

**West Babylon Schools**  
**Elementary Principals'**  
**Report to the**  
**Board of Education**

**October 2011**

**Christine Tona, Principal, Forest Avenue Elementary School**  
**Gregg Cunningham, Principal, JFK Elementary School**  
**Eleanor Levy, Principal, Santapogue Elementary School**  
**JoAnn Scott, Principal, South Bay Elementary School**  
**Charles Germano, Principal, Tooker Avenue Elementary School**

**West Babylon Schools**

# Elementary Principals' Report to the Board of Education October 2011

## ***I. District Data Summary***

Below is ELA, Math and Science data from all five elementary schools in West Babylon as well as averages of the West Babylon School District and Suffolk County for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years. The data shows the percentage of students scoring on each performance level and the percentage of students meeting proficiency on each assessment and on each grade level.

ELA 3	Levels 3 + 4		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Percentages										
<b>Suffolk</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>64</b>	19.86	5.16	42.55	58.40	27.46	27.35	10.13	9.09
<b>District</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>63</b>	16.49	3.07	41.05	59.73	31.23	31.74	11.23	5.46
<b>FA</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>63</b>	29.51	2.04	50.82	61.22	13.11	32.65	6.56	4.08
<b>JFK</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>77</b>	19.28	8.57	34.94	68.57	34.94	22.86	10.84	0
<b>SA</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>62</b>	10.64	1.59	29.79	60.32	40.43	33.33	19.15	4.76
<b>SB</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>56</b>	6.67	1.85	46.67	53.70	37.78	25.93	8.89	18.52
<b>TA</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>53</b>	8.70	0	45.65	52.63	34.78	45.61	10.87	1.75

ELA 4	Levels 3 + 4		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Percentages										
<b>Suffolk</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>64</b>	6.76	2.51	59.81	61.62	28.54	30.47	4.89	5.41
<b>District</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>65</b>	5.26	2.39	64.40	62.80	27.55	30.03	2.79	4.78
<b>FA</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>71</b>	2.90	3.64	49.28	67.27	43.48	21.82	4.35	7.27
<b>JFK</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>73</b>	6.85	3.53	79.45	69.41	12.33	23.53	1.37	3.53
<b>SA</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>43</b>	8.47	1.96	57.63	41.18	30.51	52.94	3.39	3.92
<b>SB</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>65</b>	6.67	2.04	56.67	63.27	33.33	30.61	3.33	4.08
<b>TA</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>69</b>	1.67	0	80.00	69.39	18.33	26.53	0	4.08

ELA 5	Levels 3 + 4		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Percentages										
<b>Suffolk</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>	15.25	4.12	45.45	57.31	31.52	31.15	7.77	7.42
<b>District</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>67</b>	10.95	1.56	46.45	65.73	33.14	30.22	9.47	2.49
<b>FA</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>51</b>	10.94	1.47	46.88	50.00	23.44	39.71	18.75	8.82
<b>JFK</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>84</b>	11.90	1.37	58.33	82.19	28.57	16.44	1.19	0
<b>SA</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>73</b>	11.59	1.67	34.78	71.67	40.58	26.67	13.04	0
<b>SB</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>56</b>	12.96	3.51	46.30	52.63	35.19	42.11	5.56	1.75
<b>TA</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>73</b>	7.69	0	44.62	73.33	38.46	26.67	9.23	0

***\*New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) data is not included in these tables. Results may differ from school report cards for schools containing special education students who take the NYSAA instead of NYS assessments in ELA, Math and Science.***

<b>MATH 3</b>	<b>Levels 3 + 4</b>		<b>Level 4</b>		<b>Level 3</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 1</b>	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
<b>Percentages</b>										
<b>Suffolk</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>66</b>	28.48	14.45	37.43	51.51	28.39	29.43	5.70	6.46
<b>District</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>62</b>	23.78	7.22	37.41	54.30	33.57	33.68	5.24	4.81
<b>FA</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>67</b>	32.79	8.33	44.26	58.33	21.31	25.00	1.64	8.33
<b>JFK</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>79</b>	27.71	10.00	40.96	68.57	30.12	20.00	1.20	1.43
<b>SA</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>57</b>	17.02	7.94	25.53	49.21	42.55	41.27	14.89	1.59
<b>SB</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>52</b>	15.22	9.26	41.30	42.59	41.30	37.04	2.17	11.11
<b>TA</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>50</b>	21.74	0	32.61	50.00	36.96	46.43	8.70	3.57

<b>MATH 4</b>	<b>Levels 3 + 4</b>		<b>Level 4</b>		<b>Level 3</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 1</b>	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
<b>Percentages</b>										
<b>Suffolk</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>73</b>	30.14	29.13	41.17	43.79	25.43	23.51	3.26	3.57
<b>District</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>79</b>	21.74	27.30	50.31	51.54	26.09	18.43	1.86	2.73
<b>FA</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>73</b>	20.29	32.73	47.83	40.00	30.43	21.82	1.45	5.45
<b>JFK</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>87</b>	26.03	25.88	61.64	61.18	12.33	12.94	0	0
<b>SA</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71</b>	22.03	30.77	49.15	40.38	27.12	25.00	1.69	3.85
<b>SB</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>88</b>	20.34	27.08	37.29	60.42	37.29	8.33	5.08	4.17
<b>TA</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>74</b>	20.00	22.00	55.00	52.00	25.00	26.00	0	0

<b>MATH 5</b>	<b>Levels 3 + 4</b>		<b>Level 4</b>		<b>Level 3</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 1</b>	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
<b>Percentages</b>										
<b>Suffolk</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>73</b>	28.28	25.75	44.32	47.26	23.69	23.34	3.71	3.65
<b>District</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>77</b>	25.89	20.19	44.94	56.52	26.79	20.19	2.38	3.11
<b>FA</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>67</b>	35.48	10.14	33.87	56.52	29.03	26.09	1.61	7.25
<b>JFK</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>96</b>	32.14	27.03	48.81	68.92	19.05	4.05	0	0
<b>SA</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>72</b>	21.74	15.00	39.13	56.67	36.23	26.67	2.90	1.67
<b>SB</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>66</b>	31.48	25.00	48.15	41.07	14.81	30.36	5.56	3.57
<b>TA</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>82</b>	9.23	25.00	55.38	56.67	33.85	18.33	1.54	0

<b>SCIENCE 4</b>	<b>Levels 3 + 4</b>		<b>Level 4</b>		<b>Level 3</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 1</b>	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
<b>Percentages</b>										
<b>Suffolk</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	68.92	65.57	25.89	28.78	4.12	4.75	1.07	0.91
<b>District</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	81.56	78.57	16.25	19.73	2.19	1.36	0	0.34
<b>FA</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	79.10	76.79	17.91	21.43	2.99	1.79	0	0
<b>JFK</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	89.04	90.59	10.96	9.41	0	0	0	0
<b>SA</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100</b>	86.44	70.59	11.86	29.41	1.69	0	0	0
<b>SB</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>98</b>	72.88	77.55	22.03	20.41	5.08	0	0	2.04
<b>TA</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>96</b>	81.67	72.00	18.33	24.00	0	4.00	0	0

*\*New York State Alternative Assessment (NYSAA) data is not included in these tables. Results may differ from school report cards for schools containing special education students who take the NYSAA instead of NYS assessments in ELA, Math and Science.*

## ***Individual Building Plans- Building-Specific Strategy Updates***

- A. 2010-2011 Areas of Focus
  - Strategies Implemented
  - Results
  
- B. 2011-2012 Areas of Focus
  - Strategies Planned
  - Targets/Goals
  
- C. Building-Specific Concerns/Recommendations
  - Forest Avenue Elementary School
  - JFK Elementary School
  - Santapogue Elementary School
  - South Bay Elementary School
  - Tooker Avenue Elementary School

**Forest Avenue School**  
Board of Education Report  
Christine Tona, Principal

**I. Data Summary**

**A. Comparison of Forest Avenue School's 2010 to 2011 Cohort Data for ELA & Math Assessments**

- ELA 3 (2010) to ELA 4 (2011)- 80% to 71% scoring a level 3 or level 4
- ELA 4 (2010) to ELA 5 (2011)- 52% to 51% scoring a level 3 or level 4
- Math 3 (2010) to Math 4 (2011)- 77% to 73% scoring a level 3 or level 4
- Math 4 (2010) to Math 5 (2011)- 68% to 67% scoring a level 3 or level 4

**B. Comparison of Forest Avenue School's 2011 ELA & Math Results to the District and County**

**Percentage of Students Scoring a Level 3 or Level 4:**

- ELA Grade 3- Equal to district and county averages
- ELA Grade 4- Above district and county averages
- ELA Grade 5- Below district and county averages
- Math Grade 3- Above district and county averages
- Math Grade 4- Below district and equal to county averages
- Math Grade 5- Below district and county averages

**II. Individual Building Plan and Update**

**A. Focus Areas for 2010-2011**

- Integrated program (grades K, 1, 3, 5)
- Performance of the fifth grade students on NYS assessments
- Increased Parental Awareness of the NYS assessments

**Strategies Implemented**

- Focused reading instruction to special education students
- Differentiation of instruction continued in all classes
- Progress monitoring of students receiving remedial reading/math instruction
- Practice assessments were administered 4 times for ELA in grades 3 – 5 and data was analyzed and used to inform instruction
- Practice assessments were administered 3 times for Math in grades 3 – 5 and data was analyzed and used to inform instruction
- Focus on test stamina for longer assessments
- Literacy blocks in all classes for a minimum of 90 minutes per day
- SMARTboards used daily in lesson delivery
- Reading and math specialists and classroom teachers used test data to inform instruction
- Collaboration between classroom, special education and intervention teachers to address specific student needs
- All grades 3 – 5 classes received weekly push-in lesson from Reading specialist who modeled best practices
- AIMSweb benchmarking data was used to inform instruction and identify students' strengths and weaknesses
- Grade level meetings were held twice per month to focus on test data, curriculum and best practices

- On-line math program, [www.ixl.com](http://www.ixl.com), purchased for all students K – 5 for use in school and at home
- On-line reading programs, [www.RAZ-kids.com](http://www.RAZ-kids.com) and [www.studyisland.com](http://www.studyisland.com), purchased for K- 5 students for use in school and at home
- Sharing among staff members and use of instructional websites in classrooms
- Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) program used with lowest remedial reading students
- Fast Math and Touch Math programs used with remedial math students
- Foundations program used in all kindergarten classes and one pilot grade one class
- Foundations Double Dose remedial program used with struggling kindergarten students
- Extra help focused on specific areas of weakness
- AIS workshop presented to parents
- Three separate Parent Assessment workshops were held for parents of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 which focused on how to read the NYS assessment parent report, what students are expected to know and do on the NYS assessments, and how to assist children at home

### **Results**

- Fifth grade students' results on ELA and Math assessments remained consistent.
- Of the 10 special education students in Integrated classes in grades 3 – 5, one student scored a level 3 or higher on the ELA assessment and three students scored a level 3 or higher on the Math assessment.
- Parent workshop attendance
  - Grade 3- 11 parents in attendance (49 students in grade)
  - Grade 4- 10 parents in attendance (56 students in grade)
  - Grade 5- 8 parents in attendance (69 students in grade)

### **B. Focus Areas for 2011-2012**

- Increase the number of students achieving a level 3 or 4 on the NYS assessments
- Special education students in grades 4 & 5
- Increase parental awareness of NYS assessments and curriculum
- Increase teacher knowledge of the NYS Common Core Standards

### **Strategies Planned**

- Progress monitoring for remedial students
- Use of bi-monthly grade level meetings to analyze assessment data and learn about the Common Core State Standards
- Continued use of Leveled Literacy Instruction for weakest remedial reading students (as allowed by limited staffing)
- Use of Read 180 and Just Words program for special education students in grades 4 & 5
- Continued use of Foundations in kindergarten and expanded use to grade 1
- Use of Foundations Double Dose program for struggling kindergarten and first grade students (as allowed by limited staffing)
- Practice assessments in ELA and Math will be administered to students in grades 3 – 5
- Extra help sessions targeted to meet specific needs of students
- Continued use of Fast Math and Touch Math programs
- Continued use of on-line math and reading programs (ixl, RAZ kids, Study Island)
- Parent Assessment workshops planned for grades 4 & 5 in November and grade 3 in January
- Implementation of vocabulary workbooks in grades 3 – 5
- Increased use of non-fiction texts to prepare students for NYS assessments and meet the requirement of the new Common Core State Standards

- Continued use of AIMSweb benchmarking with the addition of comprehension assessments in grades 3 – 5 and math computation and application assessments in grades 3 – 5.
- Change of Back to School Format from one night to three nights. This allows parents 30 minutes in the classroom with the teacher and 30 minutes with the principal and grade level teachers to review important information related to assessments and school procedures

### **Targets/Goals**

- Meet AYP for all accountability groups
- Increase the number of students achieving a level 3 or level 4 on all state assessments
- Increase the parent attendance from the 2010-2011 school year at the Parent Assessment workshops

### **III. Challenges/Recommendations**

#### Specific concerns for Forest Avenue School

- Growing ESL population creates challenge for addressing individual students' needs. It is difficult to group the students according to need and ability since multiple grade levels of students must meet together due to staffing and scheduling.
- Increase in financially disadvantaged population
- Difficulty providing *Foundations* Double Dose to kindergarten and grade 1 students in need due to limited staffing. Program is designed to be 5 times per week but we are only delivering the program 3 times per week.
- Leveled Literacy Intervention is a successful program but only 3 students can be in a group. Limited staffing reduces the number of groups.
- Large class sizes in grades K (24 students in each of 2 classes), 2 (24 students in each of 3 classes, one of which is Inclusion), 4 (25 students in each of 2 classes, one of which is Inclusion) and 5 (26 students and 28 students).
- Staffing Tier II and III interventions for students with most intensive needs
- Meeting the demands of APPR
- Purchasing of materials and texts which support the Common Core State Standards

**JFK's BOE Follow-up Report**  
**Gregg Cunningham, Principal**

**I. Data Summary**

**Comparison of JFK's 2010 to 2011 ELA & Math State Assessment Data**

- 54% in grade three to 73% in grade four - scoring a level 3/4 on the ELA
- 86% in grade four to 84% in grade five - scoring a level 3/4 on the ELA
- 69% in grade three to 87% in grade four - scoring a level 3/4 on the Math
- 88% in grade three to 96% in grade five - scoring a level 3/4 on the Math
- Percentage of students scoring a level 4 on Gr. 3-5 ELA dropped from 12.66% in 2010 to 4.66% in 2011
- Percentage of students scoring a level 4 on Gr. 3-5 Math dropped from 28.66% in 2010 to 21% in 2011
- Percentage of students scoring a level 3/4 exceeded the percentage of students scoring a level 3/4 on the Gr. 3, 4 & 5 ELA assessment on the district, town and county level
- Percentage of students scoring a level 3/4 exceeded the percentage of students scoring a level 3/4 on the Gr. 3, 4 & 5 Math assessment on the district, town and county level

**II. Individual Building Plan & Update**

**A. Focus Areas for 2010-2011**

- Grade 3 2009-2010 ELA
- 2010-2011 Cut Points
- Level 4 Percentages
- Integrated Program

**Strategies Implemented 2010-2011**

- Build stamina during instructional activities & assessments
- Teaching test taking strategies
- Use Data Mentor to determine specific areas of focus/weakness
- Stress inferential thinking
- Collaboration between intervention, special education & classroom teachers to address specific student needs
- Progress monitor specific students too increase their fluency & math skills
- Use Smart boards to model and address state test questions
- Extra help session to target remediation and enrichment for identified students
- Use building meetings to provide professional development for staff primarily in literacy
- Use AIMSWeb benchmark data to formulate intervention programs for identified students
- Use literacy blocks to focus on ELA reading & writing strategies
- Expand the Foundations program into first grade
- Use data from our ELA & math practice assessments to inform instruction

**Results**

- On four of the six assessments (ELA/Math) we increased the percentage of students scoring a level 3/4.



- We failed to increase the percentage of students scoring a level 4 on all six assessments (ELA/Math). Our focus was to make sure students scored a level 3, not a level 2.

**B. Focus Areas for 2011-2012**

- Percentage of students scoring a level 4 in all grades on the ELA & Math assessment (Equal or exceed 2009-2010 percentages)
- Percentage of students scoring a level 3/4 on the Gr. 5 ELA (exceed 86%)
- Percentage of students scoring a level 3/4 on the Gr. 3 (77%) & 4 (73%) ELA and Gr. 3 (79%) Math assessment (target is 85%)

**Strategies Planned**

- Use the 2011 ELA trend charts for grades 3-5 to analyze the types of indicators/skills being addressed on the test and prepare higher level thinking questions in our instruction to prepare students for these types of literacy tasks.
- Continue to use BARS to gather information on individual student performance and plan lessons that would assist students in being successful on areas of weakness observed on the previous year's ELA assessment.
- Continue to prepare students for the demands of the ELA assessment by developing their stamina and engaging students in authentic reading tasks that will prepare them for the ELA test.
- Continue to actively proctor our students during formal reading assessments to ensure students are correctly filling in their selections.
- Continue to expose students to a variety of texts and genres because the ELA assessment contained various types of texts to comprehend (specifically myths in grade 5)
- Use sample questions on the new format of the 2012 ELA assessments to create practice materials that align to the new format.
- To follow the September-April/May-June NYS Program Guidance to teach all performance indicators during the period specified.
- Continue to utilize BARS (Eastern Suffolk BOCES Assessment Reporting System) to gather information on individual student performance.
- To use the Summer Math test results to determine which performance indicators from the past school year need to be revisited. Specifically:
  - Grade 3: measurement and estimation
  - Grade 4: estimation, comparing fractions, word problems (multiplication and division)
  - Grade 5: measurement, comparing fractions, and geometry
- Utilize the NYS Coach book in grades 3-5 to practice and help master the kinds of questions that will be seen on the NYS Math exam. The lessons within this book directly correlate with the NYS Math Performance Indicators.
- Continue to prepare students for the demands of the math assessment by developing student test taking stamina.
- We will wait to see samples of the new format of the 2012 math assessments, and will use these samples to create practice materials that align to the new format.

### **Goals**

- Achieve focus areas for 2011-2012
- Exceed similar school performance on all state assessments
- Meet AYP for all accountability groups

### **III. Challenges/Recommendations**

- Implementing the CCS
- Provide staff training in the CCS
- Providing fidelity for the Foundations program in K-2
- Meeting the demands of APPR
- Meeting AYP with the special education cell
- Staffing Tier II & III interventions
- Administering the new assessments based on the CCS in 2012-2013
- Purchasing materials that support the CCS

**Santapogue School Assessment Update**  
**Eleanor Levy, Principal**

**I. Data Summary**

**A. Comparison of Santapogue's 2010 to 2011 ELA & Math State Assessment Data**

- 40% in grade 3 to 43% in grade 4 - scoring a level 3 /4 on ELA
- 66% in grade 4 to 73% in grade 5 -scoring a level 3 /4 on ELA
- 43% in grade 3 to 71% in grade 4- scoring a level 3 /4 on Math
- 71% in grade 4 to 72% in grade 5 -scoring a level 3 /4 on Math

**B. Comparison of Santapogue's 2011 ELA & Math Results to the District and County**

- Based on the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or 4:
- ELA grade 3 - Just below the district and county average
- ELA grade 4 - Below the district and county average
- ELA grade 5 - Above the district and county average
- Math grade 3 - Below the district and county average
- Math grade 4 - Below the district and county average
- Math grade 5 - Below the district and county average

**II. Individual Plans and Strategies for Santapogue**

**A. Areas of Focus in 2010-2011**

- Analysis of Grade 3 2009-10 ELA results- 40% had reached Levels 3 or 4
- Incoming grade 4 students in the Fall of 2010 - how to impact their ELA scores

**Strategies Implemented**

- 2x a month grade level meetings- focus on data analysis and impacting instruction
- discussion of strategies and concerns at faculty meetings
- use of Aimsweb to monitor student progress
- use of Data mentor to discuss areas of concern
- discussion of student progress at CST meetings with building team
- practice exams during the school year in January and March built stamina and provided data for assessment
- shorter length exams in classrooms to address specific areas of concern
- AIS small group instruction in reading support classes; RSS services with reading teaching assistant
- sharing of information with parents at PTA meetings, individual parent conferences, AIS meeting with parents of AIS students, and Grade 3, 4 and 5 Parent Evening Informational Assessment Meeting
- Parent event was facilitated by reading and math specialists, grade 3, 4 and 5 classroom teachers - attendance of 57 adults at meeting
- collaboration with and support from the Director of ELA
- targeted extra help sessions

- implementation of Foundations into Kindergarten setting with Double Dose support; some 1st and 2nd graders as well
- teachers attended conferences regarding test preparation and how to prepare students using the best practices
- change of master schedule for the ELA testing week to provide appropriate testing accommodations for IEP, 504 and ESL children

## **Results**

- 43 % of 4th graders scored at Level 3 or 4 on ELA exam in May 2011
- There were 2 classes at the 4th grade level; one was an integrated class with a total of 9 ELL students; both were capped for class size
- This exam was lengthier than previous ones; more demanding with a focus on critical thinking skills

## **B. 2011-2012 Areas of Focus**

- Present grade 5 students and the need to improve their ELA exam results in the spring of 2012
- Present grade 4 students and the need to improve their Math exam results in the spring of 2012.

## **Strategies Planned**

- Faculty meetings to address concerns and strategies globally
- Grade level meetings 2x a month to discuss implementation of CCSS, data analysis and instructional strategies
- use of Aimsweb to monitor progress
- discussion of student needs at CST meetings
- administer lengthy practice exams to grades 3, 4 and 5 in ELA and Math during December and February- builds stamina and provides data
- administer short strategy focused tests to determine needs of students and progress monitor
- targeted extra help sessions
- AIS informational meeting in Oct. 2011- provided information to parents- 43 adults attended the presentation
- individual parent and teacher meetings continue
- share information at PTA meetings, through newsletters and website
- AIS small group instruction in ELA and Math with reading specialists and math specialist
- master schedule will be adjusted in spring 2012 to administer SED exams according to student needs
- use of Book Flix, Storyworks, Edhelper, Time for Kids and the New York Times to provide informational text for student learning
- use of Show What You Know strategies in math as well as integration of reading skills with verbal problems
- use of FAST MATH in math remedial settings- provides data and enables progress monitoring
- work with Director of ELA to provide support for faculty
- work with Director of Technology to improve assessment skills

- continue to focus attention on ESL, IEP and 504 students at meetings with teachers
- conduct cross grade level meetings to discuss expectations and progression of skills
- focus on short answer segments of multiple choice exams in ELA and MATH; listening segments for the weakest readers

### **Targets/Goals for Spring 2012**

- ELA grade 5 - 80% at Levels 3 or 4 (from 43% in grade 4)
- Math grade 4- 90% at Levels 3 or 4 (from 58% in grade 3)
- To reach AYP at Santapogue in ELA and MATH.

### **Long Term Plans**

- Implement Foundations with fidelity at grades K and 1 this year; at grade 2 during the 2012-13 school year
- Provide Double Dose support as required
- Encourage reading of additional non fiction (informational text) books for students at all grade levels
- Formal observations of tenured faculty with focus on informational text and questioning strategies
- Provide staff development for faculty and principal in the areas of CCSS, the new APPR and implementation of RTI

## **III. Challenges/Recommendations**

### **A. Building Concerns**

- Class size-grade 5 in particular
- Increasingly mobile population
- Increase in non English speaking population of children and parents
- Increase in financially disadvantaged population
- Class size in remedial setting in ELA and MATH
- Children who are not being serviced as in the past (very low level 3's in ELA and MATH).
- Inability to provide LLI supports in reading due to staffing challenge
- Inability to provide double dose instruction to Kg and 1st graders as prescribed ( amount of time and size of groups).
- The need to develop and staff Tier 2 and Tier 3 RTI programs and approaches
- Purchasing of materials and texts which support CCSS

### **B. Recommendations**

- Provide additional teaching support to enable instruction in Double Dose Foundations as prescribed
- Provide support in ELA and MATH for low Level 3 students
- Provide support to enable use of LLI in AIS reading classes
- Provide support for Tier 2 and 3 RTI interventions

- Investigate Award Reading program for use as pilot for students not making progress in reading
- Enable our building to implement Reading A to Z (Raz) in school and at home as an online reading support program- pilot in a 1st grade and 3rd grade class.

**SOUTH BAY SCHOOL**  
BOE Follow-up Report – October 2011  
JoAnn Scott, Principal

**I. 2010-2011 ELA and Math Assessment Data Summary**

○ **ELA**

- ELA4 -- Increased %age of students with a scale score of 650 or higher from 82% in '09-'10 to 92% in '10-'11
- ELA4 – Increased %age of students achieving proficiency from 53% as 3<sup>rd</sup> graders in '09-'10 to 65% as 4<sup>th</sup> graders in '10-'11
- ELA4 – South Bay outperformed Suffolk County and matched the district percentage of students achieving proficiency
- ELA5 -- Increased %age of students with a scale score of 650 or higher from 91% in '09-'10 to 97% in '10-'11
- **Students with Disabilities**
  - Increased %age of students achieving proficiency from 0% as 3<sup>rd</sup> graders in '09-'10 to 20% as 4<sup>th</sup> graders in '10-'11
  - Increased %age of students achieving proficiency from 0% as 4<sup>th</sup> graders in '09-'10 to 14% as 5<sup>th</sup> graders in '10-'11

○ **Math**

- Math 4 increased Mean Scale Score, from 683 in '09-'10 to 697 in '10-'11
- Math 4 increased %age of students with a scale score of 650 or higher from 86% in '09-'10 to 94% in '10-'11
- Math 4 – South Bay outperformed Suffolk County and the district percentage of students achieving proficiency
- Increased %age of students achieving proficiency from 57% as 3<sup>rd</sup> graders in '09-'10 to 88% as 4<sup>th</sup> graders in '10-'11
- Math 5 increased %age of students with a scale score of 650 or higher from 91% in '09-'10 to 93% in '10-'11
- Increased %age of students achieving proficiency from 58% as 4<sup>th</sup> graders in '09-'10 to 66% as 5<sup>th</sup> graders in '10-'11
- **Students with Disabilities**
  - Increased %age of students achieving proficiency from 33% as 3<sup>rd</sup> graders in '09-'10 to 40% as 4<sup>th</sup> graders in '10-'11
  - Increased %age of students achieving proficiency from 0% as 4<sup>th</sup> graders in '09-'10 to 33% as 5<sup>th</sup> graders in '10-'11

**II. Individual Building Update**

**A. 2010-2011 Main Areas of Focus and Strategies Implemented**

▪ **Grade 3 Progress**

- 2009-2010 progress was recognized
- 2009-2010 data was analyzed, in light of new cut-points and new goals: 59% of incoming Gr. 3 students performed at proficiency on Grade 2 ELP. 88% correct answers needed for ELA proficiency; 97% correct answers needed for ELA Level 4
- New goals were set accordingly
- Student interventions and progress were monitored
- Parent meeting was held to inform and involve them in the process

▪ **Students with Disabilities**

- Reviewed individual student goals to make sure they were realistic and as challenging as possible
- Worked to identify and maximize individual students' strengths

- Implemented well-planned differentiation of instruction through targeted small groups
- Utilized mainstreaming as much as possible
- Actively fostered parent involvement
- **Incoming Grade 5**
  - Maximized expectations
  - Monitored individual student interventions and progress
  - Parent meeting was held to inform and involve them in the process
- **Instructional Collaboration**
  - Clear common goals were communicated to staff
  - Weekly professional periods were used for meetings to discuss data, instructional delivery, and individual student progress
  - Common prep times were also used for the above purposes
  - Daily literacy block time was used for push-ins to support targeted small-group literacy instruction
  - Professional articles were shared and discussed
  - Faculty meetings had an instructional component
  - Directors and coordinators provided support, as needed
- **Additional Strategies Implemented in 2010-2011**
  - **Practice testing** was utilized to build student stamina for longer assessments
  - **Testing as a genre** was implemented as an instructional practice to train students on test-taking strategies and familiarize them with test language and format
  - **Gradual Release of Responsibility** was emphasized to ensure that students would be able to achieve success on the assessments *independently*, without relying on teacher prompting
  - **AIMSweb** benchmarking and progress monitoring were utilized as one source of data to determine interventions
  - **Extra Help** sessions were targeted to students' needs, as much as possible
  - **Additional research-based programs** were utilized with certain children, i.e., LLI, IXL Math for additional targeted support
  - **Grades 3, 4, and 5 NY State Assessment Parent Workshop** was held on 1/13/11 to allow parents to learn about the assessments, understand expectations for their children, and discover ways to support their child's success at home
- **Results**
  - On ELA 3 and 4, the percentage of "all students" and "students with disabilities" achieving proficiency increased from the '09-'10 levels
  - On Math 4, the percentage of "all students" achieving proficiency increased from 58% in '09-'10 to 88% in '10-'11
  - The percentage of "students with disabilities" achieving proficiency increased from 0% to 40% on Math 4 and 0% to 33% on Math 5 in '10-'11
  - On ELA 5, the percentage of "all students" achieving proficiency dropped from 59% in '09-'10 to 56%
  - On Math 5, the percentage of "all students" achieving proficiency dropped from 80% in '09-'10 to 66%

## **B. Main Areas of Focus (Goals) for 2011-2012**

Goal #1: *(Supports District Goal #2 and BOE Goal #1)*

Provide a comprehensive instructional program that will result in:

- Incremental gains in Gr. 3-5 ELA and Math Assessment scores for all students
- Longitudinal improvement by grade level "cohort" groups.



Goal #2: *(Supports Superintendent's Goal #1a)*

Develop mastery of the APPR requirements and maximize teacher effectiveness via more comprehensive teacher supervision and targeted professional development.

Goal #3: *(Supports District Goal #3 and BOE Goal #3(a)(ii))*

Continue to promote parent involvement by providing parents with information about instruction, expectations, student outcomes, and the importance of the home/school connection.

Goal #4: *(Supports BOE Goal #4)*

In light of present and future financial difficulties, develop creative and effective ways to utilize resources to provide quality instruction.

Goal #5: *(Supports District Goal #6)*

Continue personal professional growth in order to provide the most effective leadership.

**Planned Strategies to achieve goals:**

- Reassign K-5 teachers to maximize instructional strength at each grade level
- Begin to incorporate aspects of the CCLS in daily instruction, i.e., text-based writing, close reading of rich texts, teaching of academic vocabulary
- Increase students' experience with informational texts and primary sources, at all grade levels
- Continue to employ pull-out and push-in models to help classroom teachers differentiate instruction in targeted small groups
- Continue to rely heavily on data from a variety of sources to drive all instructional decisions
- Use ongoing progress monitoring to gauge effectiveness of instruction and interventions
- Continue to utilize teachers' professional periods for data review/progress meetings
- Continue to include an instructional component at Faculty and PTA meetings
- Continue to utilize teachers' common prep times for instructional collaboration
- Continue to target AIS and Extra Help groups, based upon specific student needs
- Continue to teach testing as a genre, via the administration of ELA and math practice assessments and "testlets," and through the use of test practice books and online resources
- Maintain and support the highest possible expectations for students with disabilities
- Identify and maximize the strengths of students with disabilities
- Utilize daily literacy block time for intensive literacy instruction K-5
- Implement Wilson FUNdations program in Kindergarten and Grade 1
- Implement additional support programs, such as LLI, LiPS, Fastt Math, etc. to address students' individual needs
- Support high-achieving students to increase percentage of students at level 4
- Increase accountability at all levels
- Actively promote teachers' participation in the Reflective Pathway Listserv/Collegial Circle
- Actively promote teachers' involvement in district APPR decisions
- Work closely with tech advisor to maintain clear, timely flow of information to community via website
- Continue to employ a collaborative leadership model

**III. Challenges/Recommendations:**

- Ongoing professional development for principals and teachers to develop mastery of the CCLS
- Ongoing professional development for principals to develop mastery of APPR requirements and
- Implementation of new teacher supervision model to foster highly effective instruction

- Continuing challenges experienced by Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners
- The need for adequate staffing to provide additional support to “on the cusp” students who would benefit from instructional support services, despite scoring a level 3 on the ELA or Math assessment
- The need for adequate staffing to better support the movement of students from Level 3 to Level 4
- The need for adequate staffing to implement the district RtI plan, particularly Tier III interventions
- The need for adequate staffing to fully support research-based programs such as Foundations
- Identifying and purchasing textbooks and other instructional materials that are aligned to the CCLS
- Alignment of the elementary report card with the CCLS

# Tooker Avenue School's Board of Education Report

October 2011

Charles Germano, Principal

## I. DATA SUMMARY

### A. Comparison of Tooker's 2010 to 2011 ELA & Math State Assessment Data

- 54% in grade three to 69% in grade four - scoring a level 3/4 on the ELA
- 82% in grade four to 73% in grade five - scoring a level 3/4 on the ELA
- 54% in grade three to 74% in grade four - scoring a level 3/4 on the Math
- 75% in grade four to 82% in grade five - scoring a level 3/4 on the Math
- Percentage of students scoring a level 4 on Gr. 3-5 ELA dropped from 5% in 2010 to 0% in 2011
- Percentage of students scoring a level 4 on Gr. 3-5 Math stayed even from 16% in 2010 to 16% in 2011

### B. Comparison of Tooker's 2011 ELA & Math Results to the District and County

- Based on the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or 4:
- ELA Grade 3 – Below the district and county average
- ELA Grade 4 – Above the district and county average
- ELA Grade 5 – Above the district and county average
- Math Grade 3 – Below the district and county average
- Math Grade 4 – Below the district and above the county average
- Math Grade 5 – Above the district and county average

## II. INDIVIDUAL BUILDING PLAN AND UPDATE

### A. Focus Areas for 2010-2011

- In-depth analysis of 2009-2010 state assessment data
- 2010-2011 New Cut Points
- Accountability cells such as special education, Hispanic, and ELL
- Staff development

### Strategies Implemented 2010-2011

- Designed activities to build the stamina necessary for longer state assessments
- Taught test taking strategies as part of the regular curriculum
- Used Data Mentor at the classroom level to determine specific areas of focus/weakness
- Initiating collaboration between intervention, special education & classroom teachers to address specific student needs
- Implemented progress monitoring to specific students to increase their fluency & math skills
- Integrated technology such as Smart boards to model and address state test questions
- Utilized extra help sessions to target specific students with common remediation
- Conducted grade level meetings to discuss assessment data and item analysis results
- Used AIMSWeb benchmark data to formulate intervention programs for identified students
- Used literacy blocks to focus on ELA reading & writing strategies

- Implemented Foundations at the kindergarten level with double dose sessions for remedial students
- Implemented Foundations as the initial remedial instruction for first and second graders
- Administered longer, more rigorous practice state assessments to identify struggling students

### **Focus Areas for 2011-2012**

- Increase the percentage of students scoring a level 3 and 4 in all grades on the ELA & Math assessments
- Increase the percentage of students scoring a level 4 in all grades on the ELA & Math Assessment
- Specific focus on the following areas: Current 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Students, Special Education Accountability Cell, ELL Accountability Cell, and Specific Struggling Students Identified by Teachers

### **Strategies Planned**

- Use the 2011 ELA trend charts for grades 3-5 to analyze the types of indicators/skills being addressed on the test and prepare higher level thinking questions in our instruction to prepare students for these types of literacy tasks
- Continue to use BARS to gather information on individual students, grade levels, and specific classrooms to assist the instructional staff in planning lessons and reflection
- Continue to prepare students by developing their stamina and engaging them in activities focusing on higher order thinking skills
- Continue to expose students to a variety of texts and genres to prepare them for the ELA assessment
- Use NYS approved sample questions on the new assessment format to appropriately prepare the students
- Follow the September-April/May-June NYS Program Guidance to teach all performance indicators during the period specified.
- Utilize the September Math test results to inform classroom instruction
- Regularly use the Apperson test scoring machines as tools during weekly classroom tests
- Utilize the NYS Coach book, NYS Ready book, and other test-prep related materials in grades 3-5 to help the students master the necessary mathematics and ELA assessment concepts
- Meet with grade 3-5 teachers twice a month during professional periods to focus on the common core learning standards, past assessment item analysis, and test-prep strategies
- Administer multiple practice assessments and mini tests in ELA and Math to the students in grades 3-5
- Utilize Fast Math and Touch Math programs with remedial math students
- Initiate literacy blocks in all classes for a minimum of 60 minutes per day
- Utilize SMART Boards in all grade level classrooms and support services
- Provide focused reading instruction to special education students
- Continue to differentiate instruction in all classes
- Utilize the Foundations program in all kindergarten and first grade classes
- Utilize the Foundations Double Dose remedial program to eligible kindergarten and first grade students
- Provide extra help sessions to students focused on specific areas of weakness

## **Goals**

- Improvement in all assessment results
- Exceed District, Town of Babylon, and Suffolk County averages for percentage of level 3's and 4's
- Meet AYP in all accountability groups
- Meet AYP in all district-wide 3-8 accountability groups

## **III. Challenges**

- Increased grade level class sizes
  - Example: 2010-2011 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade achieved a 54% Level 3&4 for both ELA and Math, and the students were in three small classes. These students are now in two classes of 28 in 4<sup>th</sup> grade for this school year
- 3<sup>rd</sup> grade integrated class is new at Tooker
- Increased support services class sizes
- Growing ELL population – 36 total students for 2011-2012 (21 requiring double sessions per day)
- Decreased whole-group instructional time for classroom teachers due to the schedules of intervention service providers working in multiple buildings
- Implementing the Common Core Standards with the necessary professional development
- Providing fidelity of instruction for the Foundations program in K-1 with the appropriate class sizes
- Meeting the demands of APPR
- Meeting AYP for all building and district accountability cells
- Providing Tier II and Tier III interventions as part of our RTI plan and utilizing corresponding research-based programs that have already been purchased
- Administering the new assessments based on the CCS in 2012-2013
- Purchasing materials that support the CCS

### ***III. Concerns/Recommendations Common to West Babylon Elementary Schools***

- Ongoing professional development needed for principals and teachers to develop a clear understanding and eventual mastery of the Common Core State Standards
- Ongoing professional development needed for principals to develop mastery of APPR requirements and strategies to maximize teacher supervision and foster effective instruction
- Adequate staffing is needed to provide additional support to “borderline” students who are not solidly at the proficiency level, despite scoring a level 3 on the ELA and/or Math assessments
- Identify and purchase textbooks and other instructional materials that are aligned to the Common Core State Standards
- Provide fidelity for the Foundations program in grades K – 2 especially in meeting the prescribed class sizes and sessions per week for the Double Dose program
- Adequate staffing to provide Tier II and Tier III interventions as part of our RtI plan
- Meet the needs of all students while class sizes are increasing
- Decreased whole-group instructional time for classroom teachers due to the schedules of intervention service providers now working in multiple buildings