

Section I: School Information Page

School Number: 20 **School Name:** Anna Silver

District: 01 **SSO Name/Network #:** ICILSO/ Dan Feigelson

School Address: 166 Essex St New York, NY 10002

School Telephone: 212-254-9577 **Fax:** 212-254-3526

School Contact Person: James Lee **Email Address:** jlee1@schools.nyc.gov

Position/Title **Print/Type Name**

School Leadership Team Chairperson John Coleman

Principal James Lee

UFT Chapter Leader Isabel Reyna-Torres

Parents' Association President John Coleman

Community School District Superintendent Daniella Phillips

Section II: School Leadership Team Signature Page

Directions: There should be one School Leadership Team (SLT) for each school. As per the *Chancellor’s Regulations for School Leadership Teams*, **SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff** (students and CBO representatives are not counted when assessing the balance), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. The signatures of SLT members on this page indicates their participation in the development of the Comprehensive Educational Plan and confirmation that required consultation has occurred in the aligning of funds to support educational programs (*Refer to Chancellor’s Regulations A-655 on SLT’s*; available on the NYCDOE website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Administration/ChancellorsRegulations/default.htm>). *Note: If for any reason an SLT member does not wish to sign this plan, he/she may attach an explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

| Name | Position/Constituency Represented | Signature |
|---------------------|---|-----------|
| James Lee | *Principal or Designee | |
| Isabel Reyna-Torres | *UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee | |
| John Coleman | *PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President | |
| John Coleman | Title I Parent Representative (<i>suggested, for Title I schools</i>) | |
| Jenny Tam | | |
| Orna Silverstein | | |
| Anna Lopez | | |
| Ayman Hocalar | | |
| Baiden Danso | | |
| Christine Madhere | | |
| Luis Batista | | |
| Ronnie Filippatos | | |
| Rosanne Caputo | | |
| Joyce Matthews | | |
| Annique Leman | | |
| Martha Mancini | | |
| Ellen Darby | | |

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

Signatures of the member of the School Leadership Team (SLT), as well as any applicable documentation, are available for viewing at the school and are on file at the Office of School Improvement.

Section III: School Profile

Part A. Narrative Description

Directions: In no more than 500 words, provide contextual information about your school's community and its unique/important characteristics. Think of this as the kind of narrative description you would use in an admissions directory or an introductory letter to new parents. You may wish to include your school's vision/mission statement and a description of strategic collaborations/partnerships and/or special initiatives being implemented. You may copy and paste your narrative description from other current resources where this information is already available for your school (e.g., grant applications, High School Directory, etc.). Note: Demographic and accountability data for your school will be addressed in Part B of this section.

Public School 20 M is a pre-kindergarten-grade 5 school located on the Lower East Side in Manhattan. The school current serves 600 students, with a sizable ELL and special education population. Two of the three self-contained classes are new to PS 20 this year.

PS 20 has always strived to shape well-rounded independent thinkers. It believes strongly in providing more than a rigorous academic experience. To provide our children with rich experiences, community partnerships have been a mainstay at our school. Some of our long-standing partners are the Henry Street Settlement (providing an Architecture Program and after-school enrichment) and Estee Lauder, who provides "the Perfume Project" for the 4th graders and holiday gifts for the whole school through their "Dear Santa" Project. Fifth graders sing and dance thanks to Rosie's Broadway Kids, while lower grade students enjoy learning about nutrition and cooking with the Cookshop Program. Other programs include Chess in the Schools, NY Cares morning science, drama, and math programs, DARE dance, Scholastic Reads, and America Reads.

PS 20 currently has 3 computer labs, including a wireless I-Book lab, which services the entire school community. All classrooms have internet access, with greater telecommunications abilities, and multiple computers in all grades. The library also provides students and staff with access to computers for research projects. Recently, the library was updated with a computerized scanner for checking out books.

Teachers constantly strive to improve their instruction. Professional development is ongoing and is conducted by our part-time literacy coach, our Reading First coach, and other literacy and mathematics experts. The 4th and 5th grade staff has been trained in balanced literacy through Teachers College and an AUSSIE literacy consultant. Teachers in grades K-3 implement Reading First. The entire staff is currently working on improving our writing program throughout the school. Staff is given time to work on assessments, conference with others about the curriculum, work on creating and implementing learning centers, work on reading techniques, develop questioning techniques, work on the use of technology in the classroom and develop research topics and presentations.

Our math consultant from Bank Street College models the implementation of teaching strategies that is aligned with the NYC and NYS Performance Standards. Staff development also includes the implementation of the Everyday Mathematics Program for grades Pre-K to 4th, and is currently being introduced to the 5th grade teachers. Students engage in investigations that allow them to identify the concepts that are being taught. Workshops for parents enable them to knowledgeably support students and teachers.

In order to meet the state standards in other core curriculum areas, we employ two science teachers, one social studies teacher, one teacher each of art, music, physical education, and technology. A hands-on approach to learning with an emphasis on the inquiry process allows students to solve problems and think creatively.

Parents have the opportunity to work with the staff in several areas. Parents participate as members of our SLT Team, hold the leadership roles in our PTA, work as volunteers in several classrooms, and are an integral part of our partnership programs. They help as chaperones on classroom trips and help us to raise funds for various projects within the school. Parents become students themselves as members of our various workshops in several areas, such as math, science, cooking and technology. Parents are recognized for their volunteerism.

Learn more about the internal work of the school at www.ps20m.weebly.com.

SECTION III – Cont’d Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

Directions: A pre-populated version of the School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot provided in template format below (Pages 6-8 of this section) is available for download on each school’s NYCDOE webpage under “Statistics.” Schools are encouraged to download the pre-populated version for insertion here in place of the blank format provided.

| SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------------|
| School Name: | | P.S. 20 Anna Silver | | | |
| District: | 1 | DBN #: | 01M020 | School BEDS Code #: | 310100010020 |

| DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|------|------|---|--------------------|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Grades Served in 2008-09: | Pre-K | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Ungrad. Ele. | | Ungrad. Sec. | |
| Enrollment: | | | | | Attendance: | | | | |
| (As of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | (As of June 30 – % of days students attended) | | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Pre-K | 34 | 36 | 36 | | | | 93.9 | 93.9 | TBD |
| Kindergarten | 91 | 101 | 81 | | | | | | |
| Grade 1 | 140 | 106 | 107 | Student Mobility: | | | | | |
| Grade 2 | 115 | 101 | 94 | (% of Enrollment as of June 30) | | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Grade 3 | 117 | 109 | 89 | | | | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| Grade 4 | 109 | 105 | 101 | | | | | | |
| Grade 5 | 102 | 97 | 102 | Eligible for Free Lunch: | | | | | |
| Grade 6 | 126 | 0 | 0 | (% of Enrollment as of October 31) | | | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| Grade 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | 92.5 | 92.5 | 92.5 |
| Grade 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grade 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Students in Temporary Housing: | | | | | |
| Grade 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (Total Number as of June 30) | | | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |

| DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|
| Grade 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 8 | 5 | TBD |
| Grade 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Ungraded Elementary | 0 | 0 | 0 | Recent Immigrants: | | | |
| Ungraded Secondary | 0 | 0 | 0 | (Total Number as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Total | 835 | 655 | 610 | | 14 | 11 | 5 |
| Special Education Enrollment: | | | | Suspensions: | | | |
| (October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | (Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Number in Self-Contained Classes | 0 | 8 | 26 | | | | |
| No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes | 22 | 24 | 29 | Principal Suspensions | 17 | 12 | TBD |
| Number all others | 0 | 0 | 75 | Superintendent Suspensions | 7 | 2 | TBD |
| <i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i> | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Special High School Programs: | | | |
| English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: | | | | (Total Number) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| (October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | CTE Program Participants | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| # in Trans. Bilingual Classes | 0 | 0 | 0 | Early College HS Participants | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| # in Dual Lang. Programs | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| # receiving ESL services only | 489 | 261 | 125 | Number of Staff: | | | |
| # ELLs with IEPs | 0 | 1 | 7 | (As of October 31; includes all full and part-time staff) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| <i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i> | | | | Number of Teachers | 50 | 47 | 48 |

| DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|--|-------|-------|------|
| | | | | Number of Administrators and Other Professionals | 10 | 8 | 13 |
| Overage Students: | | | | | | | |
| (# entering students overage for grade as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | Number of Educational Paraprofessionals | 5 | TBD | 10 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | Teacher Qualifications: | | | |
| Ethnicity and Gender: | | | | (As of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| (% of Enrollment as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | % fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | Percent more than two years teaching in this school | 72.0 | 63.8 | 75.0 |
| Black or African American | 5.2 | 5.5 | 7.5 | Percent more than five years teaching anywhere | 62.0 | 61.7 | 64.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 60.2 | 63.2 | 65.2 | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl. | 32.8 | 29.8 | 24.8 | Percent Masters Degree or higher | 86.0 | 89.0 | 88.0 |
| White | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2.1 | Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition) | 82.3 | 95.5 | 82.1 |
| Multi-racial | | | | | | | |
| Male | 46.6 | 48.1 | 48.0 | | | | |
| Female | 53.4 | 51.9 | 52.0 | | | | |

| 2008-09 TITLE I STATUS | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|---------|-------------|
| Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) | | Title I Targeted Assistance | | Non-Title I |
| Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding: | | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 |
| | | | | 2008-09 |

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| SURR School: No | | If yes, area(s) of SURR identification: | |
| Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08): | | In Good Standing | School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 |
| Yes | School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2 | NCLB Corrective Action – Year 1 | NCLB Corrective Action – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR) |
| | NCLB Restructured – Year ____ | School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____ | |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------|------------------------|--|
| Individual Subject/Area Ratings | Elementary/Middle Level | | Secondary Level | |
| | ELA: | Met AYP | ELA: | |
| | Math: | Met AYP | Math: | |
| | Science: | Met AYP | Grad. Rate: | |

This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:

| Student Groups | Elementary/Middle Level | | | Secondary Level | | |
|---|--------------------------------|------|---------|------------------------|------|------------|
| | ELA | Math | Science | ELA | Math | Grad. Rate |
| All Students | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Ethnicity | | | | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | | | |
| Black or African American | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| White | | | | | | |

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|
| Multiracial | | | | | | |
| Other Groups | | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Student groups making AYP in each subject | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Key: AYP Status</u> | | | | | | |
| √ | Made AYP | | Did Not Make AYP | * | Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only | |
| | Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target | - | Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status | | | |
| <i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i> | | | | | | |

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

| | | | |
|--|------|--|----------------|
| Progress Report Results – 2007-08 | | Quality Review Results – 2007-08 | |
| Overall Letter Grade | A | Overall Evaluation: | Well-Developed |
| Overall Score | 69.7 | Quality Statement Scores: | |
| Category Scores: | | Quality Statement 1: Gather Data | Well-developed |
| School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score) | 9.7 | Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals | Well-developed |
| School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score) | 20 | Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals | Well-developed |
| Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score) | 37.7 | Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals | Well-developed |
| Additional Credit | 2.3 | Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise | Well-developed |
| <i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i> | | | |

Section IV: Needs Assessment

Directions: Conduct a comprehensive review of your school's educational program informed by the most current quantitative and qualitative data available regarding student performance trends and other indicators of progress. Include in your needs assessment an analysis of information available from New York State Education Department and New York City Department of Education accountability and assessment resources, i.e., School Report Cards, Progress Reports, Quality Review and Quality Review Self-Assessment documents, periodic assessments, ARIS, as well as results of Inquiry Team action research, surveys, and school-based assessments. (Refer to your school's Demographics and Accountability Snapshot in Part B of Section III.) It may also be useful to review the schools use of resources: last year's school budget, schedule, facility use, class size, etc.

After conducting your review, **summarize** in this section the major findings and highlights of your school's strengths, accomplishments, and challenges. Consider the following questions:

- What student performance trends can you identify?
 - What have been the greatest accomplishments over the last couple of years?
 - What are the most significant aids or barriers to the school's continuous improvement?
-

The school analyzed data from multiple sources, including the NY State ELA and Math exams, teacher assessments, DIBELS, Terra Nova, and NYSESLAT. No significant content trends were identified when looking at overall student performance, but an overall lower performance in the area of writing was seen. Also, both ELLs and Students with IEPs performed lower than students in general education.

Grade 5 ELA

Based on the data, by **June of 2009, 17% of students in Grade 5 should score at level 4, as measured by the NY State ELA exam.** This 17% was determined by adding the percentage of students who scored Level 4's from the 2007-2008 ELA exam (4%) to the percentage of students who scored at Level 3 but missed Level 4 by only three to four questions (13%). We believe that all of these children are capable of scoring a Level 4 this year. By **June of 2009, 68% of students in Grade 5 should score at level 3, as measured by the NY State ELA exam.** Percentages of increase was determined by adding the percentage of students who scored level 3 to the percentage of students who scored level 2 but missed Level 3 by only three or questions.

We also noticed that only 49% of our students scored at Level 3 or 4 in the writing section of the ELA, but 69% scored at Level 3 or 4 overall. Thus, our students did much worse on the writing section than on the multiple choice section.

Grade 4 ELA

After analyzing the 4th grade ELA data (their scores from 3rd grade in 2007-2008), the team decided that, by **June of 2009, 19% of students in Grade 4 should score at level 4, as measured by the NY State ELA exam.** This percentage was determined by adding the percentage of students who already scored Level 4 last year to the percentage of students who scored at Level 3 but were very close to Level 4. By **June of 2009, 64% of students in Grade 4 should score at level 3, as measured by the NY State ELA exam.** This percentage was calculated like the others, basically adding current Level 3 performers to those moving up from Level 2. It should be noted that some Level 3s are moving to Level 4, which explains why our goals for this year are actually lower than last year.

When looking at their performance in the writing section of the ELA, we see that 70% of our students scored at Level 3 or 4 on the exam. However, only 36% managed to score 2 points (out of two possible) on a randomly selected written response question. Thus we saw that our students performed markedly worse, once again, in the written section of the exam.

Grade 3 ELA

We looked at this grade's DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills assessment) score from the end of last year. Their 2007-2008 results (grade 2), indicated that 61% of students met benchmark. By

June of 2009, 64% of students in Grade 3 should score at level 3 or level 4, as measured by the NY State ELA exam.

Grade 2 ELA

By June of 2009, 47.8% of students in Grade 2 should score at level 3 or 4, as measured by the Terra Nova assessment.

77% of these students met benchmark on the DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills assessment) at the end of last year in Grade 1. **By June of 2009, 80% of students in Grade 2 should score at Benchmark level, as measured by DIBELS.**

Grade 1 ELA

By June of 2009, 44.8% of students in Grade 1 should score at level 3 or 4, as measured by the Terra Nova assessment.

68% of students met benchmark last year on DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills assessment) at the end of Kindergarten. **By June of 2009, 71% of students in Grade 1 should score at Benchmark level, as measured by DIBELS**

In comparing DIBELS performance to performance on the Terra Nova, we see that the students do much poorer on the Terra Nova. The team will need to analyze the data further to discover why the performance is much lower.

For mathematics, the team analyzed data from the NY State Math exam.

Grade 5 Math

Based on the data, by June of 2009, 28% of students in Grade 5 should score at level 4, as measured by the NY State Math exam. By June of 2009, 65% of student in Grade 5 should score at level 3, as measured by the NY State Math exam

Grade 4 Math

By June of 2009, 55% of students in Grade 4 should score at level 4, as measured by the NY State Math exam.

By June of 2009, 44% of students in Grade 4 should score at level 3, as measured by the NY State Math exam.

By June of 2009, 96% of students in Grade 3 should score at level 3 or 4, as measured by the NY State Math exam.

By June of 2009, 85% of students in Grade 2 should score at level 3 or 4, as measured by the Everyday Math End of Year Assessment.

By June of 2009, 80% of students in Grade 1 should score at level 3 or 4, as measured by the Everyday Math End of Year Assessment.

In addition to looking at student performance data, we also looked at our learning environment. We studied the teacher surveys, the parent surveys, and other indicators on our School Report Card such as attendance. In looking at the surveys, two clear areas of improvement surfaced. Those areas were Communication and Engagement. The communication concerns were seen more in the staff survey, while the engagement concerns surfaced in the parent surveys.

Section V: Annual School Goals

Directions: Based on the findings and implications from the comprehensive needs assessment (Section IV), determine your school's instructional goals for 2008-09 and list them in this section along with a few phrases of description. The resulting list should include a limited number of goals (5 is a good guideline), and the list as a whole should be a clear reflection of your priorities for the year. Good goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.

Notes: (1) In Section VI of this template, you will need to complete an "action plan" for each annual goal listed in this section. (2) Schools designated for improvement (SINI/SRAP/SURR or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification. (3) When developed, Principal's Performance Review (PPR) goals should presumably be aligned to the school's annual goals described in this section.

Learning Environment Goal

By the end of 2009, our school will achieve a +1.0 in our *Change In Score*, as measured by the Learning Environment Survey Report.

Learning Environment Objectives

In the category of Academic Expectations under the PARENT SURVEY section:

- By the end of 2009, the percentage of our parents who give a Very Satisfied rating for "*the level of assistance your child receives when he or she needs extra help with classwork or homework*" will increase by 10%.

In the category of Communication under the PARENT SURVEY section:

- By the end of 2009, the percentage of our parents who give a Very Satisfied rating for "*the school contacts me to tell me about my child's achievements and success*" will rise by 10%.
- By the end of 2009, the percentage of our parents who give a Very Satisfied rating for "*received information about what your child is studying in school*" will rise by 10%.

In the category of Engagement under the PARENT SURVEY section:

- By the end of 2009, the percentage of our parents who give a Very Satisfied rating for "*been invited to a workshop, program, performance, or other event at your child's school*" will rise by 10%

In the category of Communication under the TEACHER SURVEY section:

- By the end of 2009, the percentage of our teachers who give an About Once a Month rating for "*had a conversation or corresponded with a parent of a student about a student's behavior*" will rise by 10%
- By the end of 2009, the percentage of our teachers who give an About Once a Month rating for "*communicated with parents about their child's progress in class*" will rise by 10%.

In the category of Engagement under the TEACHER SURVEY section:

- By the end of 2009, the percentage of our teachers will give a Disagree rating for "*obtaining information from parents about student learning needs is a priority at my school*" will decrease by 10%
- By the end of 2009, the percentage of our teachers will give a Disagree rating for "*teachers and administrators in my school use information from parents to improve instructional practices and meet student learning needs*" will decrease by 10%.

