

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 [X] Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. Jennifer Bonnet

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

Official School Name P.S. 150 Tribeca Learning Center

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 334 Greenwich Street

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

City New York State NY Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 10013-2703

County Manhattan State School Code Number* 310200010150

Telephone 212-732-4392 Fax 212-766-5895

Web site/URL http://www.PS150.net E-mail jbonnet@schools.nyc.gov

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. Mariano Guzman E-mail: MGuzman16@schools.nyc.gov
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name New York City Geographic District # 2 Tel. 212-356-3815

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. Mariano Guzman
(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):
- 34 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 14 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 64 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 112 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. 2 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	11	7	18
K	12	15	27
1	12	15	27
2	16	12	28
3	13	14	27
4	15	13	28
5	13	14	27
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	92	90	182

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 12 % Asian
 - 11 % Black or African American
 - 14 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 55 % White
 - 8 % 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: 2%

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	2
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	2
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	4
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	190
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.021
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	2

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %
5 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 3
 Specify non-English languages: French, Spanish, Japanese
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 15 %
 Total number students who qualify: 27

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: 14 %
23 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>0</u> Autism | <u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment |
| <u>0</u> Deafness | <u>7</u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness | <u>7</u> Specific Learning Disability |
| <u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance | <u>8</u> Speech or Language Impairment |
| <u>1</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 Equivalent (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	7
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	3
Paraprofessionals	1
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	4

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 26:1

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	96%	96%	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

At P.S. 150 our mission is to nurture the intellectual, emotional, social and physical growth of our students as we engage their hearts and minds in a love of learning. Through child-centered, yet rigorous, curricula integrating the arts, sciences, math and English language arts, we will create independent, creative and critical thinkers, who will be on the path to college and career readiness, with the tools to excel in their future endeavors. Our small community depends on its teachers, parents and students working closely together with mutual respect to achieve the best educational environment and opportunities we can for each and every child and emphasizes the importance of participating in a community as an essential part of every child's education.

At P.S. 150, through both social studies and science content area studies and arts integration, our students are exposed to and immersed in interdisciplinary learning. This holistic approach has been a tradition for years and has proven successful, but most importantly, as an engaging and meaningful way for our students to learn. Each child, along with acquiring all the necessary skills in English language arts and mathematics, which every year leads to proficiency and advanced scores on the New York State tests, becomes an "expert" about a particular topic, whether it be snakes, bridges or Eastern Woodland Indians.

P.S. 150 has existed in its present form for the past 13 years. In 2001, The Early Childhood Center, comprised of Pre-Kindergarten through 2nd grade, located in our present building, merged with a school called Bridges, a 3rd through 5th grade school, to form P.S. 150, a small elementary school with only one class per grade, where admission is based on choice through a central lottery, in Tribeca, a lower Manhattan neighborhood, in need of more schools for its rapidly growing population. Our building was not originally designed to be a school; it was constructed to be a community center, so it lacks some of the basic "necessities" with which most schools are equipped – a gym, library, auditorium and lunchroom. Several milestones throughout the last 13 years have taken place, in attempting to creatively address these issues. In 2003, a large storage room was converted to a library/media center. We now have a comprehensive collection of children's literature, along with a plethora of iPads, laptops and desktop computers, acquired through numerous grants. In 2011, a room that was in much need of renovation was successfully converted into a music/dance studio/physical education room and cafeteria, through a city grant. In addition to physical milestones, this past year we implemented an entirely new mathematics curriculum, departing from the district wide curriculum that has been in use for more than a decade. We chose Math in Focus, an Americanized version of Singapore Math to address the Common Core Learning Standards more effectively. The students are now at least 6 months ahead of students using other curricula. They are embracing it and rising to the challenge.

The community that P.S. 150 serves comprises families from lower Manhattan, who have admissions priority, and from District 2, one of the largest districts in New York City. The families who choose to send their children to P.S. 150 are looking for a warm, nurturing, intimate environment, with an arts focus, yet with a strong academic program as well. We are able to, and take pride in getting to know all of our families. The parents play a very important role in the culture of P.S. 150. They are invited to take part in many school activities. In addition, on a regular basis, we hold parent workshops, with topics ranging from how to help your children get ready for the New York State tests, to how to incorporate strategies at home that help with social-emotional development.

At P.S. 150, we are very proud that our students attain such high test scores, along with becoming such well-rounded, life-long learners. We do much to support teacher capacity, and work very hard to maintain positive social emotional development, with the challenge of having students travel along with each other from grade to grade. In addition, all of our hard work culminates at the end of the school year with a student and teacher written musical, with a story line that incorporates all of the grades' content studies. Not only do our students become experts in specific areas, they are able to showcase their expertise through playwriting, and song and dance, for the whole community to see.

I am so proud to be leading such a wonderful school. We are a small school that does big things. I am proud that we are able to give a high quality education to our students. I am also proud that among the downtown New York City powerhouse schools, this little school has gone from “I think I can,” to “I knew I could.”

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

A) At P.S. 150, we administer the New York State English Language Arts and Mathematics test to 3rd, 4th and 5th graders. These tests are scored on a 1 to 4 basis, 1 being the lowest and 4 being the highest. NYS level 1 students are considered to be well below proficiency in standards for their grade. They demonstrate limited knowledge, skills, and practices embodied by the NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for ELA or Mathematics for their respective grade. At a level 2, students are performing below proficiency in standards for their grade. They demonstrate knowledge, skills, and practices embodied by the NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for ELA or Mathematics that are considered partial but insufficient for their respective grade. At a level 3, students are proficient in standards for their grade. They demonstrate knowledge, skills and practices embodied by the NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for ELA and Mathematics that are considered sufficient for their respective grade. At a level 4, students excel in standards for their grade. They demonstrate knowledge, skills, and practices embodied by the NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards and Mathematics that are considered more than sufficient for their respective grade.

New York State and P.S. 150 consider a level 3 or 4 an acceptable score, representing students who are meeting or exceeding the standards for their grades. Through excellent, rigorous instruction, our students have historically met these levels. For those who don't, we work very hard to give them as much extra assistance as possible, through targeted instruction, with either the classroom teacher or AIS (Academic Intervention Services) teacher who is also our SETSS teacher.

B) Looking at the P.S. 150 data, on an aggregated basis, the first thing we notice is the remarkable consistency across the years. From 2009 through 2012, almost 9 out of 10 of our third, fourth and fifth graders scored 3s and 4s on the New York State Achievement Tests in ELA (English Language Arts) and Math. We attribute this achievement to the hard work of our teachers, students and our strong ELA and math curriculum.

However, in 2013, New York State administered a new test, based on the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), which had not yet been fully implemented in the New York City schools. In ELA our performance declined from 89% of our students scoring 3s and 4s in 2012 to 71% (cf. 26% citywide) achieving these same levels in 2013. In math, our performance declined more precipitously, from 87% to 60% (cf. 30% citywide) over the same period. We attribute this decline to the increased rigor of the new CCLS, and to a math curriculum that both teachers and parents were dissatisfied with. However, we are proud that we did significantly better than the majority of public elementary schools in New York City, ranking 26 overall (inclusive of gifted and talented programs and schools).

Over the four year period from 2009-2012 we saw ELA achievement in many of our subgroups (Socio/economic disadvantaged students, Special Education students, Hispanic/Latino students, African American students, Asian students) increase from year to year. We are proud of these gains. In 2012, the only subgroup that did not achieve within 10 percentage points of our overall school performance were the socioeconomic/disadvantaged students and the Asian students.

In Math, while we saw gains over time in some of our subgroups (Special Education and African American students), other subgroups (socioeconomic/disadvantaged, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian students) performed more erratically.

We attribute these changes from year to year in student achievement to the small size of the subgroups. Each student tested in a given year represents approximately 1.2% of our student body. Within subgroups, a change in one student's score can represent a change of anywhere from 16.6% when the subgroup consists of 6 students tested to 5% when the subgroup consists of 19 students tested.

In 2013, the performance of each of our subgroups declined, and there were achievement gaps of 10 or more percentage points in all our reportable subgroups with the exception of Caucasians and African Americans

in ELA and of Caucasians in Math. These results are not acceptable to us and we have interventions in place. These include SETSS (Special Education Teacher Support Services), which are provided to students who either have individualized education plans or “at risk” students, students who score below proficiency levels on the ELA and Math tests); extended day (37 ½ minutes per day of additional schooling); professional development, in order to assist teachers in finding new methods to address students’ divergent learning styles and the introduction of a new math curriculum, aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards, to help our students be more successful in the future and address the more rigorous problems the students will face.

2. Using Assessment Results:

At P.S. 150, we use formal and informal assessment data in both English Language Arts and in Mathematics. In ELA, each student is given a reading assessment, called a “running record,” developed by Teachers College, Columbia University. This assessment measures fluency, comprehension and decoding skills. The assessment is administered five times a year. This data is then transferred into a computer program called Assessment Pro, which tracks the students’ progress and generates reports that go home to families via an online NYC Department of Education system, called ARIS Parent Link. In addition, during all reading and writing units, the teachers meet with students individually and create conference notes. These conference notes track their progress and highlight which skills they need to work on. Conference notes also help the teacher to create small groups for instruction, by putting students together with similar skill needs. For writing, our teachers use the Teachers College continuum. Based on these rubrics for informational, narrative and opinion writing, students’ baseline, midline and endline work is scored, and along with conference notes, instruction is planned. In addition, at P.S. 150, students have goals for themselves, and spend time self-assessing with checklists designed by Teachers College as well as with some which are teacher created.

The math program that is used at P.S. 150, Math in Focus, the Americanized version of Singapore Math, has assessment built in. Students are assessed before and after each unit of study. Parents are informed of their scores. Our data specialist works with the principal and the teacher to create spread sheets with these scores and indicates which areas within the unit need to be re-taught, based on trends that they observe. Math in Focus provides differentiated materials for those students who haven’t mastered skills, called “re-teach” and materials for those who are exceeding expectations, called “enrichment.” We are very fortunate to have assistant teachers in each class, who are able to work with small groups, as does the head teacher.

Specials teachers (science, music and art) administer assessments as well. For upper grades, a science fair takes place displaying exit projects, which are available for parents and the community to see. The 4th grade has consistently, year after year, achieved proficiency and advanced levels on the New York State Science Exam. The music teacher has designed assessments for the 5th grade, which are formative and summative and are designed to increase achievement in not only music but in literacy and math as well. The results of these assessments are generated in a report and are sent home to parents.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

At P.S. 150, we value the arts. For the last three years, we have been part of a special grant called Arts Achieve. The goal of Arts Achieve is to improve achievement in the arts by creating formative and summative assessments for the arts, in our case, in music, for the 5th grade. In doing so, music teachers will be able to create classroom practices based on the results of the assessments to promote musical and academic achievement. In addition, Arts Achieve is looking to implement technology into music classes. In our case, our music teacher has received 30 iPads and has incorporated them into his classroom, enabling student/teacher access to content and assessment feedback. Literacy is being incorporated as well; our music teacher has added a unit called “Writing about Music,” and the writing is done on the iPads through gmail accounts. The information the teacher gathers from what the students have written is then created into an informative spread sheet for assessment purposes.

Part of being an Arts Achieve school is the ability to share practices in the arts with other schools. P.S. 150

has hosted many other music teachers and has served as a lab site for them numerous times in the last three years to observe the innovative methodology that our music teacher has implemented, from technology to assessment to pedagogy. P.S. 150 has also been identified as an Arts Achieve Treatment school with exemplary instructional and formative assessment practice. As a result, an Arts Achieve videographer has been assigned to the school to document our work in this project. The video will be disseminated as a model for practice in the Arts Achieve Toolkit.

With the advent of our new math curriculum this school year, Math in Focus, which is expertly aligned with the Common Core Learning Standards, we have opened our doors to other schools who are interested in learning about the program. We have been approached by public and prominent private elementary schools and have set up labsites where teachers may come and observe. We have also built in time for debriefing, and plan on continuing this practice as long as the demand is there. We are proud to have made the leap to this new curriculum and are happy others are interested in it as well.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

P.S. 150 is located in Tribeca, a small, tight-knit community in lower Manhattan. We are a choice school, with many excellent zoned schools in the vicinity. Because of our admissions policy, we attract families who are extremely dedicated to our school model of one class per grade and want to be very involved in their children's education. When you walk into the school, you will often see parents helping in the art class, attending publishing parties, or working on various committees.

At P.S. 150, in order to fully engage our families, we have put certain structures into place. The principal has an open door policy, and holds monthly morning parent forums called "Java with Jenny." This gives parents an opportunity to ask questions about curricula and policies, in a casual, comfortable way. In addition, we hold many different types of workshops for parents, ranging from our philosophy on social-emotional development to how to help your child get ready for the New York State exams. We also have curricula mornings, where parents may come and learn about what their children are learning. Parents and teachers have an open line of communication, and our in-depth progress reports for our students comprehensively address, through grades and detailed narratives, how the students are doing academically, socially and emotionally. At the end of the school year, as a culminating event, we have an arts festival, a musical that the teachers and students write together. The parents play an important role in this, as they help make costumes, design sets and assist in directing the show. The show takes place at a local Tribeca theater and is open to the community.

Tribeca is an incredibly supportive community with regard to its schools. Twenty years ago, P.S. 150 parents reached out to neighborhood restaurants and started a fundraiser for the school called the "Taste of Tribeca." Taste of Tribeca has been replicated all over Manhattan by other schools. This has been an amazing show of support for our school financially, and has allowed us to enrich our academic and arts programs.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

At P.S. 150, a rigorous academic program aligned with the Common Core Learning Standards is taught to Pre-K through 5th grade students. The school also prides itself on having a strong arts base, through instruction in visual arts and music. In addition, due to the nature of our small, one class per grade school, we focus on the social and emotional well-being of our students, through the Responsive Classroom approach, where students work as a community and develop hopes and dreams for themselves, academically and socially, for the school year.

After years of a different literacy approach, two years ago we adopted the Teachers College Reading and Writing Workshop model. This method of instruction allows students to learn at their own pace with regard to acquiring reading and writing skills. There is no “round robin” reading, where each student is reading the same book, nor is there work that is done out of a text book. Only authentic literature, both fiction and non-fiction are used. Students are assessed in order to determine their reading levels, and in response, read “just right” books. As they read these books, the teachers teach skills during “mini-lessons,” and after engaging in guided practice with the students, the students go off to apply the skills themselves. The teachers conference with the students throughout the year, as they teach and have students read from different genres, and keep track of their students strengths and weakness, and address those needs accordingly. A similar approach is taken with writing. Skills are modeled and taught, and students work independently or in partnerships with each other, by drafting, editing, revising and publishing.

This year at P.S. 150, we have adopted a new math program that is not only aligned to the CCLS, but was one of the curricula that helped in the evolution of these standards. Math in Focus, the Americanized version of Singapore math is a challenging math program that concentrates on creating critical thinkers, by emphasizing multi-step word problems. Another unique feature of Math in Focus is the use of a pictorial method for solving all kinds of math problems, called the “bar model” method, starting in the second grade. Differentiation is built into the curricula, by providing work at different levels for the students around each lesson. Assessments are built in too; at the beginning and end of each unit there is a pre and post assessment, to inform the teacher of where the students are and whether they have grasped the concepts in the unit.

Science at P.S. 150 follows the New York City Scope and Sequence and is taught by a science teacher who is programmed to see all of the grades, except for Pre-K. All of the science involves hands-on learning activities and writing. In addition, the science teacher takes the students on numerous field trips, from trips to the New York Hall of Science to a sail on the Clearwater. Technology is incorporated as well; upper grades create podcasts as their end year exit projects, and iPads are used that were purchased via a grant, for research and literacy purposes. A culminating science fair has been a tradition for years and allows the students to showcase their experiments and discoveries to their families.

Social studies (and science in the classroom) are woven into two content studies that each teacher creates for the school year. Each semester a different topic, based around either science or social studies (i.e. snakes, Eastern Woodland Indians, bridges) is taught, interweaving all of the academic content areas, with the intention of creating P.S. 150 “experts.” Primary sources, information from the internet (each student has a laptop and each room is equipped with a SMARTboard) and an informational text classroom library, provides reference material for learning. Field trips are a large part of social studies as well and are planned throughout the year as learning experiences related to the content studies.

Visual arts and music are taught according to the New York City Department of Education Blueprint for the Arts and are integral to the culture of P.S. 150. Physical Education is a combination of NYC DOE required curriculum and a dance program that is paid for by our Parent-Teacher Association. We also have a hydroponic system that grows vegetables that was acquired through a grant via our parent wellness committee, stressing health and nutrition.

2. Reading/English:

At P.S. 150, we follow the Teacher's College Reading Workshop model. The workshop model helps our students develop strong reading skills through the use of a mini-lesson, where specific skills are taught, through read aloud, shared reading, reading partnerships and conferencing with teachers (so the teachers may assess realistic goals to set for their students). Students are then given large amounts of time to read "just right" books – ones they have chosen themselves and are of interest to them. They must be able to read these books with fluency and comprehension, and must keep track of them in their reading logs. As they continue to read, their levels move upward, and our teachers continue to track their progress individually. Reading workshop is an effective method of instruction with regard to differentiation – the students are never reading the same book in "round robin" style. In the earlier grades, we focus on foundational skills as well, including word work using Words Their Way, phonics skills and word walls.

For those students who are performing below grade level, the Special Education Teacher Support Service provider is in place. The SETSS provider, in order to provide support with reading skills that students are struggling with in class, assesses these students by administering baselines. The assessments used are ECLAS-2 and Teacher's College running record assessments. Both of these assessments are excellent with regard to noting student's strengths and challenges in decoding and comprehension. The results of these assessments are then used to help guide instruction. Each subtest is used as a benchmark. Next, small groups are formed based on the needs of the students. Instruction is provided through the Wilson Reading Foundations program. The Foundations program addresses all five areas of reading instruction (phonemic awareness, phonics and word study, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension), with an emphasis on systematic phonics and study of word structure. We chose to work with this program because it teaches all skills explicitly, sequentially, and systematically, with multi-sensory techniques. The Foundations program follows along with the Common Core Learning Standards. We use the Teacher's College Reading Assessment program to determine at what level a student is reading independently for decoding and comprehension. We assess and track these levels quarterly and each teacher and/or support staff keeps records of these assessments. Whole class or small group instruction in and/or out of the classroom is based on the results of each assessment.

3. Mathematics:

At P.S 150, we have implemented a new math curriculum this year, Math in Focus, the Americanized version of Singapore Math. For years we had followed a different curriculum, but with the advent of the Common Core Learning Standards, the staff identified gaps in this curriculum with regard to addressing these standards. Math in Focus was one of the models used to write the Common Core Learning Standards, so it seemed logical that we transition to this program.

At the core of Math in Focus is the concept of problem solving, particularly multi-step problems. In order to solve problems, a student must possess the conceptual base, the relevant skills, metacognition and tenacity (to follow through when problems are complicated). Unlike other math programs, complex problem solving is embedded in the curriculum, rather than being an added extra. Another important reason why we chose Math in Focus was for the built-in differentiation. Along with the workshop model, where the teacher teaches a skill during a mini-lesson, followed by guided practice, there are different levels of work for the students to tackle, based on what skills they have acquired. The work ranges from "extra practice," which helps students who haven't mastered the lesson, to "Enrichment" for those who are on an upward trajectory. The curriculum includes hands-on activities and math games and teaches the students to use bar modeling to visualize and help solve multi-step problems. Each of our classrooms has an assistant teacher, who helps with small group instruction, for both students who are struggling and who are accelerated, in tandem with the head teacher. In addition, for those who are really having trouble conceptualizing the work, our Special Education support teacher will either push-in or pull out these students a few times a week, in order to work closely with them. The students are assessed and re-assessed at the beginning and end of each unit chapter, which helps to guide the teacher with regard to the student's knowledge base and acquisition of skills.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Music at PS 150 is a creative and active learning program in which all PreK-5 students participate. In order to engage all students and their diverse learning styles, music instruction emphasizes a multi-sensory approach incorporating teaching methods taken from various schools of musical thought and research. The music curriculum was designed to meet the standards of the New York City Department of Education's Blueprint for Teaching and Learning in the Arts and centers around a comprehensive understanding and use of rhythm, melody, dynamics, timbre, and creativity. The music program actively endeavors to meet PS 150's mission to nurture the intellectual, emotional, social and physical growth of our students.

Music literacy instruction is drawn largely from the Kodaly Method, a rigorous, developmentally appropriate approach that introduces ear training and sight singing skills in a particular sequence. Children are first introduced to musical concepts through experiences in listening and singing and soon after, through notation. Learned concepts are constantly reviewed and reinforced as new ones are introduced.

The nurturing of students' social, emotional and physical growth happens in a number of ways. In lesson planning, consideration is always given to providing students with multiple opportunities to interact socially. Choosing and receiving partners for games and activities, independently distributing materials, moving and dancing through shared space, blending as an ensemble, and commenting on each other's work all provide rich social experiences. Students are also challenged emotionally through the performing and listening repertoire itself. They are asked to consider the mood of each composition they encounter and they explore the composer's musical strategies for realizing it. Physical movement, through the lens of Dalcroze Eurythmics, plays a large role in the student's performance and retention of musical concepts. Instruction in various instruments provides opportunities for fine motor skill acquisition and development.

In addition, this year we have added a literacy component to our music studies. Based on units being taught in each grade, students will write informational and opinion pieces in response to work they are creating and performing in music class (i.e., music critiques and pieces on composers) on iPads. This fulfills the Common Core Learning Standards, and helps students to realize that writing can be an important component of any subject area.

5. Instructional Methods:

At P.S. 150, curricula is created using Universal Design for Learning. UDL helps to address different learning styles by suggesting flexible goals, methods, materials and assessments that can be used to meet the variable needs of students. The UDL framework is effective because it encourages the creation of flexible designs from the start which allow all learners to move forward from where they are not where we feel they "should" be.

Teachers College Reading and Writing workshop falls into this framework, as students read "just right" books, and work individually with the teacher through conferencing, after they have been taught specific skills in a mini-lesson. In this way, goals are developed with teacher and student that are unique to him or her, depending on ability level. In writing, different genres are taught throughout the year, and students write about topics that are of interest to them. For some of our reluctant readers and writers, we have provided technological tools, such as kindles, laptops, neos (for assistive technology purposes) and iPads. This type of technology seems to keep them focused and helps them in getting their thoughts down (particularly those students who have dysgraphic issues).

Our math program provides for different levels of learning, and also uses technological programs on the computer and Smartboard. These games and problems help struggling students to become engaged. In addition, some are visual and address the different learning styles of the students. In addition, we have created an "exchange" program for our Kindergarten through second grade students, where students who are struggling in one grade, are sent for a couple of periods to a lower grade class in order to catch up on foundational skills they may be having trouble grasping. This has been a very successful tool thus far, and we plan on exploring this option in the upper grades as well.

Our extended day program, 37 and a half minutes of additional instruction, three days a week, targets our subgroup of struggling students. Students are invited or mandated based on test scores and school work. The groups are fluid and teachers design curricula for the students as revealed through assessments and classwork. On a particular day, they may be working on ELA skills, and on another they may be working on math skills. The groups are small and have been very effective in boosting not only student achievement, but morale as well.

6. Professional Development:

At P.S. 150, both an in-house staff developer and hired staff developers work with the teachers to help build capacity in order to support student achievement. With the advent of a new math curriculum, and with implementation of the Common Core Learning Standards, it was essential that we plan staff development days for the teachers. A staff developer from Math in Focus will be working with our teachers five days this year. They constitute full day sessions, where the philosophy is discussed, pedagogical assistance is given, and assessment strategies are taught. In addition, this staff developer works with our parents to better understand the mathematical approach of Singapore math, so they may help their children as well, during "Parent Universities." These sessions follow the staff sessions and last one and one half hour. Math in Focus has hosted other professional development sessions at the few schools who have adopted this approach, and our teachers have participated in them as well.

The in-house staff developer is one of our mentor teachers. She works with our staff on literacy and on developing content based studies, by assisting in curriculum map development, and honing in on appropriate essential questions for whatever their topics may be. Since she is also the 5th grade teacher, she is released on an as needed basis, which averages to approximately once a month to work with each teacher. Last year we hired a literacy consultant to work with us, but because of the unique nature of the school (one class per grade) and the concentration of content studies, we decided that someone in-house, who is familiar with our culture, would be a wiser choice.

The principal sits in on all sessions, and after staff development takes place, the teachers apply new strategies and techniques. They then take note, when assessing work, whether these strategies have helped to improve student achievement by administering formative assessments (which happen throughout the year). The teachers and principal then analyze student work and decide on next steps.

Staff at P.S. 150 is also provided professional development opportunities from our network achievement coach, during what they call "Planning Paloozas," where topics such as the CCLS, creating curriculum maps, and Universal Design for Learning are focused on.

7. School Leadership

At P.S. 150, a transformational leadership approach is taken. We view our school as a community, not an organization. In order to achieve this, the principal encourages and tries to inspire the staff to look beyond themselves for the good of the students. This is achieved by communicating high expectations for student achievement and in teachers' pedagogical practice, by giving personal attention to teachers by coaching and advising them as not only their principal but as their mentor and by providing an open line of communication, enabling the staff to feel free and comfortable when approaching the principal with any type of issue or problem. In addition, our School Leadership Team, comprised of teachers and parents, helps to generate goals for the school year, which become a part of our Comprehensive Educational Plan.

At P.S. 150, there is only one administrator, so distributive leadership has been an effective method for addressing the achievement and needs of the students. A mentor teacher provides literacy professional development for the staff along with helping new staff members create rich, meaningful content-based studies, through the development of essential questions and cognitive rigor, using Depth of Knowledge levels. The SETSS teacher, who provides push-in and pull-out services for students who have individualized educational programs, also serves as the Special Education coordinator. She organizes once a

week meetings, comprised of the school based support team, in order to discuss specific students and develop plans of action for them which include Tier 1 interventions, where all students receive instruction that is synonymous with the core reading and math curriculum, or Tier 2 interventions, where children in need of supplemental intervention receive additional instruction, focused on their specific needs, along with recommendations for special education referrals.

The principal does the schedule programming, and builds in common planning periods for the teachers so that they may meet with her, once a week, in order to analyze student work, and to discuss any social-emotional or pedagogical issues that may arise. In addition, the staff meets another two times per month and the principal gives any teacher who wants to share new initiatives or pedagogical practices that they are proud of and feel would work in other classrooms in order to boost student achievement, the opportunity to present this information.

In order to run a successful school, it takes a village. It is believed that through the leadership approach at P.S. 150, everyone works together in a productive, meaningful way, with the students' achievement and social emotional development as being paramount.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: see notes

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: see notes

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	50	89	85	83	100
% Level 4	14	23	26	46	19
Number of students tested	28	26	27	24	27
Percent of total students tested	100	96	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	17	100	100	75	100
% Level 4	0	0	0	50	0
Number of students tested	6	1	2	4	4
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	20	100	75		100
% Level 4	20	0	25		
Number of students tested	5	3	8	2	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	67	100		100
% Level 4	0	17	33		
Number of students tested	5	6	3	4	5
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	100			100
% Level 4	0	0			
Number of students tested	3	2	0	2	2
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	100	100			100
% Level 4	0	40			40
Number of students tested	1	5	0	3	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	92	83	87	100
% Level 4	17	23	25	47	13
Number of students tested	18	13	24	15	15
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Omitted data indicates that data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. The missing data indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than 5 students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. New York State ELA tests for 2012 and 2013 were published by Pearson. 2009-2011 were published by CTB McGraw Hill.

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 number 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://222.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

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 2011-2012. This change in scores - which will effectively create a new baseline to 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.p12nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: see notes

Test: see notes
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

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	67	96	89	89	100
% Level 4	33	70	30	27	67
Number of students tested	27	27	27	26	24
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	100	75	67	100
% Level 4	0	50	25	0	60
Number of students tested	1	2	4	3	5
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	89	75		100
% Level 4	0	56	25		
Number of students tested	3	9	4	3	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	60	100	80	83	100
% Level 4	20	67	20	17	
Number of students tested	5	3	5	6	2
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	50		100		100
% Level 4	0		0		
Number of students tested	2	0	2	1	4
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	33		75	100	100
% Level 4	33		25	60	80
Number of students tested	6	0	4	5	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	86	96	94	93	100
% Level 4	43	71	38	21	69
Number of students tested	14	24	16	14	13
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Omitted data indicates that data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. The missing data indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than 5 students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. New York State ELA tests for 2012 and 2013 were published by Pearson. 2009-2011 were published by CTB McGraw Hill.

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 number 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://222.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

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 2011-2012. This change in scores - which will effectively create a new baseline to 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.p12nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: see notes

Test: see notes
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

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	67	82	96	96	100
% Level 4	26	22	35	63	73
Number of students tested	27	27	23	24	26
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	33	60	100	100	100
% Level 4	33	60	0	100	74
Number of students tested	3	5	2	5	7
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	78	71			100
% Level 4	22	14			
Number of students tested	9	7	0	3	4
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	50	40	100		100
% Level 4	25	40	25		100
Number of students tested	4	5	4	3	5
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		100	100	80	100
% Level 4		0	0	40	
Number of students tested	0	2	1	5	3
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		75	100		100
% Level 4		25	75		
Number of students tested	0	4	4	4	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	70	94	93	100	100
% Level 4	26	19	29	67	64
Number of students tested	23	16	14	12	14
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Omitted data indicates that data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. The missing data indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than 5 students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. New York State ELA tests for 2012 and 2013 were published by Pearson. 2009-2011 were published by CTB McGraw Hill.

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 number 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://222.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

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 2011-2012. This change in scores - which will effectively create a new baseline to 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.p12nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: see notes

Test: see notes
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

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	68	96	93	88	100
% Level 4	11	19	19	29	39
Number of students tested	28	27	27	24	28
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	60	100	100	75	100
% Level 4	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	5	1	2	4	4
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	20	100	100		100
% Level 4	0	0	13		0
Number of students tested	5	3	8	3	5
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	40	100	100		100
% Level 4	0	17	0		17
Number of students tested		6	3	4	6
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	100	100			100
% Level 4		0			
Number of students tested	3	2	0	2	2
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	100			100
% Level 4		20			
Number of students tested	1	5	0	3	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	72	93	92	87	100
% Level 4	17	21	21	40	53
Number of students tested	18	14	24	15	15
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Omitted data indicates that data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. The missing data indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than 5 students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. New York State ELA tests for 2012 and 2013 were published by Pearson. 2009-2011 were published by CTB McGraw Hill.

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 number 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://222.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

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 2011-2012. This change in scores - which will effectively create a new baseline to 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.p12nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: see notes

Test: see notes
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

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	67	96	81	77	100
% Level 4	41	11	7	23	8
Number of students tested	27	27	27	26	24
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	0	100	50	0	100
% Level 4	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	1	2	4	3	5
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	50	100	75		100
% Level 4	0	11	25		
Number of students tested	2	9	4	4	3
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	60	100	60	33	100
% Level 4	40	0	0	17	
Number of students tested	5	3	5	6	2
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	50		100		100
% Level 4	50		0		
Number of students tested	2	0	2	1	4
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	33		75	100	100
% Level 4	33		0	60	0
Number of students tested	6	0	4	5	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	86	96	88	93	100
% Level 4	43	13	13	14	15
Number of students tested	14	24	16	14	13
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Omitted data indicates that data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. The missing data indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than 5 students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. New York State ELA tests for 2012 and 2013 were published by Pearson. 2009-2011 were published by CTB McGraw Hill.

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 number 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://222.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

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 2011-2012. This change in scores - which will effectively create a new baseline to 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.p12nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.students>. New York State ELA tests for 2012 and 2013 were published by Pearson. 2009-2011 were published by CTB McGraw Hill.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 5
Publisher: see notes

Test: see notes
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

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	82	80	83	92	100
% Level 4	37	7	0	42	35
Number of students tested	27	27	23	24	26
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
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	67	60	100	80	100
% Level 4	0	0	0	20	13
Number of students tested	3	5	2	5	8
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	89	71			100
% Level 4	33	0			
Number of students tested	9	7	0	4	4
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4	50	40	50		100
% Level 4	0	0	0		20
Number of students tested	4	5	4	3	5
5. African- American Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		100	100	80	100
% Level 4		50	0	20	
Number of students tested	0	2	1	5	3
6. Asian Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4		50	100		100
% Level 4		0	0		
Number of students tested	0	4	4	4	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	87	100	86	92	100
% Level 4	44	0	0	50	50
Number of students tested	23	16	14	12	14
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level 3 plus % Level 4					
% Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Omitted data indicates that data were not made public because fewer than 10 students were tested. The missing data indicates that data for a group of students have been suppressed. If a group has fewer than 5 students, data for that group and the next smallest group(s) are suppressed to protect the privacy of individual students. New York State ELA tests for 2012 and 2013 were published by Pearson. 2009-2011 were published by CTB McGraw Hill.

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 number 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://222.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents_Approve_Scoring_Changes.html

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 2011-2012. This change in scores - which will effectively create a new baseline to 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.p12nysed.gov/irs/pressRelease/20130807/home.html>