U.S. Department of Education
2015 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. Lisa Arcuri
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name PS 5 The Huguenot School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 348 Deisius Street
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Staten Island   State NY   Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 10312-4400

County Richmond County   State School Code Number* 353100010005

Telephone 718-984-2233   Fax 718-984-4761

Web site/URL   http://www.ps5si.org   E-mail larcuri@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. Anthony Lodico   E-mail: Alodico@schools.nyc.gov
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name School District 31R   Tel. 718-420-5667
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. Michael Reilly
(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 and National Blue Ribbon Schools requirements, are 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 2014-2015 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 2009 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: 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014.

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   51 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
   (per district designation):   11 Middle/Junior high schools
                                          8 High schools
                                          1 K-12 schools

                                          71 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
   [X] Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [ ] Suburban
   [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
   [ ] Rural

3. 5 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	35	35	70
1	19	17	36
2	24	18	42
3	19	22	41
4	10	16	26
5	16	14	30
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	123	122	245

5. Racial/ethnic composition of   0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
    the school: 2 % Asian
                                     1 % Black or African American
                                     9 % Hispanic or Latino
                                     0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
                                     88 % White
                                     0 % 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 2013 - 2014 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 *to* the school after October 1, 2013 until the end of the school year	5
(2) Number of students who transferred *from* the school after October 1, 2013 until the end of the school year	2
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	7
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	214
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.033
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	3

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 0 %
                                                      0 Total number ELL
    Number of non-English languages represented: 0
    Specify non-English languages:

8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 22 %

    Total number students who qualify: 54

Information for Public Schools Only - Data Provided by the State

The state has reported that 22 % of the students enrolled in this school are from low income or disadvantaged families based on the following subgroup(s): Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals

9. Students receiving special education services: <u>19</u> %

                                                               <u>46</u> 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>1</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>5</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>8</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>3</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>26</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>1</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>2</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	15
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	4
Paraprofessionals	15
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	0

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   <u>16:1</u>

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

Required Information	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Daily student attendance	94%	95%	96%	95%	95%
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 2014

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.

15. Please summarize your school mission in 25 words or less: We are dedicated to providing our students with a quality instructional program in a nurturing environment which enables our students to surpass academic standards.

PART III – SUMMARY

PS 5 is a small school that has an enrollment of 245 students. Our community is in a residential area with middle-class families, many of whom are civil servants. Our population composition is 88% White, 9% Hispanic, 2% Asian, and 1% Black. 18% of our students are economically disadvantaged. Although a significant percentage of our students are economically disadvantaged, our school does not qualify for Title I funding. In addition, PS 5 is in a budget appeal every year due to the lack of funds that the DOE provides us with. In spite of this, we have been very strategic in our use of resources to support our goals.

S 5 is a neighborhood school that is 85 years old and is referred to in the community as "The Little Red Schoolhouse". We are logistically challenged with having little to no space for providing our students with extracurricular activities. Despite the fact that we have limited space and our cafeteria serves as a gymnasium and auditorium, our students and parents describe the school as cozy and nurturing. During our Quality Review, the reviewer shared with me that when she asked our parents if a new school was built down the block, would they want to move their children, they replied, "We wouldn't want our children to be anywhere else." Our school has educated many of our children's parents leading to a strong family-school bond.

A key strategy used within our school to ensure that all students develop to their full potential is transparency. All stakeholders at PS 5 know what our instructional goals are and that we have high expectations for reaching them. At the beginning of each unit, parents receive a letter that outlines the goals for that unit of study. Monthly, on our school website, the teachers write a "Take a Look" which notifies parents about the curricula focus for the current month. Keeping parents informed of what students are learning in the classroom allows parents to support their child academically. In addition, we continually monitor student progress toward our instructional goals. Parents receive individualized letters explaining their child's progress. Progress is also shared with the students through specific teacher feedback that is aligned to the appropriate rubric. Parents are frequently invited into the classrooms for publishing parties and Portfolio Days which allows them to see the work that our children are most proud of.

Our strategy of transparency is also applied to data analysis. At PS 5, we believe that assessment data is integral for understanding what students are able to do and what their next steps are. That is why assessment is ongoing at PS 5 and we use data to drive our instruction. Assessment data includes the everyday checks for understanding as well as the formative and summative types of assessments. All data is discussed at our weekly "Data Review" meetings with the instructional team and grade level colleagues. This data is then displayed in our "Data Room" where teachers can view the data from other classrooms and notice trends and patterns. The availability of data to all teachers supports the horizontal and vertical alignment that PS 5 prides itself on and supports students in reaching their full potential over their years at our school. We believe that data should be used less for judgment and more as a tool to address student needs. The analysis of data is a catalyst for inquiry. Often our findings during "Data Review" spark discussions that lead to the implementation of new initiatives to promote student achievement.

Being transparent about our budget has also allowed all stakeholders to be aware of our fiscal needs. Our PTA has been a great support in promoting our students' physical and social-emotional growth. They have funded our Kindergarten and first graders with Zumba which supports the development of a healthy, active lifestyle and coordination skills. In addition, they have funded a ballroom dance program for our fourth and fifth graders which fosters respect for one another and different cultures, confidence, politeness, coordination and flexibility.

Also funded through the PTA is our Band program for grades 3 through 5. Grant writing has been a shared endeavor between parents and staff and has enabled us to support the needs of the "whole child". Programs that build self-esteem, such as the One Can Count Program and the YMCA anti-bullying program have supported students' social-emotional growth. Through grant writing we have been able to obtain an arts program each year for our second graders and third graders. Also this year, we were chosen for the "Cultural Immigration Residency Grant" which will focus on the immigration experiences of the backgrounds of our families. This will culminate in a final theater arts production.

Our curriculum is a rigorous one with much emphasis on discussion and higher order thinking questions. Building students' expertise in creating logical arguments and challenging each other's ideas is another goal for us as we continue to deconstruct Domain 3 and engage all students in learning. Our professional development plan includes both personal professional goals as well as school-wide goals in the area of Domain 3 in order to continue a systematic effort to improve student performance.

Our strategy to have our goals transparent and understood by all ensures that there is a clear alignment among our CEP, school-wide instructional focus and professional development plan. All members of our community are working toward a shared goal of improving student outcomes and can articulate our plans to attain this goal.

PART IV – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. **Core Curriculum:**

At PS 5, we have developed our own inter-connected reading and writing curriculum that is Common Core aligned. Through extensive professional development, we have identified resources that will enable us to integrate the shifts into our curriculum. We have selected this curricular approach in order to tailor our instruction, assessment, and curriculum to the needs of our students. By utilizing the workshop model, teachers embed foundational skills into the direct instruction portion of the lesson. Key skills, such as phonemic awareness, fluency, and comprehension are addressed daily in whole group lessons, as well as during individual and group conferences. In order to support our students in reading complex texts, teachers model close reading strategies. Students then have the opportunity to engage in Socratic Seminars where they strengthen their listening and speaking skills, as well as their use of text based evidence. For students performing below grade level in writing, teachers provide them with additional individual conferences focusing on skills that are sometimes on the previous grade level. For reading, teachers utilize leveled libraries as well as online resources which allow access to informational texts on multiple Lexile levels. This allows all students, regardless of reading abilities, exposure to texts on the same topic.

The mathematics curriculum at PS 5 is Math in Focus, a Common Core aligned program. We selected this program because it is in agreement with our philosophy of how children learn best. We believe that children learn best by proceeding through the stages of concrete, pictorial, and abstract reasoning. This program not only addresses the content standards, but also consistently embeds the mathematical practice standards, such as making sense of problems and persevering in solving them. As a supplement, we utilize Math Exemplars for our enrichment students. For our students who perform below grade level, we provide them with small group lessons, known as "Reteaches", addressing areas of need through a different strategy or alternate scaffolds. This strategy has proven to be effective with approximately 90% of our students. For students who show weakness on a pre-assessment, we utilize the transition map portion of the program. The transition map allows us to trace skills to lessons from previous years. Essentially, this assists the teachers in scaffolding the curriculum and allows us to fill in the gaps in student learning.

As for our science curriculum, we use a combination of the Harcourt and FOSS programs following the NY State Science Scope and Sequence. We have embedded the Common Core Standards focusing on reading informational texts, writing to inform and persuade, and engaging in conversation. We believe that students retain scientific knowledge best when they have the opportunity to engage in hands-on experiences. Students have the opportunity to investigate their hypothesis and participate in scientific inquiry. In addition, students explore content through interactive Smart Board lessons, through text, multimedia, and group discussions. After students complete the hands-on and content lesson, they reflect upon their experience connecting back to the science content they learned.

Our social studies instruction follows the NY State Social Studies Scope and Sequence. Our teachers use the Harcourt Social Studies program for teaching social studies content explicitly. As with science, we further develop our students' abilities to read informational texts, write to inform and persuade, and strengthen student discussions by citing relevant text evidence. The focus of the Common Core literacy shift # 1 is to balance the time spent reading literary and informational texts. We infuse more social studies based informational texts into our literacy block. Our purpose is two-fold. This serves as a means of delivering social studies content, as well as a means of addressing key learning standards.

2. **Other Curriculum Areas:**

At PS 5, we believe that incorporating other curriculum areas into our daily school lives is extremely valuable to our students' social-emotional development leading to well-rounded students with a strong sense of self-esteem.

Theatre Arts: Our school has a full-time certified Theatre Arts teacher who works with Grades K – 5 a minimum of one time per week. The Theatre Arts curriculum is aligned to the Blueprint for the Arts, as

well as our school curriculum. For example, our fourth graders study the genre of mythology in literacy. In Theatre Arts, this grade's production is Mad about Mythology. Our Theatre Arts teacher also integrates the Common Core Standards by having students frequently engage in writing activities, such as writing monologues, and self-reflections. Theatre Arts supports our students' acquisition of knowledge by addressing different learning modalities. Students have the opportunity to connect kinesthetically to the text through performing, leading to more insightful comprehension. Each year, a group of students from our Theatre Arts program participates in the district-wide performing arts night.

Band: PS 5 has a part-time band teacher who works with grades 3 through 5 students. In grade 3, they meet one time per week in order to introduce students to reading music. At this level, all students play the same instrument, the recorder. When students are in grades 4 and 5, they meet with the band instructor two times per week. Here, students are surveyed to determine which instrument they would like to play. The essential skills that our Band program instills are perseverance and collaborative efforts. Students are taught that in order to facilitate the success of the band as a whole unit, each part must practice diligently, persevere, and be responsible for the care of their instrument.

Zumba/Physical Education/Dance: PS 5 has a part-time certified Zumba instructor. Grades K and 1 students have Zumba one time per week. These classes help our youngest students develop a healthy lifestyle, incorporate fitness, develop self-esteem, attend to memory, and develop coordination skills. Our physical education program is for grades K through 5. The number of periods per week is contingent upon the number of supplementary physical education programs that grade level participates in. Our physical education program helps students develop their ability to work as a team, show good sportsmanship, strengthens peer relationships, and improves self-confidence. Our 4th and 5th grade students participate in a ballroom dance program facilitated by Dancing Classrooms. A teaching artist visits for a total of twenty sessions where the focus is teaching dance using the Dulaine philosophy. This philosophy develops caring and compassion, as well as focuses on creating a safe environment where students can express themselves freely.

Technology: Our school is fortunate enough to have computers and Smart Boards in all classrooms. The use of technology is integrated into all of our curriculum areas on a daily basis. We believe that technology is essential to our students' acquisition of essential skills and knowledge. In literacy, we utilize technology in order to model the close reading of complex texts, access multimedia resources, research, and publish writing. In mathematics, students have the opportunity to utilize the student interactivities component of the Math in Focus program such as viewing tutorials, make use of virtual manipulatives, and develop fact fluency. As for science, technology provides the opportunity to engage in scientific experimentation that would otherwise be impossible to conduct in the classroom through virtual experiments. During social studies, technology is utilized in order to close read primary and secondary source documents, watch multimedia clips about historical time periods, provide research opportunities for further learning, and virtually explore landmarks, monuments, and other places in alignment with the content.

Art: Our grade 2 students participate in an art residency program for twenty sessions throughout the year. Here a teaching artist works in conjunction with our teachers to create an art program specific to the curriculum that is being studied. This year, grade 2 students are learning about New York City in social studies, as well as their non-fiction literacy unit. The art program facilitated students expressing their knowledge of New York City in artistic ways such as creating silk banners and silk sun catchers.

3. **Instructional Methods and Interventions:**

At PS 5, we utilize the workshop model in order to meet the varying needs of the students in our classrooms. Through such an approach, teachers have the opportunity to address a skill or strategy by explicitly modeling to the whole class. This is followed by the active engagement portion which allows the teacher to monitor student progress toward meeting the objective of the lesson. Often, we utilize a Socratic Seminar as our active engagement portion. This allows students the opportunity to engage in a discussion about the concept taught. Based upon a range of data, such as performance data and observation data, students participate in differentiated activities. At PS 5, we differentiate in a variety of ways to meet our students' needs. For example, at times, we differentiate the content providing support on the prerequisite skills

needed to be successful in a concept. For students who have already achieved mastery, we look to the following year's standards to see how the concept can be extended. We also differentiate by process by considering the learning style of students. For example, when Kindergarten teachers are introducing new words, they attend to their visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learners. Visual learners have charts with picture support, puzzle cards, and the use of the Smart Board. Auditory learners are addressed through letter songs and chants. Magnetic letters, letter cards, and counters are used to make and break words addressing our kinesthetic learners. Therefore, our groupings are flexible and change contingent upon the objective of the lesson and student prior knowledge. All of our lessons end with a share which provides students an opportunity to consolidate their learning and provides the teacher with another opportunity to gauge understanding.

Teachers with special training are utilized to assist their colleagues in the development of intervention strategies for their students. We have two certified Reading Recovery teachers, two certified Sonday teachers, two teachers who have participated in Orton-Gillingham training, and one teacher who is trained in Lindamood-Bell.

PART V – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results Narrative Summary:

A dramatic drop in performance was evidenced beginning with the 2012-2013 New York State Assessments. The cause was due to NYS adoption of the New Common Core Exams. As the charts below demonstrate, the change in proficiency was systemic.

When comparing the performance of the city and 31R005 in ELA, 31R005 outperforms the city in the percentage of students who are proficient or exceeding proficiency by almost double each year.
See the table below:

Percentage of Students Who Are Proficient or Exceeding Proficiency in ELA

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
31R005	80%	82%	80%	49%	46%
All NYC Schools	42%	44%	47%	26%	28%

When comparing the performance of the city and 31R005 in Math, 31R005 outperforms the city in the percentage of students who are proficient or exceeding proficiency by approximately 30% each year.
See the table below:

Percentage of Students Who Are Proficient or Exceeding Proficiency in Math

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
31R005	88%	89%	87%	64%	65%
All NYC Schools	54%	57%	60%	30%	34%

It should be noted that given the relatively small school population, and especially the number of students in the testing grades (91 students tested in 2014), the size of the school's subgroup sampling is, in most cases insignificant. Extreme changes in performance percentages can be affected by one student. Furthermore, many of our peer schools receive extra credit which gives their students a "bump up" into Levels 3 or 4. Due to our small size we do not have a population eligible for an adjusted extra credit so all of our student's scores are "raw" scores" without extra credit.

There continues to be an achievement gap for Students with Disabilities, however, Public School 5R has consistently outperformed New York City Schools as a whole. In fact, Students with Disabilities at Public School 5R exceed the city average in proficiency for their non-disabled peers.

Comparative Performance of Students with Disabilities
(Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Proficiency)

NYS Common Core Assessment	Public School 5R	NYC Schools
English Language Arts	46.7%	6.7%
Math	47.0%	11.4%

During the 2013-2014 school year, Public School 5R ranked in the top 8.8 percentile amongst all NYC Public Schools in student proficiency (meets or exceeds) in ELA and in the top 10.8 percentile in Math. This is a pattern that consistently represents Public School 5.

2. **Assessment for Instruction and Learning and Sharing Assessment Results:**

Each teacher has a scheduled additional prep period for Data Review with the Instructional Team. Through our regular analysis of classroom data, we are able to continually adjust curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of each individual student. Each reading, writing, and math unit begins with a pre assessment. This data is utilized to determine whole class lessons, student groupings, and individual student entry points. During the units, there are two benchmark tasks which measure student progress during the course of the unit. Instructional and/or pacing adjustments are made based upon this data. At the end of the unit, students engage in a rigorous culminating differentiated task to demonstrate the knowledge attained during the unit. At the end of each reading and math unit, students take an end of unit assessment. This data is analyzed and although it is the end of the unit they are working on, class weaknesses and individual student weaknesses are addressed in the subsequent units. In writing, students publish a final product which is scored focusing on the traits of writing. Since these traits are components of any genre, we utilize this data to help identify writing goals for the students in their next writing unit. Using assessment data, students become part of the goal setting and monitoring process. In each unit of study, students have established goals. Based upon their performance on pre assessments, tasks, and assessments, students monitor their progress toward meeting their goals. This allows students to make meaningful use of their academic data. Parents are informed of student academic achievement in numerous ways. They receive a weekly writing checklist with feedback regarding student progress toward their writing goals and individualized letters regarding mastery of specific concepts. Teachers provide extensive feedback on all assessments in order to ensure parents are aware of their child's academic achievement.

Part VI School Support

1. School Climate/Culture

One way that our school motivates students is by clearly communicating high expectations for their academic success and personal behaviors. Our students are motivated and engaged by our rigorous curriculum which is differentiated to challenge students at all levels. Our curriculum provides frequent opportunities for students to have choice, work collaboratively in groups, and set goals for themselves. Technology is utilized daily and we collaborate with our PTA to ensure that our children are immersed in the arts. Our children have a certified Theater Arts teacher, take ballroom dancing, Zumba, band, art, and we use a School Wide Enrichment model to engage children using different learning modalities.

The social and emotional growth of our students is very important to our staff. This is why we have weekly PPT meetings with our School Based Support Team to discuss our student's individual needs. We implement the One Can Count Program and work with the YMCA anti-bullying program so that students build relationships with one another. Moreover, each morning students are excited to have their turn at reading the "Words of Wisdom." The "Words of Wisdom" messages empower the students to persevere and do their best, have empathy for others, appreciate what they have and what others do for them, and encourage them to contribute to their community. These messages also serve as morale boosters for the staff and starting points for teachers if they need to address certain issues in their class. They also come with lessons for follow up activities if teachers need ideas on how to address a specific issue.

Our teachers are involved in all important decision making on curriculum, school policy and professional development which demonstrates the value that is placed on their expertise. Teachers are provided with a wealth of professional development which is differentiated by the teacher's personal professional goals. Teachers serve as resources for one another and collaborate to plan professional development based on their expertise. Principal observations are always followed up with specific feedback so that teachers are clear on their next steps and how they will be supported in implementing them. According to the School Culture section of our most recent Learning Environment Survey, 100 percent of our teachers strongly agreed with the following statements:

- The Principal at my school encourages open communication on important school issues
- My school sets appropriately high expectations for student work in their classes
- In my school, the professional staff believe that all students can learn including English language learners and students with disabilities
- I feel supported by the Principal
- I feel supported by other teachers at my school
- Teachers in our school trust each other

2. Engaging Families and Community

One strategy that our school employs is to involve parents in our Grant Writing Committee. Since we are not a Title I school, writing grants is a resourceful way for us to provide our students with materials and programs that enrich their education.

This year one of our CEP goals is written specifically to involve parents in school decision making. The goal states: "Parents and teachers will work together to develop a shared understanding of school goals and expectations." As part of our action plan in meeting this goal, our School Leadership Team is developing a proposal for our second Family Engagement Night.

Each year our parents take a survey which enables our school instructional team to plan for workshops that meet parents' needs. These workshops are provided by in house staff and outside vendors throughout the year and are designed to help assist parents in supporting their child's academic and social development in school. Parents have an active role in choosing the arts activities that we offer to the students. They work diligently to support our art programs so that our students receive visual arts, music, theatre arts and dance.

Twice a year parents are invited to a "Portfolio Day" where students put together a portfolio of the work they are most proud of in each subject area and share it with their parents. In addition, parents in all grades are invited to monthly writing celebrations which reflect the various genres the students are learning in ELA. They are also invited to school performances throughout the year which showcase the arts programs that the children participate in.

Many of our parents are police officers, firefighters and city workers and have personally been affected by September 11th. They love and appreciate our yearly tradition of celebrating Flag Day. Each year on or around June 14th, our parents come out to celebrate our country and our community. We give awards for community service and excellent attendance while entertaining our students, staff, and parents with various displays and performances. We also have a yearly Carnival Day which parents plan and pay for. This is one of the highlights of the school year for many of our students. We always anticipate at least one parent attending per student and many times both parents attend.

We work to build community ties by forming a partnership with our nearby High School where the majority of our students will attend. High School students, who are seniors and want to attend teaching programs in college, come to our school at the end of their day and receive credits for working in our classrooms. Likewise, the high school has a Junior Achievement program that visits PS 5 three times a year and students in grades 9-12 come with their Economics teacher. They are graded on the lessons they plan and implement for an entire day with the class they are assigned to. Our students learn about economics, how to write a check and balance a checkbook, etc… Our neighboring high school also brings the Robotics team to our school twice a year to provide assemblies for our students in Grades K-5.

3. Professional Development

Our school motto and philosophy is "Everyone Learns Every Day". This phrase represents the importance that we place on professional development for all of our staff. We believe that schools are learning places for adults as well as children and that the single most important variable in the learning of students is the quality of the teacher. Therefore, professional development is paramount and must be ongoing and collaborative. We believe that adults like students, learn best when they are engaged in interactive learning opportunities. These learning opportunities focus on 3 areas:

1. The areas where the teacher feels they need support. We believe that adults learn best when they feel that the information they are learning is meaningful and valuable to them
2. The areas that the data informs both the teacher and I as areas needing improvement
3. The areas that I identify during my observations of teachers based upon the Danielson Rubric

In order to build capacity, feedback must be specific, honest, and frequent including a next step. Follow up and support are always provided so that teachers are successful in implementing new learning. Our school has several structures in place to build teacher capacity. We provide teachers with peer coaching, weekly data review grade meetings, inquiry team work, and inter-visitations with colleagues on their grade level as well as the grade level above and the grade level below. Professional development is given in house by teachers who turn-key trainings, teachers with special skills, and/or teachers who are rated highly effective on the Danielson Rubric. Professional development, whether aligned to a teacher's personal professional goal or our school-wide goals, is always aligned to Common Core Instructional Shifts. This year in ELA, we are focusing on Close Reading and Socratic Seminar in the classroom. This aligns to ELA shifts 3 & 4 where students are challenged to have rich and rigorous conversations that are dependent on complex texts.

This also aligns to Component 3b of the Danielson Rubric (Questioning and Discussion Techniques). In Mathematics, our students are challenged to persevere at problem solving and obtain automaticity and flexibility in number sense. Our math professional development concentrates on shifts 3, 4, & 5 (Fluency, Deep Understanding, & Application).

As an instructional leader, I attend all of the professional development sessions with teachers so that we are sharing a common language and belief system regarding best practices. The success in capacity building

among my staff has enabled me to have a distributive leadership style which motivates my staff to become lifelong learners.

4. School Leadership

I believe that we have a distributive leadership philosophy which has had a positive impact on student achievement. The teachers and staff are leaders and problem solvers. They are using data to inform instruction and solve classroom and grade problems as well as identify school-wide trends. For example, in math, there is a school wide- trend indicating that students struggle with solving word problems. As an outgrowth of this, in each grade specific templates and protocols were created to support students in breaking down a word problem. Specifically, the teachers have been trained on a successful strategy used in Singapore called the "Bar Model". Over the past year, students in grades 2-5 have been successfully implementing this strategy in the classroom. When we analyze math assessments, we can see evidence that our students are using this strategy to successfully solve rigorous math word problems.

The team structures that we have in place ensure that student work is carefully analyzed in a timely manner and that lesson plans are appropriately differentiated for individual learners. For example, one structure that we have in place is a weekly "Data Review Meeting" on each grade level. These weekly team meetings help to build teacher capacity in using different types of data to adjust curriculum and instruction. Teachers are accountable for making decisions about which key standards to emphasize during a specific unit of study and how to pace the lessons and group students according to students' strengths and areas for improvement.

Teachers on a grade are scheduled for common planning several times per week and they spend a minimum of 3-4 hours per week collaboratively planning lessons. Each Monday at the end of our Inquiry Work time, teachers place a shared lesson plan on our "Interactive Inquiry Wall" so that it is transparent for all. The teachers choose which teachers on their grade will video this lesson and bring it to the next Inquiry Meeting. Teachers watch the video and evaluate each child's progress in Socratic Seminar using a rubric that they have created.

Our professional development plan includes how we can utilize all resources such as virtual components of our math program, use of the Smart Board, and the creation of multi-leveled tasks and activities so that all students are intellectually engaged and challenged. Additionally, we utilize instructional specialists from our network to organize lesson study groups with our teachers and others from the district. These teacher leaders come back to the building and then share resources and best practices with their grade level colleagues so that they build a repertoire of strategies to scaffold student learning and provide enrichment.

Inter-visitations and debrief sessions allow our teachers to trouble shoot common problems of practice and develop solutions. This structure of inter-visiting and debriefing builds capacity in understanding the Danielson Rubric and the criteria for highly effective teaching. We also use the inter-visitation structure to visit classrooms when a Data Review meeting reveals that a teacher's pedagogy has been successful at attaining high percentages of students exceeding the standards.

Leadership at PS 5 is a collaborative effort with parents to ensure that our children are offered a wide variety of extracurricular activities and services to keep them engaged at school.

PART VIII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math	**Test:** NYS STM
All Students Tested/Grade: 3	**Edition/Publication Year:** N/A
Publisher: Pearson	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
NYS Level 3 and above	58	63	71	80	97
NYS Level 4	23	22	6	15	64
Number of students tested	26	32	34	40	33
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	0	43	63	67	91
NYS Level 4	0	0	13	17	64
Number of students tested	4	7	8	6	11
2. Students receiving Special Education					
NYS Level 3 and above	33	25	60	0	100
NYS Level 4	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students tested	3	4	5	0	7
3. English Language Learner Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	57	64	72	83	97
NYS Level 4	29	21	6	17	63
Number of students tested	21	28	32	35	30
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 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

Subject: Math	Test: NYS STM
All Students Tested/Grade: 4	Edition/Publication Year: N/A
Publisher: Pearson	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
NYS Level 3 and above	58	66	93	97	84
NYS Level 4	29	22	63	63	42
Number of students tested	31	32	41	35	31
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	33	33	100	88	56
NYS Level 4	0	33	57	50	22
Number of students tested	6	6	7	8	9
2. Students receiving Special Education					
NYS Level 3 and above	40	50	80	83	20
NYS Level 4	20	0	40	50	0
Number of students tested	5	4	5	6	5
3. English Language Learner Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	61	67	94	67	82
NYS Level 4	29	23	68	65	43
Number of students tested	28	30	34	31	28
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 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: NYS STM
All Students Tested/Grade: 5	Edition/Publication Year: N/A
Publisher: Pearson	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
NYS Level 3 and above	77	63	97	90	85
NYS Level 4	27	16	61	40	44
Number of students tested	34	38	36	30	39
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	57	80	100	89	75
NYS Level 4	14	20	50	33	25
Number of students tested	7	5	10	9	8
2. Students receiving Special Education					
NYS Level 3 and above	63	0	100	50	0
NYS Level 4	13	0	50	0	0
Number of students tested	8	0	4	4	0
3. English Language Learner Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	75	64	97	89	83
NYS Level 4	25	18	61	44	40
Number of students tested	32	33	31	27	35
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 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: ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3	Edition/Publication Year: N/A
Publisher: Pearson	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
NYS Level 3 and above	62	41	68	80	91
NYS Level 4	12	0	9	0	33
Number of students tested	26	32	34	40	33
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	25	14	75	83	82
NYS Level 4	0	0	13	0	45
Number of students tested	4	7	8	6	11
2. Students receiving Special Education					
NYS Level 3 and above	100	25	40	0	86
NYS Level 4	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students tested	3	4	5	0	7
3. English Language Learner Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	62	43	66	80	90
NYS Level 4	14	0	9	0	30
Number of students tested	21	28	32	35	30
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 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: ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4	Edition/Publication Year: N/A
Publisher: Pearson	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
NYS Level 3 and above	39	44	88	83	81
NYS Level 4	7	16	5	3	6
Number of students tested	31	32	40	35	31
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	17	33	83	63	67
NYS Level 4	17	0	0	13	0
Number of students tested	6	6	6	8	9
2. Students receiving Special Education					
NYS Level 3 and above	20	0	80	83	20
NYS Level 4	20	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	5	4	5	6	5
3. English Language Learner Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	39	43	88	87	79
NYS Level 4	7	17	3	0	7
Number of students tested	28	30	34	31	28
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 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:
All Students Tested/Grade: 5	Edition/Publication Year: N/A
Publisher: Pearson	

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
NYS Level 3 and above	68	61	83	90	62
NYS Level 4	27	11	6	40	33
Number of students tested	34	38	35	30	39
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment					
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/ Disadvantaged Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	43	60	37	89	38
NYS Level 4	14	0	22	33	25
Number of students tested	7	5	9	9	8
2. Students receiving Special Education					
NYS Level 3 and above	63	0	75	25	0
NYS Level 4	13	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	8	0	4	4	0
3. English Language Learner Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
5. African- American Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
6. Asian Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					

School Year	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
NYS Level 3 and above	69	67	84	82	60
NYS Level 4	25	9	3	4	29
Number of students tested	32	33	31	27	35
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
NYS Level 3 and above					
NYS Level 4					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: 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