of each member of the learning community in all aspects of the school (e.g. creation and enforcement of policies, programs, and allocation of resources). ROAR even establishes the foundation for interpersonal interactions – ensuring that our purpose for being is on behalf of the students and not in service of the professionals who work with them. The principal designs opportunities for high level professional development and collaboration that will result in student learning that is more meaningful, relevant, and authentic than the outcomes that any individual teacher could accomplish.

In addition to the principal, the school leadership team consists of a Director of Humanities, a Director of Science, Technology, and Mathematics (STEM), and an Assistant Director of Special Education. As the instructional leader, the principal works collaboratively with the directors and other identified teacher leaders to strategically orchestrate the realization of the shared vision.

In working with teachers and directors to implement the tenets of the shared vision (ROAR), the principal recognized - and teachers corroborated - the potential benefits of focusing on a single tenet of the vision statement: enhancing opportunities for students to think creatively, use critical thinking strategies, communicate and collaborate. Therefore, the principal has strategically allocated resources toward professional development for the full faculty to increase teacher capacity for, and interest in, developing such experiences across the curriculum.

Through rich conversations horizontally across grade/department level teams, as well as vertically on grade level teams, teachers create authentic, purposeful, CCLS-aligned, performance based assessments that engage students in purposeful, relevant learning that incorporates student choice on a topic of research related to their studies. As a result of designing authentic performance tasks, teachers' conversations and lesson plans reflect deeper understanding of CCLS-aligned concepts and 21st Century Skills, specifically in the area of learning and innovation. Based upon review of student work and classroom visits, there is concrete evidence of students' growth in critical thinking, reflection, and passionate engagement in learning.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: New York State Testing Program -
Mathematics

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson (2012-2013/2011-2012); CTB-
McGraw-Hill (2010-2011/2009-2010/2008-2009)

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	May	May	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	72	92	84	80	98
% Level 4	32	38	26	43	42
Number of students tested	71	66	74	65	64
Percent of total students tested	100	99	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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	80	100	100	100
% Level 4	0	40	0	0	33
Number of students tested	1	5	4	1	3
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	28	73	29	63	100
% Level 4	11	9	0	25	29
Number of students tested	18	11	14	8	7
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		0	100		100
% Level 4		0	0		0
Number of students tested		1	2		1
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	67	67	100	50	100
% Level 4	33	33	20	50	50
Number of students tested	3	3	5	2	2
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	100	100		
% Level 4	0	0	0		
Number of students tested	2	1	1		
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	100			100	100
% Level 4	50			50	100

Number of students tested	4			4	1
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	71	94	82	80	98
% Level 4	32	39	27	42	41
Number of students tested	59	62	68	59	61
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	100				
% Level 4	33				
Number of students tested	3				
11. Other 1: Total Female					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	76	93	84	79	100
% Level 4	33	43	19	38	40
Number of students tested	33	28	31	42	30
12. Other 2: Total Male					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	68	92	81	83	97
% Level 4	32	34	30	52	44
Number of students tested	38	38	43	23	34
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 1. The edition/publication years for the test cited above are the same as the years in which those exams were administered (and for which data is presented).

2. For the 2009-2010 school year results, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the percent of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, "These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets." Additional information can be found in the news release materials at:
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8_Results07282010.html
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

3. The 2013 state assessments are the first for New York students to measure the Common Core Learning

Standards that were adopted by the State Board of Regents in 2010. Commissioner King said that, as expected, the percentage of students deemed proficient is significantly lower than in 2011-12. This change in scores – which will effectively create a new baseline of student learning – is largely the result of the shift in the assessments to measure the Common Core Standards, which more accurately reflect students' progress toward college and career readiness. Commissioner King emphasized that the results do not reflect a decrease in performance for schools or students. The new assessments are a better, more accurate tool for educators, students, and parents as they work together to address the rigorous demands of the Common Core and college and career readiness in the 21st century. Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: New York State Testing Program -
Mathematics

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson (2012-2013/2011-2012); CTB-
McGraw-Hill (2010-2011/2009-2010/2008-2009)

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	May	May	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	74	93	94	88	97
% Level 4	35	70	63	59	52
Number of students tested	66	76	66	64	110
Percent of total students tested	99	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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	60	100	50	100	100
% Level 4	20	75	50	33	0
Number of students tested	5	4	2	3	1
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	56	62	73	40	88
% Level 4	11	15	27	20	25
Number of students tested	9	13	11	5	8
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	100		100	
% Level 4	0	100		0	
Number of students tested	1	2		1	
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	50	100	100	100	50
% Level 4	50	67	100	0	0
Number of students tested	2	6	1	2	2
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	100	100			100
% Level 4	0	0			100
Number of students tested	1	1			2
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4			100	100	100
% Level 4			50	100	75
Number of students tested			4	1	4
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	76	93	93	87	98
% Level 4	35	71	64	61	51
Number of students tested	63	68	61	61	101
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		100			100
% Level 4		100			100
Number of students tested		1			1
11. Other 1: Total Female					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	79	88	93	90	96
% Level 4	31	65	65	57	48
Number of students tested	29	34	40	30	56
12. Other 2: Total Male					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	73	98	96	85	98
% Level 4	38	74	62	62	56
Number of students tested	37	42	26	34	54
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 1. The edition/publication years for the test cited above are the same as the years in which those exams were administered (and for which data is presented).

2. For the 2009-2010 school year results, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the percent of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, "These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets." Additional information can be found in the news release materials at:
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8_Results07282010.html
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

3. The 2013 state assessments are the first for New York students to measure the Common Core Learning Standards that were adopted by the State Board of Regents in 2010. Commissioner King said that, as expected, the percentage of students deemed proficient is significantly lower than in 2011-12. This change in scores – which will effectively create a new baseline of student learning – is largely the result of the shift in the assessments to measure the Common Core Standards, which more accurately reflect students' progress

toward college and career readiness. Commissioner King emphasized that the results do not reflect a decrease in performance for schools or students. The new assessments are a better, more accurate tool for educators, students, and parents as they work together to address the rigorous demands of the Common Core and college and career readiness in the 21st century. Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: New York State Testing Program -
Mathematics

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson (2012-2013/2011-2012); CTB-
McGraw-Hill (2010-2011/2009-2010/2008-2009)

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	May	May	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	65	93	100	81	100
% Level 4	23	65	64	32	55
Number of students tested	77	69	63	114	75
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	2	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	3	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	40	100	100	0	100
% Level 4	20	60	25	0	50
Number of students tested	5	5	4	2	4
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	13	71	100	25	100
% Level 4	0	50	25	25	20
Number of students tested	15	14	4	8	10
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0		100		
% Level 4	0		0		
Number of students tested	2		1		
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	40	100	100	25	100
% Level 4	20	100	0	0	40
Number of students tested	5	2	2	4	5
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0			100	
% Level 4	0			50	
Number of students tested	2			2	
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		100	100	86	100
% Level 4		75	100	43	40
Number of students tested		4	1	7	5
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	69	92	100	82	100
% Level 4	24	63	65	31	57
Number of students tested	70	62	60	100	65
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		100		100	
% Level 4		100		100	
Number of students tested		1		1	
11. Other 1: Total Female					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	63	93	100	74	100
% Level 4	17	63	63	33	41
Number of students tested	35	40	30	57	32
12. Other 2: Total Male					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	67	93	100	88	100
% Level 4	29	69	64	30	65
Number of students tested	42	29	33	57	43
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 1. The edition/publication years for the test cited above are the same as the years in which those exams were administered (and for which data is presented).

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

http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8_Results07282010.html

http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

3. The 2013 state assessments are the first for New York students to measure the Common Core Learning Standards that were adopted by the State Board of Regents in 2010. Commissioner King said that, as expected, the percentage of students deemed proficient is significantly lower than in 2011-12. This change in scores – which will effectively create a new baseline of student learning – is largely the result of the shift

in the assessments to measure the Common Core Standards, which more accurately reflect students' progress toward college and career readiness. Commissioner King emphasized that the results do not reflect a decrease in performance for schools or students. The new assessments are a better, more accurate tool for educators, students, and parents as they work together to address the rigorous demands of the Common Core and college and career readiness in the 21st century. Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: New York State Testing Program - ELA

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson (2012-2013/2011-2012); CTB-McGraw-Hill (2010-2011/2009-2010/2008-2009)

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	May	Apr	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	64	88	85	65	92
% Level 4	11	25	11	22	19
Number of students tested	70	67	74	65	64
Percent of total students tested	99	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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	80	50	100	100
% Level 4	0	20	0	100	0
Number of students tested	1	5	4	1	3
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	29	58	57	50	57
% Level 4	0	17	7	13	14
Number of students tested	17	12	14	8	7
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		0	0		100
% Level 4		0	0		0
Number of students tested		1	2		1
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	50	67	60	100	100
% Level 4	0	33	0	100	0
Number of students tested	2	3	5	2	2
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	50	0	0		
% Level 4	0	0	0		
Number of students tested	2	1	1		
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	100			75	100
% Level 4	0			0	100
Number of students tested	4			4	1
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	63	91	88	63	92
% Level 4	14	25	12	20	18
Number of students tested	59	63	68	59	61
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	67				
% Level 4	0				
Number of students tested	3				
11. Other 1: Total Female					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	82	100	90	67	100
% Level 4	18	32	13	29	27
Number of students tested	33	28	31	42	30
12. Other 2: Total Male					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	49	80	81	61	85
% Level 4	5	21	9	9	12
Number of students tested	37	39	43	23	34
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 1. The edition/publication years for the test cited above are the same as the years in which those exams were administered (and for which data is presented).

2. For the 2009-2010 school year results, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the percent of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, "These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets." Additional information can be found in the news release materials at:
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8_Results07282010.html
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

3. The 2013 state assessments are the first for New York students to measure the Common Core Learning Standards that were adopted by the State Board of Regents in 2010. Commissioner King said that, as expected, the percentage of students deemed proficient is significantly lower than in 2011-12. This change in scores – which will effectively create a new baseline of student learning – is largely the result of the shift in the assessments to measure the Common Core Standards, which more accurately reflect students' progress

toward college and career readiness. Commissioner King emphasized that the results do not reflect a decrease in performance for schools or students. The new assessments are a better, more accurate tool for educators, students, and parents as they work together to address the rigorous demands of the Common Core and college and career readiness in the 21st century. Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: New York State Testing Program - ELA

All Students Tested/Grade: 4

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson (2012-2013/2011-2012); CTB-McGraw-Hill (2010-2011/2009-2010/2008-2009)

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	May	May	Apr	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	73	86	89	86	95
% Level 4	30	18	12	19	13
Number of students tested	67	76	65	64	109
Percent of total students tested	100	100	98	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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	40	75	100	67	100
% Level 4	0	0	50	0	0
Number of students tested	5	4	2	3	1
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	33	46	70	20	63
% Level 4	0	0	20	0	0
Number of students tested	9	13	10	5	8
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	50		0	
% Level 4	0	0		0	
Number of students tested	1	2		1	
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	67	83	100	50	100
% Level 4	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	3	6	1	2	2
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	100			100
% Level 4	0	0			0
Number of students tested	1	1			2
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4			100	100	100
% Level 4			0	100	50
Number of students tested			4	1	4
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	75	85	88	87	95
% Level 4	32	19	13	18	12
Number of students tested	63	68	60	61	100
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		100			100
% Level 4		100			0
Number of students tested		1			1
11. Other 1: Total Female					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	83	88	90	93	95
% Level 4	38	21	10	13	16
Number of students tested	29	34	39	30	56
12. Other 2: Total Male					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	66	83	88	79	96
% Level 4	24	17	15	24	9
Number of students tested	38	42	26	34	53
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 1. The edition/publication years for the test cited above are the same as the years in which those exams were administered (and for which data is presented).

2. For the 2009-2010 school year results, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the percent of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, "These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets." Additional information can be found in the news release materials at:
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8_Results07282010.html
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

3. The 2013 state assessments are the first for New York students to measure the Common Core Learning Standards that were adopted by the State Board of Regents in 2010. Commissioner King said that, as expected, the percentage of students deemed proficient is significantly lower than in 2011-12. This change in scores – which will effectively create a new baseline of student learning – is largely the result of the shift

in the assessments to measure the Common Core Standards, which more accurately reflect students' progress toward college and career readiness. Commissioner King emphasized that the results do not reflect a decrease in performance for schools or students. The new assessments are a better, more accurate tool for educators, students, and parents as they work together to address the rigorous demands of the Common Core and college and career readiness in the 21st century. Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA

Test: New York State Testing Program - ELA

All Students Tested/Grade: 5

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: Pearson (2012-2013/2011-2012); CTB-McGraw-Hill (2010-2011/2009-2010/2008-2009)

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	May	Apr	Jan
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	65	87	87	78	99
% Level 4	27	13	22	20	20
Number of students tested	77	69	63	114	75
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	2	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	3	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	20	100	100	100	100
% Level 4	0	40	0	0	0
Number of students tested	5	5	4	2	4
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	20	57	25	38	90
% Level 4	0	14	0	0	10
Number of students tested	15	14	4	8	10
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0		100		
% Level 4	0		0		
Number of students tested	2		1		
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	60	100	100	75	100
% Level 4	20	50	0	0	0
Number of students tested	5	2	2	4	5
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0			100	
% Level 4	0			0	
Number of students tested	2			2	
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		100	100	100	100
% Level 4		0	100	29	0
Number of students tested		4	1	7	5
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					

% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	67	85	87	76	99
% Level 4	29	13	22	20	23
Number of students tested	70	62	60	100	65
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		100		100	
% Level 4		0		100	
Number of students tested		1		1	
11. Other 1: Total Female					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	74	85	93	79	100
% Level 4	37	8	23	21	19
Number of students tested	35	40	30	57	32
12. Other 2: Total Male					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	57	90	82	77	98
% Level 4	19	21	21	19	21
Number of students tested	42	29	33	57	43
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 1. The edition/publication years for the test cited above are the same as the years in which those exams were administered (and for which data is presented).

2. For the 2009-2010 school year results, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the percent of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, "These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets." Additional information can be found in the news release materials at:
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8_Results07282010.html
http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

3. The 2013 state assessments are the first for New York students to measure the Common Core Learning Standards that were adopted by the State Board of Regents in 2010. Commissioner King said that, as expected, the percentage of students deemed proficient is significantly lower than in 2011-12. This change in scores – which will effectively create a new baseline of student learning – is largely the result of the shift

in the assessments to measure the Common Core Standards, which more accurately reflect students' progress toward college and career readiness. Commissioner King emphasized that the results do not reflect a decrease in performance for schools or students. The new assessments are a better, more accurate tool for educators, students, and parents as they work together to address the rigorous demands of the Common Core and college and career readiness in the 21st century. Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>