

***U.S. Department of Education  
2010 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program***

---

Type of School: (Check all that apply)     Charter  Title I  Magnet  Choice

Name of Principal: Mr. Louis Cuglietto

Official School Name: John F. Kennedy Magnet School

School Mailing Address:  
40 Olivia Street  
Port Chester, NY 10573-2808

County: Westchester    State School Code Number\*: 661904030003

Telephone: (914) 934-7990    Fax: (914) 939-6625

Web site/URL: http://jfk.portchesterschools.org/home.aspx    E-mail: lcuglietto@portchesterschools.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

Date\_\_  
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent\*: Dr. Donald Carlisle

District Name: Port Chester Rye UFSD    Tel: (914) 934-7901

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

Date\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Anne Capeci

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

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

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

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173

## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

---

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress 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, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2009-2010 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals 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 and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 or 2009.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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** (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district: (per district designation)
- |          |                                   |
|----------|-----------------------------------|
| 4        | Elementary schools (includes K-8) |
| 1        | Middle/Junior high schools        |
| 1        | High schools                      |
| 0        | K-12 schools                      |
| <b>6</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>                      |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 17829

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

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- Urban or large central city  
 Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area  
 Suburban  
 Small city or town in a rural area  
 Rural

4. 10 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
K	77	65	142	7	0	0	0
1	73	71	144	8	0	0	0
2	65	69	134	9	0	0	0
3	46	52	98	10	0	0	0
4	47	45	92	11	0	0	0
5	54	61	115	12	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL</b>							725

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
1 % Asian  
9 % Black or African American  
86 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
3 % White  
1 % Two or more races  
100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting 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.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 10 %

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	30
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	36
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	66
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	678
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.097
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	9.735

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 48 %

Total number limited English proficient 347

Number of languages represented: 2

Specify languages:

Spanish and Chinese (there is one child who arrived this year from China).

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 78 %

Total number students who qualify: 563

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 8 %

Total Number of Students Served: 60

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u>0</u> Autism	<u>1</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>4</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>21</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>3</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>31</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>0</u> Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>32</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>14</u>	<u>8</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Support staff	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>
Total number	<u>60</u>	<u>9</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 23 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	95%	95%	90%
Daily teacher attendance	94%	93%	95%	95%	96%
Teacher turnover rate	12%	10%	3%	8%	0%
Student dropout rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Please provide all explanations below.

Teacher turnover rates were due to maternity, illness, and long term Workers' Compensation.

The 90% daily student attendance in 2004-2005 cannot be explained except the data was taken from an outdated student information system. There was no explanation nor inquiry made by either our district or the NYS Education Department. This led us to believe there might have been an error in the NYS reporting.

For Daily teacher attendance rate, we have simply counted the total number of absences for the year for all teachers and teaching assistants (personal illness, maternity, essential business, and Workman's Comp) and divided it by the product of the number of teachers multiplied X 187 school days (contractual). This is not a published statistic of our district. We have a young staff and maternity leaves have been common the past two years.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2009 are doing as of the Fall 2009.

Graduating class size	0	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0	%
Enrolled in a community college	0	%
Enrolled in vocational training	0	%
Found employment	0	%
Military service	0	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0	%
Unknown	0	%
<b>Total</b>	0	%

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

At John F. Kennedy Magnet School (JFK), we believe an excellent, comprehensive education – not demographics – will shape the destiny of our students and their families. JFK has a poverty rate of 78%. Nearly 50% of our students are English Language Learners (ELL). Our district has the highest percent of Hispanic students in any Westchester school district, with 85% of our students coming from Spanish speaking homes. We are a Title I funded program, among the highest need schools in New York State (NYS).

While the professionalism, commitment, and dedication of our staff have been influential in permitting JFK to outperform similar and more affluent schools, it is our extended community of parents, teachers, professional staff, and students who have helped us achieve our high standards. But this is only part of our story. Our belief system and expectations create a willingness to do whatever it takes to support success for every student. JFK embraces the collective voice, hopes, and dreams of this community, and we accept the attendant challenges and responsibilities as a way of life. In so doing, we have become a family, a team of leaders. We consider ourselves rich: our students and families are the human capital of our success. Our high achieving school is a valuable partner in providing our community with a quality of life commensurate with the affluent districts that surround us.

JFK is a full service community school, where the physical, intellectual, and emotional safety of our students is of critical importance. At every turn, the needs of our children are being met. We offer academic extended day and summer programs for our students and families. On-site primary medical and mental health services reinforce our vision of a comprehensive web of support. Over 70% of Kennedy School children had *no* health insurance before our Open Door School-Based Health Center was in place; today 100% of our students have medical coverage. Our parent outreach program features workshops and English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. Our Pace University partnership has brought higher education into our classrooms, fostering a commitment to pre-service teacher preparation and professional development.

JFK established a comprehensive Bilingual Program, based on our belief in the natural resources of our students and families. We empower parents to believe they are their children's first teacher, that their home language is essential to their child's success. We have allocated district resources to create equity and excellence for English, ESL, and Bilingual instruction. We systematically began hiring teachers and staff highly proficient in English and Spanish to completely remove language barriers, dispelling any notion that children struggling with English acquisition are not capable of achieving at the highest levels.

Using data to improve instruction has changed the mindset of our faculty. Our teachers rely on a variety of data streams that support decision making related to student growth and gain. Data warehousing has improved our knowledge and understanding of assessment and differentiation. Data has allowed us to become more reflective and responsive, which has influenced our teaching and our Instructional Support Team (IST) process, a primary engine of intervention services.

JFK is a Math, Science, and Technology (MST) theme-based magnet school unique in our village and county. The sciences permeate each core curricular area, supporting inquiry, constructivism, and imagination. We believe seamless use of instructional technology will enable our students to enter a world that requires digital literacy, experience, and imagination. Partnerships with IBM, Columbia University's Hispanic Engineering Program, Verizon, and The Jacob Burns Film Center allow us to offer real world applications to our students and teachers.

In the words of President Barack Obama, "the best anti-poverty program is a world-class education." This belief fuels our collective journey every day.

## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### 1. Assessment Results:

JFK's Fifth Grade English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics test data illustrate growth and consistency during the past four years, a trend that has taken us from a faculty searching for best practice to a program that outperforms many of our wealthier neighbors. Our testing data in mathematics has been consistent with or above most schools in our county, region, and state.

NYS ELA and mathematics assessments are administered to students in grades 3, 4, and 5 each year to assess proficiency and performance, based on the NYS Learning Standards. Results are categorized by Levels: 1 and 2 indicate levels of academic intervention services (AIS) are required; Level 3 indicates proficiency; Level 4 indicates advanced status, where state standards have been exceeded. Approximately 50% of JFK's students are ELL's. Since 2006-2007, ELL's who have been in U.S. schools for more than one year sit for all NYS ELA assessments.

JFK's 2008-2009 test results indicate that 96% of our fifth graders either met or exceeded state standards on the ELA assessment, and 99% met or exceeded state standards in mathematics. In grade 5, the percentage of our students achieving level 4 in mathematics has grown from 20% to 37% over the past four years. Of 292 JFK students tested in grades 3 through 5 in 2008-2009, 90% met or exceeded state standards on the NYS ELA assessments. Of 295 students tested on the NYS mathematics assessments in 2008-2009, 99% met or exceeded state standards, with 34% achieving Level 4.

In 2008-2009, our Fifth Grade ELA test scores for both major subgroups (Economically Disadvantaged and Hispanic students) were at 96% in meeting or exceeding state standards. For mathematics, these same subgroups achieved 99% and 100%, respectively.

Fourth Grade testing results in both ELA and mathematics have shown remarkable consistency and excellence, despite a 128% increase in total tested in ELA from 2004-2005 to 2008-2009 because of the change in regulations mentioned above.

In 2008-2009, our Third Grade test results in ELA and mathematics show growth patterns similar to our fifth graders for both major subgroups (Economically Disadvantaged and Hispanic students), performing at 97% meeting or exceeding state standards in mathematics and 91% and 90% (respectively) meeting or exceeding state standards in ELA.

A review of ELA mean scaled scores from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009 shows an increase in each testing grade. JFK's mean scaled scores in mathematics for grades 3 and 5 show a similar increase.

Regardless of poverty level, immigrant status, or disability, our disaggregated data illustrates that the overwhelming majority of JFK students are achieving and have made steady progress over the last four years, especially in the area of ELA. Despite our successes, we recognize that we have room for growth and are continuing to find ways to raise the percentage of students achieving level 4 in ELA.

We judge our school program on three factors: school environment, student performance, and student progress, and we will continue to monitor the rise in student scale scores and all measurable objectives from year to year.

In NYS, new assessments for elementary level ELA and mathematics were administered in January, 2006. Results from assessments administered in 2004-2005 in grade 4 cannot be directly compared to results

from 2005-2006. NYS did not administer statewide assessments to grades 3 and 5 in ELA or mathematics in 2004-2005.

New York State assessment data can be accessed through [www.nysed.gov](http://www.nysed.gov) (linking to NYS Report Cards) or through [www.nySTART.gov](http://www.nySTART.gov). Due to rounding off, there can be a discrepancy of one (1) percentage point between these two sources. We have used both to cross-check our data.

## 2. Using Assessment Results:

We continually scrutinize a comprehensive database of student information that informs our decisions about instruction, differentiation, and intervention. Multiple data sources are required at Data Team and IST meetings.

*The Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)* is our K-2 universal screening tool, providing us with data on phonemic awareness, phonics, and oral reading fluency. Children who are considered “at risk” are monitored weekly.

Literacy Profiles are developed for all K-1 students in January, providing diagnostic information on subskills that predict later reading and writing success.

We administer DRA-2 assessments in kindergarten twice per year, three times per year in grades 1 and 2, and three times per year in grades 3-5 if students have not met district Language Arts benchmarks or achieved proficiency on NYS ELA assessments the previous year. The DRA-2 provides diagnostic information on text fluency and comprehension. Midyear DRA’s for grades 2-5 provide us with information for targeted interventions and extended day tutoring.

At JFK, we support four instructional software packages, each supplying assessment data for teachers and parents. K-1 classrooms use *Breakthrough to Literacy* to support early language acquisition. *Imagine Learning English* is used for ELL’s in grades 2-4. Students in grades 3-5 are assessed through *Scholastic Reading Inventory* three times per year. We chart lexiles for growth and independent reading levels. Students in grades 2-4 use Pearson’s *SuccessMaker*, which supports language arts and mathematics instruction, and serves as an extended day, Tier II intervention for grades 3 and 4. Progress reports are used strategically to improve decision making and targeted instruction.

Data warehousing allows us to utilize NYS assessment results to improve our understanding of longitudinal patterns, trends, and gaps in our instruction. “Mining” student data provides us with essential information related to students’ areas of difficulty. Before each NYS testing cycle, we use Data Mentor to create digital folders of prior test questions, by standard and subskill, for teachers and students.

## 3. Communicating Assessment Results:

We communicate assessment results to our parents and community through regularly scheduled parent-teacher conferences, our NYS Report Card, PTA meetings, and our school’s web site. Student report cards are distributed three times per year. Upon receipt of the official NYS student assessment scores for parents, we send them home. We encourage parents to discuss their child’s assessment results and general progress with our professional staff at parent information meetings designed to support better understanding of literacy practices and the NYS Testing Program.

As mentioned in section 2, we support four instructional software packages, each with a sophisticated data tracking system that creates a picture of student achievement levels, by skill, for teachers and parents. Using multiple data sources creates clarity and allows us to communicate efficiently with colleagues and parents.

Scheduled and non-scheduled parent meetings are held when necessary as parent communication has been a key building block of our school’s improvement. We share assessment results with professional colleagues through grade level and administrative team meetings. Once per year, JFK sponsors a televised Board of Education meeting, where our assessment results are highlighted and discussed publicly. In this detailed communication with the public, we highlight and evaluate JFK’s success rates, explain the meaning

of our longitudinal data patterns, examine whether we have met our instructional objectives, and state our goals for the future.

Port Chester publishes a district newsletter, *Spotlight*, which features all pertinent assessment results for our parents and taxpayers. Our Principal has been featured on *The Superintendent's Corner*, a weekly television program designed to communicate school performance to our parents and community.

#### 4. **Sharing Success:**

The keys to JFK's growth and success have been teamwork, the passionate dedication and teaching skills of our faculty, and leadership. Meticulous hiring practices, professional development, attention to data, partnerships, and our PTA have enabled our development from a struggling school to a Blue Ribbon nominee. We have been true partners with our Board of Education and central office. When sharing our trials and successes, we are clear on these points.

JFK received the "2003 Pathfinder Award" from the NYS Business Council. Our Principal was the guest speaker at IBM's "Collaboration that Matters" Breakfast at their corporate headquarters in 2006. He has shared JFK's successes at various conferences, primarily in the area of "using data to improve instruction," such as *Technology & Learning's* Tech Forum in 2006, BOCES' Tech Expo in 2007, and eScholar's Data Warehousing Forum in 2007. On March 5, 2010, JFK will present at WNET's "Celebration for Teaching and Learning" conference, perhaps the largest educational venue to showcase and share best practice in the New York metropolitan area.

Members of our faculty co-authored an article highlighting our IST process, published in the March 2007 edition of *Educational Leadership*. Our Principal is an executive board member of the Empire State Supervisors and Administrators Association, which highlights the achievements of all member districts and schools.

Our Principal recently discussed our Blue Ribbon nomination as the guest of Senator Suzi Oppenheimer on her weekly television program *Report from the Senate*.

Each venue and opportunity has allowed us to thank our partners and discuss the delicate balance that links challenge with commitment and community. In turn, each relationship enhances our ability to serve our students, providing JFK and its partners with avenues to share our mutual successes.

If we are worthy and selected as a Blue Ribbon school, we will do our very best to share and support the growth of other schools because, indeed, we represent schools everywhere that are confronted with overwhelming challenges.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

### 1. Curriculum:

We believe there are two distinct but crucially important curricular areas: the implicit curriculum for physical, social, and emotional development and the explicit curriculum for intellectual development and support.

Our day begins with Morning Meeting in every classroom, an essential aspect of our Responsive Classroom (RC) approach. Students gather to greet each other, share news, interact cooperatively, and prepare for the day ahead. We are committed to the notion that the social curriculum is as important as the academic curriculum, and that the greatest cognitive growth occurs through social interaction. Supported by a comprehensive training program, we have systematically worked toward full implementation.

We use the workshop model to teach reading and writing. This approach allows for brief and explicit teacher directed instruction, an extended period of independent reading and writing, and a wrap-up that summarizes and reflects on the day's lesson. Literacy interventionists push in to support readers and writers workshop, which allows us to differentiate instruction through small group work and student conferences. We have developed a yearlong language arts curriculum, which organizes our instruction around units of study on process, strategies, genre, and conventions. Our balanced literacy approach allows teachers to share common practices, language, and objectives. Our goal is student independence and a lifelong passion for reading and writing.

Our web-based Social Studies curriculum integrates language arts and technology, promoting higher order thinking skills, cooperative learning, access to primary source documents, and real-time data. Smartboard lessons, as well as the infinite possibilities of online publishing and United Streaming, create interactive and engaging opportunities for learning. We supplement our curriculum with authentic literature and non-fiction trade books, newspaper and magazine publications, virtual field trips through videoconferencing and Skype, and guest speakers and assemblies.

Our library program strives to foster a love of books and reading. Students learn how to navigate the library's electronic catalog and browse the shelves to find books that suit their interests, independent levels, and research needs. Our librarians are familiar with the best in children's literature and work cooperatively with teachers to supply curriculum materials and support. Through book talks, introductions to authors and various genres, and introductory lessons in research skills, our librarians integrate social studies and science into learning activities that develop effective strategies to analyze and evaluate information.

Port Chester's Council for the Arts provides a unique "Artists in Residence" program for JFK. Our students work with professionals in the areas of theater, clay arts, storytelling, dance, music, and visual arts. These modules are directly tied to literacy development and aligned with New York State Standards. JFK is a founding member of the nationwide movement, "National Arts in the School Day."

Our music program provides our students with various performance opportunities throughout the year. Our music curriculum encourages literacy and acceptance of different genres, such as West African and Afro-Cuban drumming. There are six formal performances per year, including our village-wide Band Night, which showcases our band, dance team, and cheerleaders.

JFK's physical education program partners with our Open Door School-Based Health Center to provide each student with a positive, safe environment where children build character, learn social and team building skills, and monitor their own wellness. Through integrated, sequential, and developmentally appropriate modules, we create an environment that promotes physical and nutritional health, inspiring students to be active for life. Using Project Adventure and RC techniques, we continually reinforce the team concept and community ideals. Students participate through the "Challenge by Choice" concept that allows them to take risks, have fun, and push themselves to the limit, while feeling safe and accepted.

Our IST is a hub of decision making and a moral compass to ensure no child is left behind. The IST process allows us to monitor every child who is experiencing any type of academic, behavioral, social, or emotional difficulty, giving us a structure to support and track student growth. Weekly meetings include

teachers, administrators, interventionists, psychologists, a nurse practitioner, and a clinical social worker. This process underpins our AIS program and enables us to meet Response to Intervention (RTI) mandates.

**2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:**

(This question is for elementary schools only)

In grades K-5, JFK uses a balanced literacy approach to teach reading. Our model is student centered and affords all children the opportunity to become strong, independent readers.

Each grade level allocates 120 minutes per day for literacy development, which includes reading, writing, and phonics/spelling instruction. We use daily read-alouds and shared reading to develop vocabulary and to model problem-solving and thinking strategies. *Wilson Foundations* is used in grades K-2 to provide explicit and systematic phonics and spelling instruction. We also use songs, nursery rhymes, chants, and other poems to strengthen students' phonemic awareness and fluency skills. Through guided reading, we focus on building background knowledge and text comprehension. Daily independent practice allows students to apply all of the necessary skills and strategies to become proficient readers and writers.

Parallel instruction in English and Spanish by dually certified teachers allows us to deliver our literacy program with rigor, equity, and excellence across our ESL, bilingual, and monolingual English classrooms.

An array of reading assessments is administered throughout the year, which provides teachers with comprehensive diagnostic information about student strengths and deficiencies. This data is then used to create homogeneous and heterogeneous groups and partnerships that enable teachers to provide targeted instruction, intervention, and acceleration.

With the opening of our Early Learning Center (K-1 building) two years ago, we have moved from a paradigm of reaction and remediation to data driven early intervention and prevention of reading difficulties. We use before school and after school programming to extend our tiered intervention instructional model. This continuation of services allows us to make time the variable and learning to read the constant.

**3. Additional Curriculum Area:**

JFK's math and science achievement scores illustrate excellent instruction and the emphasis we place on our math, science, and technology programs.

Our Science Laboratory is one focal point of our school. Teachers use the FOSS (Full Option Science System) curriculum, which supports meaningful science instruction through hands-on scientific investigations. Students learn important scientific concepts, develop the ability to think critically, and construct ideas through inquiry, investigation, and analysis. JFK has attracted a joint venture with the Hilltop Hanover Farm/Environmental Center. We have an outdoor garden, an ideal interdisciplinary learning experience for nutrition and responsibility funded through The Junior League of Women and Port Chester's Tamarack Tower Education Foundation.

Mathematics is taught through the *Math Trailblazers* program, which integrates math, science, and language arts. Through experimentation, students internalize the material and have a deeper understanding of the content and its connections. Through the TIMS (Teaching Integrated Mathematics and Science) Laboratory Method, students use manipulatives, gather, organize, and graph data, and analyze results. With Smartboards and multi-sensory learning software, mathematics instruction is delivered in a highly engaging and interactive manner.

Our computer laboratory is another focal point of our school. Students learn to keyboard, research, and analyze a variety of sources to organize their ideas for presentations. We use instructional software to provide individualized, interactive experiences to improve core literacy skills. Students learn to use real-time data to solve contemporary problems.

We have Smartboards in grades 1-5, necessitating continual professional development in the area of Smart Notebook applications. Our partnership with Pace University and Verizon has allowed our teachers to receive ongoing training using the Verizon *Thinkfinity* website, a teacher-friendly, comprehensive, digital learning platform. Verizon has donated two rolling wireless Netbook labs, which allow us to maximize space while providing teachers with additional tools for innovative instruction.

#### 4. **Instructional Methods:**

We believe excellent instruction for every child is the most powerful form of emancipation from poverty.

JFK's balanced literacy approach in grades K-5 impels us to differentiate instruction on a daily basis, according to the strengths and weaknesses of our students. Through core instruction, we ensure that all students have access to and develop skills that promote the five essential components of reading: phonemic/phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. These areas are met through guided, small group and individualized instruction. When necessary, we employ an intervention model, using ongoing assessment to determine movement through tiers, informing our instruction.

In grades K-2, Tier II supplemental support is provided by aligning a special educator or literacy specialist with every classroom teacher during literacy blocks. These specialists provide small group instruction in the classroom to students not performing at district benchmark levels. This model is paralleled in the bilingual classrooms where native language arts support is provided by highly proficient Spanish speaking specialists.

Tier II services are also provided through a pull-out model in grades K-5. We utilize research based programs and methodologies such as *Foundations/Lectura*, *Preventing Academic Failure (PAF)*, guided reading, and strategy groups, both in English and Spanish. Students who continue to have difficulty responding to Tier II interventions are brought before our IST to determine if intensive Tier III level support is required. These students are seen in small groups, five days per week, by qualified specialists.

At Tier III, students are strategically grouped according to their needs in programs such as *Wilson*, *Reading Recovery*, *Lindamood-Bell (LIPS)*, and *Visualizing & Verbalizing (V&V)*. Our special educators also provide several models of support both inside and outside of the classroom to students with IEPs to meet their individualized goals.

#### 5. **Professional Development:**

During the last four years, JFK's faculty has experienced remarkable personal and professional growth. We have formed learning communities around three key areas: Literacy, Character Development, and Bilingual/ESL education. This collaborative approach has positively impacted student achievement. Our goal has been to train our teachers as experts in differentiating literacy instruction. They now feel confident in their ability to address the needs of every student. Our classroom teachers are divided into lesson study groups. With the support of a literacy consultant, teachers plan, deliver, and debrief with their group. This on-site, job-embedded training allows teachers to reflect on their practices, learn from one another, and sharpen their craft.

Our literacy specialists have been trained in multiple research based intervention programs, including *Wilson*, *LIPS*, *PAF*, *V&V*, and *Reading Recovery*. With this level of expertise, our faculty has embraced reading achievement as the norm.

Character education permeates every decision we make. Our journey began with one teacher who believed deeply in RC and passionately advocated this approach for our building. Five years later, we have secured a \$10,000 legislative grant and obtained extensive funding to train our entire staff in implementing RC. The core values of CARES (Cooperation, Assertiveness, Responsibility, Empathy, and Self-Control) embrace our entire community, from the classroom to our playground. Every staff member, student, and parent knows they belong at JFK.

After forming our Bilingual Team, we defined our mission and vision. We immersed ourselves in literature and research articles, conducted site visits, and brought in experts to inform our decisions on instructional practices and programs supporting our ELL's. We built a comprehensive Bilingual/ESL program and, within three years, began to see children achieving grade level literacy benchmarks in two languages. Our Bilingual Team includes 23 members who meet monthly. Together, we have built a belief system based on the notion that diversity is one of our greatest strengths.

## 6. **School Leadership:**

The evolution of JFK began with the hiring of our Principal ten years ago. His vision from the onset was a distributed leadership model, which allowed teams of teachers to support the mutually agreed upon goals and objectives of our learning community. We established the ethic, the “rules of our house,” that through teamwork, meticulous hiring, professional development, and excellent instruction we *will be* miracle workers. A certified secondary math teacher, he is a leader by example, happily providing instruction to children in grades 2-5 at every opportunity.

Grade level teams foster decision making in the areas of core instruction and character development. Our Literacy Team, comprised of Reading, Special Education, Speech and Language teachers, and School Psychologists, is an advisory arm of Literacy instruction, testing, AIS, and our IST process. Our Bilingual Team oversees our Bilingual/ESL program and the administration of the NYS English as a Second Language Testing (NYSESLAT) program. JFK’s Magnet Team oversees all topics and programs associated with science and technology, such as our MST Olympiad, which is unique to Westchester County, and multiple IBM initiatives, such as Family Science, our IBM Mentoring Program, and National Engineers Week. Our character education (RC) committee provides teachers the forum to discuss the state of our community and ways to maintain and improve common language, practice, and teamwork across three buildings. Our Wellness team supports all aspects of our student safety, health, and nutrition programs. JFK’s PTA completes our school program through their support of activities and fundraisers throughout the year. They have donated approximately \$10,000 to our libraries in support of student literacy and are exemplary in their financial support of various assemblies, author visitations, child-centered events, and memorable educational programs for our students and parents.

Our Principal, Assistant Principal, Community Schools Liaison, and District Curriculum Coordinator are partners, serving and supporting building initiatives on a daily basis. Our Secretaries and Head Custodian are beloved for their dedication and quiet leadership of our daily operations. Aside from our Literacy Team, each committee mentioned is voluntary. This spirit of commitment and volunteerism promotes total inclusion, giving us the leadership, common voice, and organizational structure to address any challenge.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: New York State Math

Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009

Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	97	99	90	
% Advanced	31	17	46	29	
Number of students tested	87	115	95	73	
Percent of total students tested	100	97	98	100	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	97	99	91	
% Advanced	30	16	43	25	
Number of students tested	60	79	70	53	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		100		82	
% Advanced		9		9	
Number of students tested	7	11	5	11	
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	96	99	92	
% Advanced	30	19	44	30	
Number of students tested	77	91	78	60	
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		82			
% Advanced		9			
Number of students tested	8	11	9	7	
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	97	96	98	88	
% Advanced	23	13	40	19	
Number of students tested	39	52	42	26	
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
White		100	100		
White		15	60		
Number of students tested	3	13	10	2	

Notes:

NYS did not administer statewide assessments to grades 3 and 5 in ELA or mathematics in 2004-2005.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009

Grade: 3 Test: New York State ELA  
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	73	89	72	
% Advanced	23	6	10	9	
Number of students tested	90	112	91	54	
Percent of total students tested	100	96	99	95	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	68	88	69	
% Advanced	30	4	12	8	
Number of students tested	64	77	67	36	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91			
% Advanced		18			
Number of students tested	7	11	6	9	
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	69	88	77	
% Advanced	24	5	7	9	
Number of students tested	79	87	72	43	
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91	82		
% Advanced		0	0		
Number of students tested	8	11	11	7	
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	54	81		
% Advanced	18	0	6		
Number of students tested	39	48	36	8	
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
White		86	100		
White		7	27		
Number of students tested	4	14	11	2	

Notes:

NYS did not administer statewide assessments to grades 3 and 5 in ELA or mathematics in 2004-2005.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Grade: 3 Test: New York State ELA  
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	73	89	72	
% Advanced	23	6	10	9	
Number of students tested	90	112	91	54	
Percent of total students tested	100	96	99	95	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	68	88	69	
% Advanced	30	4	12	8	
Number of students tested	64	77	67	36	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91			
% Advanced		18			
Number of students tested	7	11	6	9	
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	69	88	77	
% Advanced	24	5	7	9	
Number of students tested	79	87	72	43	
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91	82		
% Advanced		0	0		
Number of students tested	8	11	11	7	
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	54	81		
% Advanced	18	0	6		
Number of students tested	39	48	36	8	
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2009

Grade: 3 Test: New York State ELA  
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	89	73	89	72	
% Advanced	23	6	10	9	
Number of students tested	90	112	91	54	
Percent of total students tested	100	96	99	95	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	91	68	88	69	
% Advanced	30	4	12	8	
Number of students tested	64	77	67	36	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91			
% Advanced		18			
Number of students tested	7	11	6	9	
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	90	69	88	77	
% Advanced	24	5	7	9	
Number of students tested	79	87	72	43	
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced		91	82		
% Advanced		0	0		
Number of students tested	8	11	11	7	
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	87	54	81		
% Advanced	18	0	6		
Number of students tested	39	48	36	8	
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

Notes:

Subject: Mathematics  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 4 Test: New York State Mathematics  
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	May
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	100	99	96	97
% Advanced	33	39	28	31	49
Number of students tested	115	85	74	101	70
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	99	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	100	100	95	98
% Advanced	30	39	30	33	58
Number of students tested	83	57	54	80	43
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100			86	
% Advanced	23			21	
Number of students tested	13	5	9	14	8
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	100	98	97	96
% Advanced	33	36	29	34	49
Number of students tested	90	69	63	79	57
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	92	100		90	
% Advanced	17	33		60	
Number of students tested	12	12	5	10	9
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	98	100	95	98	96
% Advanced	40	42	10	31	39
Number of students tested	43	26	21	42	28
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
White	100				
White	36				
Number of students tested	11	9	2	6	5

Notes:

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2004-2009

Grade: 4 Test: New York State ELA  
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	86	85	61	75	82
% Advanced	2	1	6	8	2
Number of students tested	114	85	70	65	50
Percent of total students tested	100	98	99	95	95
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	84	83	59	71	83
% Advanced	0	0	4	9	0
Number of students tested	82	58	51	56	29
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100			36	
% Advanced	0			0	
Number of students tested	13	5	9	14	8
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	83	83	61	84	86
% Advanced	1	0	7	9	0
Number of students tested	90	69	59	45	36
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	50	71			
% Advanced	0	0			
Number of students tested	12	14	5	9	8
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	73	63	21		
% Advanced	0	0	0		
Number of students tested	41	27	19	5	2
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
White	91				
White	9				
Number of students tested	11	9	2	4	6

Notes:

In New York State, new assessments for elementary and middle level ELA and Math were administered in 2006. Results from these assessments cannot be directly compared to results to the 2004-2005 NYS ELA and Math assessments.

Subject: Mathematics  
Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009

Grade: 5 Test: New York State Mathematics  
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	May	May	May	May	
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	97	88	85	
% Advanced	37	28	19	19	
Number of students tested	93	75	99	73	
Percent of total students tested	100	98	100	99	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	99	96	89	80	
% Advanced	33	25	21	18	
Number of students tested	73	53	70	56	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			77		
% Advanced			8		
Number of students tested	7	7	13	6	
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	91	85	
% Advanced	37	29	22	18	
Number of students tested	75	66	77	60	
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	93		79		
% Advanced	20		7		
Number of students tested	15	7	14	7	
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	100	93	90	
% Advanced	28	15	7	24	
Number of students tested	25	13	14	21	
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
White					
White					
Number of students tested	9	2	7	6	

Notes:

NYS did not administer statewide assessments to grades 3 and 5 in ELA or mathematics in 2004-2005.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009

Grade: 5 Test: New York State ELA  
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	83	83	75	
% Advanced	8	1	4	5	
Number of students tested	92	75	93	56	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	95	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	79	93	74	
% Advanced	5	0	4	2	
Number of students tested	72	53	67	42	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			68		
% Advanced			8		
Number of students tested	7	7	13	5	
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	82	83	82	
% Advanced	6	0	4	4	
Number of students tested	74	66	71	45	
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80		77		
% Advanced	0		0		
Number of students tested	15	7	13	6	
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	77	60		
% Advanced	0	0	0		
Number of students tested	23	13	10	4	
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
White					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested	9	2	7	5	

Notes:

NYS did not administer statewide assessments to grades 3 and 5 in ELA or mathematics in 2004-2005.

Subject: Reading  
Edition/Publication Year: 2006-2009

Grade: 5 Test: New York State ELA  
Publisher: CTB/McGraw-Hill

	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005
Testing Month	Jan	Jan	Jan	Jan	
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	83	83	75	
% Advanced	8	1	4	5	
Number of students tested	92	75	93	56	
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	95	
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Socio-Economic Disadvantaged/Free and Reduced-Price Meal Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	79	93	74	
% Advanced	5	0	4	2	
Number of students tested	72	53	67	42	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced			68		
% Advanced			8		
Number of students tested	7	7	13	5	
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	96	82	83	82	
% Advanced	6	0	4	4	
Number of students tested	74	66	71	45	
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	80		77		
% Advanced	0		0		
Number of students tested	15	7	13	6	
<b>5. Limited English Proficient Students</b>					
% Proficient plus % Advanced	100	77	60		
% Advanced	0	0	0		
Number of students tested	23	13	10	4	
<b>6. Largest Other Subgroup</b>					
White					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested	9	2	7	5	

Notes: