



ROY H. MANN, IS 78

**2008-09
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

SCHOOL: 22K078

ADDRESS: 1420 EAST 68TH STREET, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11234

TELEPHONE: 718-763-4701

FAX: 718-251-3439

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT (SINI) AND SCHOOLS REQUIRING ACADEMIC PROGRESS (SRAP)

APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURRE)

APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL-LEVEL REFLECTION AND RESPONSE TO SYSTEM-WIDE IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS FROM AUDITS OF THE WRITTEN, TESTED, AND TAUGHT CURRICULUM IN ELA AND MATHEMATICS

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2008-09

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: IS 78 **SCHOOL NAME:** Roy H. Mann

DISTRICT: 22 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** ICI

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 1420-East 68th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11234

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-763-4701 **FAX:** 718-252-3439

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Phyllis Marino **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Pmarino3

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

Angela Sett

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON

Phyllis F. Marino

PRINCIPAL

Josh Gutterman/Michael Diesa, Designee

UFT CHAPTER LEADER

Jack Falzone

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT**

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools)

Marianne Ferrara

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT**

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
Phyllis F. Marino	*Principal or Designee	
Michael Diesa	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Jack Falzone	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Rhonda Hadgkiss	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative, if applicable	
Martin Kelly	Teacher	
Angela Sett	Teacher	
Lori Falzone	Parent	
Lashon Scott	Parent	
Ronide Gedeon	Parent	
Ann Allen	Parent	

* 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.

Roy H. Mann (IS 78) is a community school located in the Bergen Beach section of Brooklyn. The community is primarily residential and diverse in population. We serve grades 6, 7 and 8. Over half of our students travel to school using public transportation.

Although the school collected 100% lunch applications and 52% of students were eligible for free lunch, it does not meet the required average for Title I funds. Thus, many students cannot afford basic necessities which the school provides as needed (gym uniforms, free cultural trips, etc.).

The school offers three accelerated programs, Excelsior, CIG and CAP for all grades, 6 through 8.

The school has a vibrant music, art and drama program. The arts are an integral part of the school's educational plan. Every student has an opportunity to participate artistic expression. Our school is known for our band and dramatic productions and many of our students are accepted to specialized arts high schools.

We remain the only school in the district that offers a Culinary Arts program. Students are taught cooking, restaurant entrepreneurship and healthful eating.

All students are engaged in technology based work throughout the normal academic day. In only two years the school has tripled its use of technology in the classroom. Both students and teachers are expected to integrate technology into the learning process.

Our facilities have been upgraded significantly over the past two years. We have a new science lab, a new computer lab and this year a new culinary arts room is scheduled to be installed.

Data plays a critical part in instructional planning. The faculty is well trained in collecting and utilizing various assessment tools. Teachers have current data that enables them to assist each student in areas of weakness on an individual basis. Additionally, whole school data trends are used to set targets and goals in all core subjects. We have worked to develop culture of inquiry that aims to improve the progress and performance of every child.

Professional Development for teachers is a priority. Teachers receive on going training so that they are continually prepared to integrate data, technology and to successfully differentiate instruction. Every teacher is expected to utilize Core Curriculum and implement student centered teaching. Minor track courses such as Physical Education, Drama, Culinary Arts, Technology, Library, Foreign Language and Music all follow state curriculum standards as well.

Parents play a very active role in the school program. Many parents volunteer in all phases of the school including SLT participation, PTA, collaboration in the Music and Drama presentations and numerous academic and community events.

The school is committed to a full range of youth development supports for all students. Every grade has a fully certified Guidance Counselor and one Social Worker is on staff. Each Grade has a dedicated PPT that meets monthly. Each Grade has a Grade team consisting of Asst. Principal, Guidance Counselor and Dean that work daily on individual student interventions and preventions. Career development, health, paths to high school and college are all areas that the teams must plan and provide for students. The school's incidents have been in steady decline over the last three years. Incentives and rewards are continually offered to students who demonstrate academic excellence and good behavior. We pay close attention to the attendance of every child and notify parents daily of absences. We continually confer with families regarding student attendance. We strongly believe that attendance is a key factor in academic achievement.

A full range of academic and afterschool activities are offered to all students. Academic tutoring and classes are offered afterschool and at Saturday and Super Saturday Academy. Numerous afterschool clubs and dances run throughout the year.

The Principal's primary tool for setting the initiatives for the 2007-2008 school year was the 2007 Quality Review. This was shared, studied and utilized by school leaders, SLT and staff throughout the year. Hence, in April, 2008 the school improved in the Quality Review rating, receiving a Proficient along with three Well Developed areas of the rubric.

In order for the school to continually improve and for all students to show improved progress and improved performance, several elements continue to be priorities over the next several years: Stable and focused leadership, excellent management of resources and utilization of assessment tools (data, surveys, QR's, etc.) to plan and implement academic goals.

We promote the idea of academic competition to our students and expect the entire staff to encourage all students to pursue college and professional life.

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:	J.H.S. 078 Roy H. Mann				
District:	22	DBN #:	22k078	School BEDS Code #:	332200010078

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec.		
Enrollment:				Attendance:					
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)	2006	2007	2008		
Pre-K	0	0	0		92.1	92.6	94.0		
Kindergarten	0	0	0						
Grade 1	0	0	0	Student Mobility:					
Grade 2	0	0	0	(% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	0	0	0		94.9	94.3	95.0		
Grade 4	0	0	0						
Grade 5	0	0	0	Eligible for Free Lunch:					
Grade 6	419	355	371	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7	487	424	368						
Grade 8	529	475	390						
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing:					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11	0	0	0		4	0	15		
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded Elementary	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants:					
Ungraded Secondary	3	1	8	(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	1438	1255	1137		15	15	11		
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	49	49	61						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	59	59	63	Principal Suspensions	406	301	226		
Number all others	26	31	36	Superintendent Suspensions	48	40	44		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
				Special High School Programs:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	36	41	40	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	0	2	4	(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	78	84	83
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	20	12	16
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	3	N/A	12
	6	8	8				
				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	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4	.06	0.5	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	57.7	61.9	78.3
Black or African American	68.2	68.0	69.3	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	51.3	47.6	56.6
Hispanic or Latino	8.7	8.9	8.0	Percent Masters Degree or higher	77.0	82.0	89.4
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	2.4	3.0	3.0	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	85.3	83.1	89.4
White	20.4	19.5	19.2				
Multi-racial							
Male	48.5	50.4	51.4				
Female	51.5	49.6	48.6				

2008-09 TITLE I STATUS				
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Title I		
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:	<input type="checkbox"/> 2005-06	<input type="checkbox"/> 2006-07	<input type="checkbox"/> 2007-08	<input type="checkbox"/> 2008-09

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
SURR School: No X <input type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:	
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):		<input type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)	
<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Restructured – Year ____	X	School Requiring Academic	

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

<input type="checkbox"/> Progress (SRAP) – Year <u> 5 </u>						
Individual Subject/Area Ratings	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA:	SRAP5		ELA:		
	Math:	SRAP3		Math:		
	Science:	IGS		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	√	√	√			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-			
Black or African American	√	√	x			
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	√			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	√	√	√			
White	√	√	√			
Multiracial						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	X	√	X			
Limited English Proficient	-	√	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	6	8	4			
Key: AYP Status						
√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only	
√ ^{SH}	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	C	Overall Evaluation:	√
Overall Score	46.8	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	√
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	7.7	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	√
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	13.3	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	W
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	25	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W
Additional Credit	0.8	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	W
<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?

NYSED ACCOUNTABILITY STATUS

As per the 2007-2008 New York State School Report Card the school has the following status:

ELA: Requiring Academic Progress (Year 5)

Math: Good Standing

Science: Good Standing

In ELA the school met AYP safe harbor in Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient. To be removed from improvement status in English language arts, the school must make AYP in this measure for two consecutive years. If the school fails to make AYP in 2008-2009 the school will be Requiring Academic Progress (Year 6) in 2009-2010. If the school makes APY in 2008-2009, the school will be in good standing in 2009-2010.

NYC ACCOUNTABILITY STATUS

As per the 2008-2009 Quality Review the school received a rating of Proficient.

As per the 2007-2008 Progress Report the school received a C. Exemplary gains were made in the area of English Language Learners (.75)

As per the 2007-2008 Progress Report School Environment grade the school received a B.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AIDS AND BARRIERS

Based on the 2008 State Mathematics exam, the results are as follows: 64.1% of students in grades 6, 7 and 8 are performing at a level 3 or 4 with a median student proficiency of 3.18. The average change in student proficiency for level 3 and 4 students is -0.09.

The percentage of students making at least one year of progress is 55.8%. The percentage of students in the school's lowest third making one year of progress is 67.2% and the average change in student proficiency for level 1 and 2 students is 0.22.

Based on the 2008 ELA exam, the results are as follows: 52.9% of students in grades 6, 7 and 8 are performing at a level 3 or 4 with a median student proficiency of 3.04. In addition, the average change in student proficiency for level 3 and 4 students is - 0.12.

The percentage of students making at least one year of progress is 54.1%. The percentage of students in the school's lowest third making one year of progress is 79.4% and the average change in student proficiency for level 1 and 2 students is 0.19.

The data above clearly suggests that our lower level students have made significant progress in Math and ELA, whereas, our higher level students have dropped. In an effort to remedy this decrease and enable more students to perform at levels 3 and 4, we must look at a number of variables. First, we must look at the success of our lower level students and assess what type of interventions, assistance and guidance was made available to them. This is so that we may offer similar opportunities to other students in need of improvement. Much of the success of these students was, in part, due to the fact that many of them were part of small focus groups much like our school's Inquiry Team. These focus groups were monitored by their teachers who utilized ITA's and met closely with the ELA and Math Coaches to continually plan academic interventions. All level 1 and 2 students were mandated for Extended day and many of them participated in Afterschool programs. Holiday courses and study packets were also made available to these students. These programs consisted of fewer students which allowed for more individualized instruction. Resources were carefully selected for these students. Each teacher was provided with Skill of the Week material which was aligned with the state standards. Both Coaches carefully monitored classroom resources, pacing calendars and curriculum. Finally, professional development for the teachers was a critical factor in student achievement. Teachers received regular PD from the Coaches in data utilization, technology trainings, classroom modeling and testing strategies. Time for this was arranged during teacher preps and lunches as well as DOE PD days.

Therefore, it is our intention to provide the same advantage for students at levels 3 and 4 on a full scale approach. This year teacher professional development will begin at our Fall Faculty kickoff. Teachers will study the level 3 and 4 progress, identify their students and begin targeted interventions. After school programs will be made available to them so that their particular needs can be met in a smaller setting with more individualized attention. Many level 3 and 4 students are part of accelerated programs such as the Achieve 3000 online differentiated learning program. Therefore, they will receive highly challenging instruction and reinforcement equated with such programs.

In an effort to sustain progress of level 1 and 2 students and in an attempt to increase level 3 and 4 students, other modifications will be made to overall classroom instruction as well. New materials have already been purchased for every Math and Literacy classroom inside of the school day, including Extended day and Afterschool, Saturday and during holiday breaks. Every literacy classroom will receive reading and writing enrichment using Write Source and Coach.

This year we purchased and introduced our students to an online differentiated reading program, Achieve 3000. We targeted students in the bottom third of the school in ELA scores.

Schoolwide Enrichment will allow us to develop the gifts and talents of all students by providing enrichment opportunities in academics, arts, technology and interests.

This year we purchased the internet based program Renzulli Learning. We utilized NYSTL Software allocation to purchase this system. Teachers will be trained in an intense professional development opportunity to utilize this differentiated search engine. All students, 6,7 and 8 will receive a user name and password to access this interest based program. Renzulli engages each child in enriched challenging activities such as virtual field trips, in-depth projects and on-line activities. Throughout the school day, students will utilize laptops to access Renzulli. In addition, students are able to access

Renzulli Learning from home. Through Renzulli Learning, teachers have the ability to assign students special projects and track their progress.

In ELA, it is particularly imperative that we continue to encourage students to read on a daily basis and complete classic literature in class as per the NYS Core Curriculum. Not only will they be exposed to various genres, but they will be reading for different purposes. It is our goal to make certain that this happens every day in every literacy classroom across grades. Some of the materials purchased include, classroom libraries, class novels, test prep materials and reading resource kits. In addition, many of these materials are on various reading levels so that all students, despite their reading level can be held to the same standards.

Further, grade specific reading lists have been created for teachers. Again, this is to ensure that students are exposed to a variety of reading materials on various levels. Students in accelerated classes are expected to read more advanced novels and other texts that challenge them. This will help to not only increase their vocabulary, but will help them to become more insightful readers, therefore increasing their performance on state exams.

In both ELA and Math all teachers will use mandated prep time and monthly department meetings to receive targeted assistance in planning using individual student data. These sessions will be lead by the Coaches and Sp. Ed. Coordinator.

Math Trends

In Mathematics, many student performance trends have been identified. On grade six, 371 students were tested. Of the 371 students tested, 44% are general education students, 56% are students with IEP's and 16.7% are LEP students. 4.9% or 18 out of the 371 students scored a level one.

Out of the 27.7% level 1 students, 5 students scored 500 on the NYS Math assessment. 3 students are learning disabled, one is accelerated and one is LEP. Of the 5 students, 2 are male and 3 are female, 4 black and 1 Asian.

22.6% or 84 students of the 371 tested scored a level 2. 60.7% are general education and 39.3% are students with IEP's. 8 students scored within 0.05 proficiency points of a level 2 indicating great potential to be moved. Of those 8 students, 3 have IEP's, 5 are male and 3 are female. 4 of the 5 males are black and 1 is white. Furthermore, all 3 females are black.

61.7% or 229 students of the 371 tested scored a level 3. Of this 92.1% are general education and 7.9% are students with special needs. 7 students scored within 0,05 proficiency points of a level 4 clearly signifying the ability to be moved. Of the 7 students 4 are male and 3 are female. 3 of the 4 males are black and 1 is white. Of the females 2 are black and one is white.

10% or 40 students of the 371 tested scored a level 4. 99.5% are general education and 0.5% are students with IEP's. 26 students scored within 0.08 proficiency points of a level 3 which indicates an area of concern. These individual students will become a primary focus in the coming school year so that we can insure their success as level 4 students and avoid any possibility of them dropping a level.

Of those 26 students, 10 are black males, 8 are black females, 4 are white males, 3 are white females and 1 is an Asian female.

Overall, level 1 students decreased by 7% going from 11.9% of the grade 6 population to 4.9%. Level 2 students decreased by 7.5% going from 30.1% of the grade 6 population to 22.6%. Level 3 students increased by 7.7% going from 54.0% of the grade 6 population to 61.7%. Level 4 students increased by 6.8% going from 4.0% of the grade 6 population to 10.8%.

On grade seven 367 students in all were tested. 6.3% or 23 out of the 367 students scored a level 1 on the 2008 Mathematics NYS test. Of this, 69.6% are general education students, whereas, 30.4% are students with IEP's.

125 students or 34.1% of the seventh grade scored a level 2. Of this, 73.6% are general education students and 26.4% are students with IEP's.

181 students or 49.3% of the seventh grade scored a level 3. Of this, 95.0% are general education students and 5.0% are students with IEP's.

38 students or 10% of the seventh grade scored a level 4. Of this 100% are general education students.

10 students or 3% of seventh grade scored 0.11 proficiency points below a level 4 clearly indicating the ability to be moved. Of those students 6 are male and 4 are female. In addition, 3 are black males, 3 are white males, 3 are black females and one female is Asian.

Overall, Level 1 students decreased by 3.6% going from 9.9% of the grade 7 population to 6.3%. Level 2 students decreased by 0.4% going from 34.5 of the grade 7 population to 34.1. Level 3 students increased by 5.6% going from 43.7% of the grade 7 population to 49.3%. Level 4 students decreased by 1.5% going from 11.9% of the grade 7 population to 10.4%.

ELA Trends 2008

In ELA, many student performance trends have been identified as well. On grade six 376 students in all were tested. Of this, 82.5% are general education students, 17.4% are students with IEP's and 2.5% are LEP students. 1.0% or 4 out of the 371 students tested scored a level one. All 4 students are male, 3 being black and 1 Hispanic.

Of the 139 sixth grade students performing at level 2, 57.1% are male and 42.9% are female. Of this 15.1% are white, 74.8% are black, 6.1% are Hispanic are Asian and 0.74% are Native American.

Of the 196 sixth grade students performing at level 3, 45.% are male and 54.6% are female. Of this, 20.9% are white, 69.4% are black 7.2% are Hispanic and 2.6% are Asian.

Of the 8 sixth grade students performing at level 4, 75% are white and 25% are Hispanic. 25% of whom are male and 75% are female. This data indicates that a major focus of ours must be geared toward increasing the number of African American students performing at a level 4.

Of the 7 seventh grade students performing at a level 1, 4 are male and 3 are female. Of this 3 are black males, 1 is a white male, 2 are black females and 1 is a Hispanic female.

Of the 146 seventh grade students performing at level 2, 62.3% are male and 37.7% are female. Of this 9.6% are white, 78.8% are black, 2.8% are Asian and 8.9% are Hispanic. Given the number of black males performing at this level, it is imperative that we focus on them as a group in an effort to help them reach their full academic potential.

Of the 197 seventh grade students performing at a level 3, 46.4% are male and 53.2% are female. Of this 18.4% are white, 70.9% are black, 7.7% are Hispanic and 3.0% are Asian. Our goal in response to this particular data is to look at the high level 3's and focus on what we can do move them to a level 4. In addition, the same attention will be given to the low level 4's so that we can prevent any one of those students from dropping a level.

Of the 3 seventh grade students performing at a level 4, all three are female. Of this, 66.7% are white and 33.3% are black.

ELL's and Spec. Needs Trends

ELA

Of the 164 students identified with IEP's 156 were tested using the New York State ELA exam. Of those tested 8.3% scored level 1 and 78.2% scored level 2. This is equivalent to 86.5% scoring below grade level. 13.5% scored at grade level attained a performance level of 3. Two of the level 3's were in grade 8; 13 were in grade 6 with the balance of 6 in grade 7. This tends to follow the trend of middle school performance.

Of the 36 students identified as ELL's, 26 were tested using the New York State ELA exams. Of those tested 15.4% scored level 1 and 76.9% scored level 2. Therefore 92.3% was below grade level. Only 7.7% of the tested population scored at grade level (performance level 3).

Mathematics

Of the 164 students identified with IEP's 157 were tested using the New York State Mathematics exams. Of those tested 20.4% scores a performance level of 1 and 53.5% scored a performance level of 2. This gave us 73.9% of the IEP's students performing below grade level. 24.8% of those tested scored level 3 and the 1.3% scored level 4. Those students with IEP's scoring at or above the grade level was 26.1%. Of those students scoring level 15.6% scored a raw score at or below 500. 21.9% of the level ones are also identified with Limited English Proficiency.

Addressing Continuous Improvement

We fully intend to follow the key recommendations of the 2008 Quality Review Recommendations regarding "What the school needs to improve":

- Create strategic action plans at the departmental level that reflect the challenging goals set for grades, cohorts and target groups.
- Develop the organization of the school's data so it more clearly demonstrates trends over time and the rate of progress towards the goals.
- Continue to improve instruction through planning for and building in checks on progress during and at the end of lessons to assess impact.

In order to address improve student achievement we are using several approaches.

First we will utilize both an ELA Coach and a Math Coach whose will each be responsible for intensive teacher training and oversight of individual student interventions based on DOE assessment data. Coaches will focus training teachers individually in utilization of data and differentiated instruction. Coaches will work closely with the Department Asst. Principals in delivery of trainings to teachers. Coaches and Asst. Principals will identify and plan goals for the departments using available data.

Once teachers are aware of whole school trends regarding gender and ethnicity and can identify the exact students in these areas, they will be provided with training and materials needed to address the needs of these students. For example, in ELA the 57.1% of black males scoring at level 2 in 6th grade will be targeted for Afterschool to address this cohort in a unique approach.

Curriculum training and expertise will play a critical role in this effort. Coaches will modify the curriculum with teachers to target student interest and learning style.

The school will continue to have the Inquiry Team and the Data Specialist lead the work needed to organize the school data trends and ensure that the school community has access, training and ability to utilize the information.

In order to continue to improve instruction, through planning for and building in checks on progress during and at the end of lessons, teachers will now utilize portfolios and receive more intense training in using portfolios as an assessment tool. We will continue to train teachers in data use and both Coaches can deliver PD on intra lesson assessments, formal and informal.

An AIS Reading teacher and AIS Math teacher will be available for the lowest scoring students. In AIS Reading Achieve 3000 will be implemented. Extended day and Afterschool classes will focus on all level students: 1, 2, 3 and 4. We have also selected new materials in both Math and ELA for these intervention classes.

We will utilize a generous allocation from Councilman Fidler to fund our efforts in Extended Day and enrichment for the Excelsior (accelerated students). This allocation has also included \$100,000. for classroom computers and Smartboards. This will enable every teacher to have access to a workstation for both teacher and student use and to utilize Smartboards for differentiated instruction.

A Special Education Coordinator will lead the work needed to address performance and progress of IEP students. Special Ed. teachers will have resources of both ELA and Math Coaches and the Sp. Ed. Coordinator. Technology will play an integral part in instruction. All ELA, Math and Special Education teachers will complete Smartboard trainings.

All teachers in the school will be trained in the Pre-Referral Intervention Manual (PRIM).

Our ELL teacher works closely with the ELA Coach and is an integral part of the Inquiry Team.

We will also continue to pilot gender specific classes and monitor the effectiveness.

In order to address the school's SRAP Status (in ELA and Math for black students with disabilities in The New York State Accountability Report Card) the school has taken the following measures:

- Science teachers are now observed by the Principal
- The Science Department is supervised by the Principal and the Asst. Principal
- Both the Math Coach and the Literacy Coach are including science teachers in their workshops around data use and differentiated instruction. All science teachers are expected to utilize data to set student goals.
- ICI has provided the school with customized individual PD and department PD for science teachers
- A lead Science teacher is reviewing all curriculum with each science teacher

- The Supervisor of Special Education is working with 8th Grade science teachers on individualized support for each child in this cohort.

Our Social Studies department now has a supervisor who is licensed content area expert in Social Studies. All teachers in Social Studies work with student data to set student goals. All Social studies teachers are integrating project based learning and technology into classroom teaching. Interim assessments are now being implemented in Social Studies in order to predict individual student achievements towards the grade 8 NYSED examination.

The arts will continue to play a vibrant and central role in the education of all students during their years at IS 78. Every teacher is now trained in the Blueprint benchmarks and the NYSED learning standards in the arts. Arts projects, exhibitions and performances will continue and expand as per budgetary capacity to demonstrate student achievement in the arts and in order to provide every student an opportunity to engage in arts based instruction.

Finally, there will be Focus groups of students in Math, ELA, Sp. Ed. and ELL replicating the work of the original Inquiry Team of 2007 so that we target particular students for achievement.

Attendance is a critical factor in student achievement. Our year to date attendance for 2007-2008 is 94.12 as compared to 2006-2007, 92.1.

We will continue to implement a rigorous attendance improvement plan, which includes daily calls home to parents on absences, and dedicating a social worker on Saturdays to meet with students who have attendance concerns . Further, we train teachers twice yearly on good clerical methods addressing absence of students in classes. Incentives for good attendance are continually offered to students as encouragement.

Based on our most recent analysis (below) most students attend school 90 to 99% of days. We will place strong focus on the students who attend only 60-79 % and provide individual interventions.

Attendance Data Analysis 2007-2008

Attendance Rate Interval	Number Students	Percent Students
--------------------------	-----------------	------------------

100% (Perfect)	53	4.5
90% TO 99%	601	51.2
80% TO 89%	86	7.3
70% TO 79%	12	1.0
60% TO 69%	4	0.3
50% TO .9%	0	0.0
0% (No Show)	2	0.1

Learning Environment Survey Results 200-2008

This year, our scores rose in all four categories of the Living Environment Survey:

- Academic Expectations: up to 7.1 from 6.1
- Communication: up to 6.2 from 5.5
- Engagement: up to 6.3 from 5.3

- Safety & Respect: up to 6.5 from 5.6

We must continue to address the results in order to continually improve in each area.

Academic Expectations received a 7.1 and improved 1.0 from the previous year. Our highly developed professional development plan and the data initiative were an integral part of this progress. Portfolios and Data Binders aided staff in monitoring students' progress.

Safety and Respect received a score of 6.5 and improved 0.9 from the previous year. There are many reasons for this improvement. The school has a full time Safety Coordinator and a Dean on each grade. A collaborative effort from teachers, staff, school aides, guidance counselors, and School Safety Agents were crucial in maintaining safety and respect in the school. The addition of a surveillance system to monitor hallways and stairwells aided in keeping the floors safe and secure.

Although eighty percent of parents and teachers were satisfied with how well the school has improved in the area of communication, we need to address this area regarding students. Our communication result improved by 0.7 to 6.2 but we plan to implement deeper personalization's that reach all students. These plans include:

- Class visitations by all grade guidance counselors
- Monthly grade assemblies for academic success initiatives, safety, and communication.
- Expand student activities and create more opportunities for participation in clubs/teams.
- Expand Peer Mediation.

Additionally, we will utilize the Overcoming Obstacles Program of instruction for students who are exhibiting behavior issues. Our SAPIS will target specific students in collaboration with the Grade Teams and use this program to support students in character development.

Several factors have contributed to gains in safety. In 2007-2008 a Safety Coordinator position was created. The Safety Coor. is a teacher trained in all facets of maintaining safety and overseeing student discipline throughout the entire school day. This has taken considerable burden from the instructional staff and has also focused the students on their responsibilities as outlined in the NYC Student Discipline Code. The Coordinator makes daily use of OORS data and shares this with the School Safety Team monthly where further improvements are made and all information is transparent and monitored. We also share safety data with the entire staff twice yearly at whole school faculty meetings and at monthly SLT meetings.

For the next school year, 2008-2009, we have provided targeted teachers with professional development that assists them in classroom management. Turnaround for Children provided twelve teachers with COMP training, a comprehensive program focused on Creating Conditions for learning. Teachers also received training from NYC DOE in Guided Discipline Institute, a four day training for classroom management strategies and skills designed to promote student engagement and self discipline. Further, Conflict Resolution training will be provided in the fall of 2008. We have also designated our Coordinator for Respect for All (bully prevention) as mandated in the Chancellor's Regulations.

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 received a 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.

Goal #1	By June 2009, 57% of students in grades 6, 7 and 8 (644) will demonstrate one year of progress in ELA in the NYSED ELA exam and in Acuity. This is an increase of 2.8% from 2008 when 54% (622) students made a one year increase. 59% of students in grades 6, 7 and 8 (682) will demonstrate one year of progress in Math in the NYSED Math exam and Acuity. This in a increase of 3% from 2008 when 56% (643 students) made a one year increase. This is an increase of 39 students.
Goal #2	By June 2009, increase the use of technology to support teaching and learning across the curriculum. By June 2009 to increase the number of teachers who utilize technology in classroom lessons to 50% (43 teachers). This is an increase from June 2008 when 15 teachers utilized technology in the classroom.
Goal #3	By June 2009, to improve scores in the Learning Environment Survey above 7.7. By June 2009, to increase attendance 1.0% and reduce incidents 1.0%.
Goal #4	By June 2009 100% of teachers will have measurable goals by June 2009. This is an increase of 80% from June 2008 when 20% of teachers had measurable goals set.
Goal #5	To provide all students with differentiated instruction that addresses the diversity of mixed ability learners in every classroom so that all students will have goals developed. By June 2009, 50% (42 teachers) of the teachers in the school will implement differentiated instruction in their classrooms. This is an increase from June 2008 when 20% of teachers implemented differentiated instruction.

--	--

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools designated for improvement (SINI/SRAP/SURR or received a 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.

ELA/MATH Targets

Subject/Area (where relevant):

				2007-2008 Score	Horizon Score	Target Increase	Target Score 2008-9
School Environment							
Academic Expectations				7.1	8.5	0.5	7.6
Communication				6.2	7.6	0.5	6.7
Engagement				6.3	7.9	0.5	6.8
Safety and Respect				6.5	8.5	0.7	7.2
Attendance				94.0	97.9	1.3	95.3
Student Performance							
ELA - % at Proficiency				52.9	88.0	11.7	64.6
ELA - Median Proficiency				3.04	3.48	0.15	3.19
Math - % at Proficiency				64.1	100.0	12.0	76.1
Math - Median Proficiency				3.18	3.96	0.26	3.44
Student Progress							
ELA - % Making Basic Progress				54.2	71.4	5.7	59.9
ELA - % in Lowest Third Making Basic Progress				79.7	93.3	4.5	84.2
ELA - Average Change in Proficiency for Level 1/2				0.19	0.37	0.06	0.25
ELA - Average Change in Proficiency for Level 3/4				0.12	0.02	-0.03	0.09

Math - % Making Basic Progress	56.0	82.3	8.8	64.8
Math - % in Lowest Third Making Basic Progress	67.2	89.7	7.5	74.7
Math - Average Change in Proficiency for Level 1/2	0.22	0.56	0.11	0.33
Math - Average Change in Proficiency for Level 3/4	0.09	0.18	0.03	0.12
Closing the Achievement Gap				
ELA - English Language Learners	25.0	36.8	11.8	36.8
ELA - Special Education Students	25.8	50.0	24.2	50.0
ELA - Hispanic Students in Lowest Third	9.5	50.8	41.3	50.8
ELA - Black Students in Lowest Third	19.8	50.0	30.2	50.0
ELA - Other Students in Lowest Third	17.4	53.8	36.4	53.8
Math - English Language Learners	27.3	26.0	-1.3	26.0
Math - Special Education Students	29.5	38.5	9.0	38.5
Math - Hispanic Students in Lowest Third	29.6	36.7	7.1	36.7
Math - Black Students in Lowest Third	29.9	33.6	3.7	33.6
Math - Other Students in Lowest Third	16.1	41.3	25.2	41.3

Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-</i>	By June 2009, 57% of students in grades 6, 7 and 8 (644) will demonstrate one year of progress in ELA in the NYSED ELA exam and Acuity. This is an increase of 2.8% from 2008 when 54% (622) students made a one year increase. 59% of students in grades 6, 7 and 8 (682) will demonstrate
---	--

UPDATED-MARCH 2009

<p><i>bound.</i></p>	<p>one year of progress in Math in the NYSED Math exam and Acuity. This is an increase of 3% from 2008 when 56% (643 students) made a one year increase. This is an increase of 39 students.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry Team and Coaches will develop whole school data and identify trends/needs • Principal will meet individually with all teachers in Oct/Feb/June to review all student data and intervention plans and to assess student progress • Align Asst. Principal performance goals to this initiative • Directives to AP's requiring teacher use of data included in formal observation reports • Inquiry Team will plan and implement staff trainings weekly • Math and Literacy Coach will implement data binder initiative/ARIS rollout • Literacy and Math Walkthroughs • PD for the Data Specialist and Inquiry Team • Weekly Extended Cabinet mtgs focus on this initiative • Department mtgs monthly to focus on content area data use • Present school Data throughout the year to whole school community including parents • School Data Wall designed and posted • Individualized PD for teachers • ITA/Predictives/Performance Series as tools • Achieve 3000 implemented in ELA • Classic novels implemented in ELA • Testing as a Genre provided to ELA and Math teachers • Saturday Academy/Afterschool Tutorials and Holiday Packets as academic interventions • Target groups of students in all ELA and Math classes
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C4E funds for ELA and Math Coaches • C4E funds for AIS Reading teacher • Fair Student Funding for AIS Math teacher/Sp. Ed. Coor/PD funding • Inquiry Team Funding for data work/Data Specialist • NYSTL for AIS Curriculum (Coach and Write Source) • NYSTL Software funds for Achieve 3000 • Identify in house staff for turn key and collaborative lunch and learns • Utilize monthly contractual meeting time for PD in Content Areas
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Data Specialist will align and increase staff trainings for the new assessment tools (ARIS, Scantron, etc.), support staff in accessing data for all students/maintain a data training center. • The Inquiry Team will plan and implement whole school trainings throughout the year (increase from prior year). • Increase in number of PD's and trainings in data for school staff • The entire school will be trained in the Progress Report • All observation reports will document teachers' use of data to inform classroom lessons

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase number of Literacy/Math teachers who utilize data binders • All Content areas teachers will receive data, trainings at Department meetings monthly (Increase from prior year).
--	--

Subject/Area (where relevant): ALL

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, increase the use of technology to support teaching and learning across the curriculum. By June 2009 to increase the number of teachers who utilize technology in classroom lessons to 50% (43 teachers). This is an increase from June 2008 when 15 teachers utilized technology in the classroom.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kickoff Technology Initiative in Sept. Faculty Meeting • Plan and Implement Technology Action Plan, Year 2 • Election Day/June PD will contain Technology component • Assign a dedicated supervisor for Technology • Inventory the school for technology equipment • Survey Teacher Technology Wants and Needs • Identify and implement Technology Programs for student enrichment • Classroom visitations for teachers to learn use of technology by other teachers. • Identify PD Opportunities/Provide PD to staff • Identify Core group of teachers to train • Technology teacher assigned • Classroom walkthroughs scheduled • Allocate funds for training and equipment • Purchase additional equipment (hardware and software)

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYSTL software/hardware funds • Fair Student Funding for PD • City Council Grant for Computers and Smartboards • Department Meeting time used for teacher trainings/Lunch and Learns • Identify in house staff to turn key trainings
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase # of Targeted Teachers to receive Smartboard training • Increase # of Targeted Teachers who will receive training in Powerpoint • Increase # of Targeted Teachers who will utilize technology in classroom lessons • Increase # of technology hardware and software for classrooms

Subject/Area (where relevant): ALL

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2009, to improve in all areas of the Learning Environment Survey and increase the overall score above 7.7. By June 2009 to increase attendance 1.0% and reduce incidents 1.0%.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Create a comparison of last year's budget to current years for needs assessment/Create budget reports with projected needs -Review and reorganize the academic programs -Identify a Youth Development program, Turnaround for Children, Overcoming Obstacles -Supervisory per session cut -Coordinate an Attendance Team and Intervention Plan -Coordinate a Lateness Intervention Plan. -Reorganize Asst. Principal areas of supervision -Coordinate a Student Advisory Council -Assess teacher qualifications/Reduce staff absence -Assign inventory responsibilities -Safety Coord. trainings continues

	-PD for Staff involved in all resource areas such as Attendance, Budget, Safety
Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase student Math and ELA periods -Utilize C4E funds to fund AIS Reading teacher -Utilize C4E funds for ELA and Math Coaching positions -Hire part time experienced Budget Manager -Budget will be balanced, no under utilization of funds - Reduce administrative positions:AP F- Status (school will have two full time AP's and one F-Status) -Mid Year reduction (if needed) to school will be managed with no instructional cuts -Utilize Grants for Content Areas
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increase # of Books, science materials and all technology equipment available for classroom use and distribution. -Increase in Learning Environment Survey results - Decline in Safety Incidents from prior year -Increase in YTD Attendance from previous year -Increase Youth Development trainings. -Reduction in Lateness to school -Increase # of new textbooks. -All teachers will have a professional period designated -Increase number of highly qualified teachers, teaching in their content area - Increase Workshops for Parent Involvement from prior year

Subject/Area (where relevant): ALL

Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i>	By June 2009 100% of staff teachers will have goals. This is an increase of 80% from June 2008 when 20% of teachers had goals set.
---	---

<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Areas of Supervision of Asst. Principals reorganized around Content Area (Departments) -Asst. Principals Goals and Objectives are established -Create a Professional Development Inventory for teachers -Asst. Principals are assigned Content Area responsibility -All teachers will be highly qualified and aligned within license area. -Every staff member will have direct professional development plan designed in collaboration with a licensed supervisor in their content area -Asst. Principal Goal Mtgs Sept, January and June -Teacher Goals meetings -PD for Asst. Principals in Content, Data, Technology -In house survey s for teachers regarding professional development by choice and need
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Utilize C4E funds for ELA and Math Coaching positions
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increase # teacher observations to 100% teachers formally observed -Increase # of trainings led by Asst. Principals and Coaches at the school - Midyear tracking of professional development inventory for teachers

Subject/Area (where relevant): ALL

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>To provide all students with differentiated instruction that addresses the diversity of mixed ability learners in every classroom so that all students will have goals developed. By June 2009, 50% (42 teachers) of the teachers in the school will implement differentiated instruction in their classrooms. This is an increase from June 2008 when 20% of teachers implemented differentiated instruction.</p>
--	--

<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identify and implement research based methodologies/Core Curriculum -Set instructional initiatives at Sept. Faculty Conference -Teachers write Professional Goals for the year -Introduce Achieve 3000, an online differentiated learning program -Provide trainings in Core Curriculum/Data Focus/Differentiated Instruction/Technology -Identify and implement enrichment program for students -Survey staff throughout the year on individual teacher needs -Dept. mtgs. used for PD in Differentiated Instruction -Classroom visitations and Walkthroughs with AP's and Coaches -Coaches modeling for teachers -Data training for all staff (Inquiry Team work), Formal and Informal Assessment (ITA's). -Technology training for targeted teachers -Train staff in IEP use -Train staff in multiple assessment use -Provide ELA and Math Coaches with additional trainings -Teacher Lunch and Learns/Study Groups by Content areas -Train staff (at the school and at purchased PD's). -Provide staff with data, professional materials, tech hardware, etc. -All Staff receives professional text on Differentiation as staff reading -Visitations to model schools for teachers and administrators
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C4E funds for ELA and Math Coaches • C4E funds for AIS ELA teacher (Read 180) • Fair Student Funding for AIS Math teacher/Sp. Ed. Coor/PD funding • Inquiry Team Funding for data work/Data Specialist • NYSTL for AIS Curriculum (Coach and Write Source) • Identify in house staff for turn key and collaborative lunch and learns • Utilize monthly contractual meeting time for PD in Content Areas
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increase use of Data Binders utilized in ELA and Math classrooms -Increase # of Content Area teachers utilize Data for planning -Increase # of trainings in Differentiated Instruction for all teachers -# Trained and Targeted Teachers utilize technology in classrooms -Increase in # of Principal Classroom Observations from prior year -Increase # of Teachers that utilize multiple assessments

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

Directions: All schools must complete Appendices 1, 2, 3, 7 & 8. All Title I schools must complete Appendix 4. All schools identified under NCLB or SED for School Improvement, including Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 and Year 2, Title I Corrective Action (CA) Schools, NCLB Planning for Restructuring Schools, NCLB Restructured Schools, and Schools Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP), must complete Appendix 5. All Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) must complete Appendix 6. **Note: Please refer to the accompanying CEP Guide for specific CEP submission instructions and timelines.**

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM – SED REQUIREMENT FOR ALL SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS – NCLB/SED REQUIREMENT FOR ALL SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION – CHANCELLOR’S REGULATIONS FOR ALL SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SINI AND SRAP SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURR)

APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL-LEVEL REFLECTION AND RESPONSE TO SYSTEMWIDE CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS – REQUIREMENT FOR ALL SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACT FOR EXCELLENCE (CFE) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2008-09 – SED REQUIREMENT FOR ALL SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

New York State Education Department (SED) requirement for all schools

Part A. Directions: On the chart below, indicate the total number of students receiving Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in each area listed, for each applicable grade. AIS grade and subject requirements are as follows: K-3: reading and math; 4-12: reading, math, science, and social studies. Academic Intervention Services include **2 components**: additional instruction that supplements the general curriculum (regular classroom instruction); and/or student support services needed to address barriers to improved academic performance such as services provided by a guidance counselor or social worker. Note: Refer to the District Comprehensive Educational Plan (DCEP) for a description of district procedures for providing AIS.

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K			N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								
5								
6	136	86	35	30	65	5	25	
7	187	152	50	35	17	3	12	
8	176	156	59	59	100	2	17	
9								
10								
11								
12								

Identified groups of students who have been targeted for AIS, and the established criteria for identification:

- Students in Grades K – 3 who are considered at-risk for not meeting State standards as determined by their performance on ECLAS 2 or other identified assessments, or who have been identified as potential holdovers.
- Students in Grades 4 – 8 who are performing at Level 1 or Level 2 on New York State English language arts (ELA), mathematics, science, and social studies assessments.
- Students in Grade 9 who performed at Level 1 or Level 2 on NYS Grade 8 ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies assessments.
- Students in Grades 10 – 12 who scored below the approved passing grade on any Regents examination required for graduation in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	<p>COACH-Leveled reading reinforcement series that mirrors the NYS ELA exam. Includes skill study, pre/post test and additional assessments needed to monitor student progress. It will be utilized before school, in small group and on-to-one instruction.</p> <p>WRITE Source-Consists of standards based resources for the ELA Core Curriculum. An in depth writing program which will be implemented in every Literacy Classroom. It will be delivered in whole class, small group and one on one conferencing. Grade specific class sets will be used to ensure that each student is learning at their own level while still receiving the necessary skills and instruction needed to both meet and exceed the NYS standards.</p> <p>Achieve 3000-differentiated instructional technology program. Will be utilized during class instructional time and for AIS reading pull out.</p> <p>Additional AIS delivery of services: Afterschool tutorials, Saturday Academy, Holiday Academy.</p>
Mathematics:	<p>COACH-Leveled math reinforcement series that mirrors the NYS ELA exam. Includes skill study, pre/post test and additional assessments needed to monitor student progress. It will be utilized before school, in small group and on-to-one instruction.</p> <p>Additional AIS delivery of services: Afterschool tutorials, Saturday Academy, Holiday Academy.</p>
Science:	<p>AIS delivery of services: Afterschool tutorials, Saturday Academy, Holiday Academy.</p>
Social Studies:	<p>AIS delivery of services: Afterschool tutorials, Saturday Academy, Holiday Academy.</p>
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	<p>One on one counseling Family counseling Small Group counseling Classroom visits Peer Mediation Family Counseling</p>

At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	One on one counseling Family counseling Small Group counseling Classroom visits Peer Mediation Family Counseling
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	One on one counseling Family counseling Small Group counseling Classroom visits Peer Mediation Family Counseling
At-risk Health-related Services:	One on one counseling Family counseling Small Group counseling Classroom visits Family Counseling NYU Child Study Center Asthma Pilot Project

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) – Attach a copy of your school's current year (2007-2008) LAP to this CEP.

Part B: CR Part 154 (A-6) Bilingual/ESL Program Description

Type of Program: ___Bilingual ___X___ESL ___ Both **Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08: 41**

I. Instructional Program (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc):
I.S. 78 is a traditional New York City middle school located in the Bergen Beach community of Brooklyn. The present student population is 20% Caucasian, 68% African-American, 9% Hispanic, and 3% Asian and others. The student population is roughly 1160 and is heterogeneously grouped within each grade, with the exception of the gifted programs. A pedagogical staff of 100 teachers supports the total population.

IS 78 offers a pullout ESL program consisting of 45 English Language Learners. Of the total number of students, 18 are at the advanced stage of English language development, 18 are at the intermediate stage and 14 are at the beginning stage of English language development. More specifically, of the 6th graders, 5 are beginners, 5 are intermediate, and 6 are advanced level ELLs. In the 7th grade, there are 5 beginners, 4 intermediate and 6 advanced level ELLs. Finally, the 8th grade is comprised of 3 beginners, 9 intermediate and 2 advanced level ELLs. All ELLs are mandated by the state to receive ESL services as per part 154. Students' level of English language proficiency is based upon their performance on the LAB-R or NYSESLAT. Those designated as beginner or intermediate level ELLs are entitled to 360 minutes or 8 45minute periods of ESL per week. Advanced level ELLs are entitled to 180 minutes of 4 45 minute periods of ESL per week.

I.S. 78's ESL program features small group instruction and consists of 5 different classes. Our ELLs hail from a myriad of countries and speak many different languages including French, Creole, Spanish, Ukrainian, Arabic, and Urdu.

Instruction is in English and is aimed at improving each student's ability in the 4 modalities of English language proficiency, including reading, writing, speaking and listening. Prior knowledge, past experiences and cultural backgrounds are incorporated into classroom activities. ELLs are immersed in a print rich environment where comprehension, participation and higher order thinking skills are emphasized through the use of a wide variety of teaching methods and tasks including graphic organizers, response groups, and writing workshops. ESL instruction is provided by a fully certified ESL teacher who works collaboratively with content area teachers so as to better meet the needs of our ELLs.

Instruction of ELLs is cognitively demanding but will be scaffolded so as to ensure student success. Learning will be organized into topics and themes so that students can build upon previous learning of vocabulary and grammatical structures as well as academic concepts and skills. Our students often work in groups, which affords them the opportunity to see other learners' styles of problem solving while developing an appreciation for each person's contribution to the group. Cooperative learning allows ELLs to work with advanced and native English speakers, which affords them the opportunity to hear and produce English and

negotiate its meaning with others, small group instruction creates a relaxed learning environment which encourages participation and inhibits any feelings of trepidation or anxiety. We also seek to maintain the continued enhancement of an appreciation of the cultural diversity existent in an ESL classroom.

II. Parent/community involvement:

Given I.S. 78's relatively high number of ELL's, forging a strong partnership between school and home is vital to nurturing the academic and social growth of our students. Strong parental involvement is one factor that research has shown time and time again to have positive effects on academic achievement and the overall culture of a school. Parental involvement supports, encourages and provides opportunities for parents and educators to work together in educating students. Maintaining such a relationship is of utmost significance at I.S. 78. An explicit open door policy will be established so that parents always know they are welcome. Written information about classroom assignments, goals, assessments and school events and notices will be translated and parents will be encouraged to reply. Several parent conferences and orientations will be arranged each year so that parents can tour the school, meet teachers, see student work and progress first hand, and obtain a better understanding of the school's expectations and standards. The parent coordinator will be available at these conferences to answer questions and provide further information regarding school matters. Visuals and literature will be provided in a myriad of languages at these meeting so as to ensure understanding. Tentative dates for these meetings include the first weeks of September, December, March and May. Finally, calls will be made periodically to parents to further their involvement in school matters.

III. Project Jump Start (Programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL students):

Newly enrolled ELL's will be identified upon entry in September. The ESL instructor will seek to make their transition into an English speaking school system as smooth as possible. It must be recognized that middle school can at times be difficult for anyone. ELL's face even more obstacles due to the language barrier. I.S. 78 will seek to help these students through a variety of activities. Newcomers will have opportunities to tour the school, meet teachers and interact with other ELL's. A "buddy" system will be in place so that more experienced ELL's can help the newcomers get acclimated to the new school and culture. Both students and parents will be invited to attend orientations where information will be provided in their home language and any questions or concerns can be addressed.

IV. Staff Development (2008-2009 activities):

Meaningful professional development will be provided to all teachers throughout the year by an Asst. Principal, a Literacy Coach and a licensed ESL instructor. ICI, our SSO will also provide offsite professional development. Professional development blocks will be used to pass on ESL teaching strategies, identification procedures, and testing modifications. Model lessons, common planning and alternate assessment methods will be thoroughly explored. Professional development sessions will be tentatively scheduled for professional days including Election Day and Brooklyn/ Queens Day. Common prep time will also be utilized for further training and collaboration and strategy sharing. Teachers will be encouraged to take part in QTEI training, NYSABE, and the annual TESOL Conference.

Number of LEP Students Identified and Served in Each School Building by Type of Program in 2007-08 A-2

School District: 22

Type of Program: ESL Bilingual Both
 (Check one only)

School Building: IS 78, Roy H. Mann

(Complete this form for each school building with LEP students in grades K-6 during 2007-08)

Language	K			Grade 1			Grade 2			Grade 3			Grade 4			Grade 5			Grade 6		
	Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served	
		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL
Arabic (ARB)																			2		X
Bengali (BEN)																					
Bosnian (BOS)																					
Chinese (CMN)																			1		X
French (FRA)																					
H. Creole (HAT)																			2		X
Hindi (HIN)																					
Japanese (JPN)																					
Korean (KOR)																					
Polish (POL)																					
Portuguese (POR)																					
Russian (RUS)																			1		X
Spanish (SPA)																			1		X
Vietnamese (VIE)																					
SUB TOTALS →																			7		

Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Total Number of LEP students in grades K-6 **Identified** in the Building in **2007-08**
 (Do not include long-term LEPs)

7

Total Number of LEP students in grades K-6 **Served** in the Building in **2007-08**
 (Do not include long-term LEPs)

Bilingual

7
ESL

Number of LEP Students Identified and Served in Each School Building by Type of Program in 2007-08 **A-2(a)**

School District: 22

School Building: IS 78 Roy H. Mann

(Complete this form for each school building with LEP students in grades 7-12 and Special Education during 2007-08)

Language	Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade 9			Grade 10			Grade 11			Grade 12			Special Education(K-12)		
	Identi fied	Served		Identi fied	Served		Identi fied	Served		Identi fied	Served		Identi Fied	Served		Identi fied	Served		Identi fied	Served	
		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL
Arabic (ARB)	5		X	2		X															
Bengali (BEN)																					
Bosnian (BOS)																					
Chinese (CMN)																					
French (FRA)																					
H. Creole (HAT)	10		X	6		X															
Hindi (HIN)																					
Japanese (JPN)																					
Korean (KOR)																					
Polish (POL)																					
Portuguese (POR)																					
Russian (RUS)																					
Spanish (SPA)	7		X	4		X															
Vietnamese (VIE)																					
SUB TOTALS →	22			12																	

Total Number of LEP students **Identified** in the Building in 2007-08
(Do not include long-term LEPs)

41

Total Number of LEP students **Served** in the Building in 2007-08
(Do not include long-term LEPs)

Bilingual

41

ESL

Part C: Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students – School Year 2008-2009

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) 6,7,8 _____ **Number of Students to be Served:** 41 **LEP** _____ **Non-LEP**

Number of Teachers 1 **Other Staff (Specify):** **Guidance Counselor/Literacy Coach/Asst. Principal**

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

Language Instruction Program – Language instruction education programs funded under Title III, Part A, of NCLB, must help LEP students attain English proficiency while meeting State academic achievement standards. They may use both English and the student's native language and may include the participation of English proficient students (i.e., Two Way Bilingual Education/Dual Language program.) Programs implemented under Title III, Part A, may not supplant programs required under CR Part 154. In the space provided below, describe the school's language instruction program for limited English proficient (LEP) students. The description must include: type of program/activities; number of students to be served; grade level(s); language(s) of instruction; rationale for the selection of program/activities; times per day/week; program duration; and service provider and qualifications.

I.S. 78's LAP team is comprised of Ms. Marino, Principal, Mr. Puleo, ESL Teacher, Ms. Gottesman, Literacy Coach, Ms. D'Aleo, Parent Coordinator, Ms. Gold, Assistant Principal, and Mr. Anoyke, Guidance Counselor.

I.S. 78 offers a pullout ESL program consisting of 41 English language learners. Of the total number of students, 15 are at the advanced stage of English language development, 8 are at the intermediate stage of English language development, and 18 are at the beginning stage of English language development. More specifically, of the 6th graders, 1 is a beginner, 1 is intermediate, and 5 are advanced level ELLs. In the 7th grade there are 13 beginners, 5 intermediate and 4 advanced level ELLs. Finally, the 8th grade is comprised of 4 beginners, 7 intermediate, and 6 are advanced level ELLs.

All entitled ELLs are mandated by the state to receive ESL services as per part 154. Students' level of English language proficiency will be based upon their performance on the LAB-R or NYSESLAT. Those designated as beginner or intermediate level ELLs are entitled to 360 minutes or eight 45 minute periods of ESL per week. Those deemed proficient are no longer entitled to receive ESL series. Our ELLs hail from a myriad of countries and speak many different languages, including Creole, French, Spanish, Ukranian, Arabic, and Urdu. Trends in parent choice letters indicate that the majority of parents select ESL for their children.

Test results and classroom performance indicate that listening and speaking are the strongest modalities. Test results and classroom performance also indicate that reading and writing are the weakest modalities. Instruction will be aimed at addressing each ELLs individualized needs, prior knowledge, past experiences and cultural background will be incorporated into classroom activities. ELLs will be immersed in a print-rich

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

environment, where comprehension, participation, and higher order thinking skills will be emphasized through the use of a wide variety of teaching methods and tasks, including graphic organizers, response groups and writing workshops. Instruction will be provided by a fully certified teacher of English Language Learners, who will work collaboratively with content area teachers so as to better meet the needs of our ELL students.

Instruction of ELL (English Language Learners) students will be cognitively demanding, but will be scaffolded so as to ensure student success. Learning will be organized into topics and themes so that students can build upon previous learning of vocabulary and grammatical structures as well as academic concepts and skills. Our students will work in groups, which affords them the opportunity to see other learners' styles of problem solving while developing an appreciation for each person's contribution to the group. Advanced level ELLs will be grouped with beginner and intermediate level learners so that they may help their peers improve their English proficiency. In working with each other, advanced level ELLs can reinforce the material within themselves while helping their peers improve their English proficiency. Cooperative grouping allows ELLs to work with native English speakers, which affords them the opportunity to hear and produce English and negotiate its meaning with others. Laptops have also been purchased to aid in our ELL students' development of the English language. Programs and Websites, including Better-English and ESLCAF6 will be explored to supplement and enhance lessons.

Long term ELL students will be provided with a high level of instruction aimed at getting them proficient in the four modalities of the English language – reading, writing, speaking and listening. The ESL teacher will also work diligently with the content area teachers so that instruction is aligned, and will therefore better prepare our students to succeed in all academic areas.

Newcomers will also be provided with instruction aimed at developing their reading, writing, listening and speaking skills. They will be working together and with more advanced level ELLs in a small group setting that will utilize a myriad of instructional materials. These materials include a wide variety of books, manipulatives, flash cards posters, audio tapes and games designed to improve their English proficiency. Though all instruction will be in English, students may use their native language to help each other and negotiate the meanings of words or concepts. Letters sent home to parents will also be available in a variety of languages so as to keep them informed and fully involved in their children's education.

Students in need of additional or alternative services such as special education will be referred to the School Based Support Team for further evaluation. Students identified as SIFE will receive the additional support they need so that they may perform at grade level. All of our ELLs are encouraged to take part in our after-school ESL program.

Professional Development Program – Describe the school's professional development program for teachers and other staff responsible for the delivery of instruction and services to limited English proficient students.

Meaningful professional development will be provided to all teachers by the Asst. Principal, the Literacy Coach and a licensed ESL instructor. Offsite professional development will be provided by ICI, our school support organization. Instruction will include methods aimed to better equip

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

teachers to help our ELL students to succeed. Professional development blocks will be used to pass on ESL teaching strategies, identification procedures, and testing modifications. Model lessons, common planning, and alternate assessment methods will also be thoroughly explored. Trips will be scheduled to provide alternate settings for our ELL students to further develop their language skills learned in the classroom and enrich their curriculum and cultural experiences. Professional development will be provided, and a wide variety of teaching methods will be thoroughly explored. Professional development will be provided throughout the duration of the school year so that all teachers will be better equipped meet the needs of our ELL students. Teachers will collaborate and work together to create and implement an effective instructional, monitoring and assessment system for our students.

I.S. 78's LAP committee will work together to provide our ELL students with a relaxed and nurturing learning environment with small group settings where our ELLs will be provided with the individualized instruction they need to improve their English proficiency. We will also seek to maintain the continued enhancement of an appreciation of the cultural diversity existent in an ESL classroom as well as all classrooms within our school.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

**Title III LEP Program
School Building Budget Summary**

Allocation:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	\$3500.	3 hours per week for 27 weeks=81 hours
Purchased services such as curriculum and	\$3500.	Books

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

staff development contracts		
Supplies and materials	\$2456.	General supplies
Travel		
Other	\$5544.	5 laptopsx\$1108=\$5544.
TOTAL	\$15,000.	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

Goal: To communicate whenever feasible with non-English speaking parents in their home language in order to support shared parent-school accountability, parent access to information about their children's educational options, and parents' capacity to improve their children's achievement.

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

1. Describe the data and methodologies used to assess your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs to ensure that all parents are provided with appropriate and timely information in a language they can understand.

When a child is admitted to the school the parent is interviewed by the Guidance counselor and also fills out the Native Language form. At that time the parent is asked if they wish any school documents to be sent home in a language other than English. If so, their request is given to the ELL Coordinator who is responsible for ensuring that the parent receives information given in the translated version.

2. Summarize the major findings of your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs. Describe how the findings were reported to the school community.

In the 2007-2008 school year no parent requested translated documents. At the start of the 2008-2009 school year, information was gathered at parent orientation to determine if parents requested translated documents. We continually offer this option to parents and assess their needs via Parent Newsletters, letters home, the Parent Message board in the lobby and at individual conferences.

Part B: Strategies and Activities

1. Describe the written translation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Include procedures to ensure timely provision of translated documents to parents determined to be in need of language assistance services.

Indicate whether written translation services will be provided by an outside vendor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

The school will make all parent notifications available in translated form as requested by parents at the student intake conference. We will utilize an in house teacher to interpret for Spanish, French and Haitian Creole (our majority languages). For other languages we will utilize the DOE online documents and also utilize a vendor if needed. To ensure a timely turnaround we will have a dedicated staff member (the Parent Coordinator) to oversee this process.

2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Indicate whether oral interpretation services will be provided by an outside contractor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

We utilize in school teacher translators for Spanish, French and Haitian Creole on an immediate basis. Parent volunteers are available for Russian, Chinese and Hebrew.

3. Describe how the school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services. Note: The full text of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 (Translations) is available via the following link: <http://docs.nycenet.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-151/A-663%20Translation%203-27-06%20.pdf>.

The Parent Bill of Rights will be provided to all parents on Open School Day and Evening. A translation sign is posted in the main lobby in a conspicuous location. The School Safety Plan contains procedures for ensuring that all parents in need of language assisted services are not prevented from reaching the school's administrative offices solely due to language barriers.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

- All Title I schools must address requirements in Part A and Part B of this appendix.
- Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) schools must complete Part C of this appendix.
- Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) schools must complete Part D of this appendix.

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

1. Enter the anticipated Title I allocation for the school for 2008-2009_____
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program_____
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified_____
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year_____
5. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2007-2008 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year.

Part B: TITLE I SCHOOL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY & SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT

1. School Parental Involvement Policy – Attach a copy of the school’s Parent Involvement Policy.

Explanation: In support of strengthening student academic achievement, each school that receives Title I, Part A funds must develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents of participating children a written parental involvement policy that contains information required by section 1118(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The policy establishes the school's expectations for parental involvement and describes how the school will implement a number of specific parental involvement activities. It is **strongly recommended** that schools, in consultation with parents, use a sample template as a framework for the information to be included in their parental involvement policy. The template is available in the eight major languages on the NYCDOE website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Parents/NewsInformation/TitleIPIG.htm>. Schools, in consultation with parents, are encouraged to include other relevant and agreed upon activities and actions as well that will support effective parental involvement and strengthen student academic achievement. The school parent involvement policy must be provided and disseminated in the major languages spoken by the majority of parents in the school. For additional information, please refer to the 2008-09 Title I Parent Involvement Guidelines available at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

2. School-Parent Compact - Attach a copy of the school's Parent Involvement Policy.

Explanation: Each school receiving funds under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) must develop a written school-parent compact jointly with parents for all children participating in Title I, Part A activities, services, and programs. That compact is part of the school's written parental involvement policy developed by the school and parents under section 1118(b) of the ESEA. The compact must outline how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high standards. It is **strongly recommended** that schools and parents use the sample template which is available in the eight major languages on the NYCDOE website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Parents/NewsInformation/TitleIPIG.htm> as a framework for the information to be included in the compact. Schools and parents, in consultation with students, are encouraged to include other relevant and agreed upon activities and actions as well that will support effective parental involvement and strengthen student academic achievement. The school-parent compact must be provided and disseminated in the major languages spoken by the majority of parents in the school. For additional information, please refer to the 2008-09 Title I Parent Involvement Guidelines available at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

Directions: Describe how the school will implement the following components of a Schoolwide Program as required under NCLB. **Note:** If a required component is already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
 - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
 - o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.
8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.
10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

Directions: Describe how the school will implement the following components of a Title I Targeted Assistance Program as required under NCLB. Note: If a required component is already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

1. Use program resources to help participating children meet the State standards.

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

2. Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning.
3. Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that:
 - a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;
 - b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
 - c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;
4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;
5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;
6. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff;
7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and
8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT (SINI) AND SCHOOLS REQUIRING ACADEMIC PROGRESS (SRAP)

This appendix must be completed by all Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 and Year 2, Title I Corrective Action (CA) Schools, NCLB Planning for Restructuring Schools (PFR), NCLB Restructured, Schools, Schools Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP), and SURR schools that have also been identified as SINI or SRAP.

NCLB/SED Status: _____ **SURR¹ Phase/Group (If applicable):** _____

Part A: For All School Improvement Schools (SINI and SRAP)

1. For each area of school improvement identification (indicated on your pre-populated School Data Profile, downloadable from the NYCDOE website at <http://www.schools.nyc.gov>), describe the school's findings of the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified.

The school is SRAP, Year 5 for ELA in the subgroup Students with Disabilities. The school did not meet Criterion in Science for Black or African American students and Students with Disabilities

Of the 164 students identified with IEP's 156 were tested using the New York State ELA exam. Of those tested 8.3% scored level 1 and 78.2% scored level 2. This is equivalent to 86.5% scoring below grade level. 13.5% scored at grade level attained a performance level of 3. Two of the level 3's were in grade 8; 13 were in grade 6 with the balance of 6 in grade 7. This tends to follow the trend of middle school performance. Of the 36 students identified as ELL's, 26 were tested using the New York State ELA exams. Of those tested 15.4% scored level 1 and 76.9% scored level 2. Therefore 92.3% was below grade level. Only 7.7% of the tested population scored at grade level (performance level 3).

The school is SRAP, Year 3 for Mathematics in the subgroup Students with Disabilities. The school did not meet Criterion in Science for Black or African American students and Students with Disabilities

Of the 164 students identified with IEP's 157 were tested using the New York State Mathematics exams. Of those tested 20.4% scores a performance level of 1 and 53.5% scored a performance level of 2. This gave us 73.9% of the IEP's students performing below grade level. 24.8% of those tested scored level 3 and the 1.3% scored level 4. Those students with IEP's scoring at or above the grade level was 26.1%. Of those students scoring level 15.6% scored a raw score at or below 500. 21.9% of the level ones are also identified with Limited English Proficiency.

2. Describe the focused intervention(s) the school will implement to support improved achievement in the grade and subject areas for which the school was identified. Be sure to include strategies to address the needs of all disaggregated groups that failed to meet the AMO, Safe Harbor, and/or 95% participation rate requirement. Note: If this question was already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found. **See Page 14-16**

Part B: For Title I Schools that Have Been Identified for School Improvement (SINI)

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified.
 - (a) Provide the following information: 2008-09 anticipated Title I allocation = \$_____ ; 10% of Title I allocation = \$_____.
 - (b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement.
2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school's strategy for providing high-quality professional development.
3. Describe how the school will notify parents about the school's identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.

APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURR).

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

SURR Group/Phase: _____ **Year of Identification:** _____ **Deadline Year:** _____

Part A: SURR Review Team Recommendations – On the chart below, indicate the categorized recommendations for improvement resulting from the SED Registration Review Visit/Report and all external review and monitoring visits since the school was first identified as a SURR. Indicate the specific actions the school has taken, or will take, to address each of the recommendations.

Type of Review or Monitoring Visit (Include agency & dates of visits)	Review Team Categorized Recommendations (e.g., Administrative Leadership, Professional Development, Special Education, etc.)	Actions the school has taken, or plans to take, to address review team recommendations

**APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL-LEVEL REFLECTION AND RESPONSE TO SYSTEM-WIDE IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS FROM
AUDITS OF THE WRITTEN, TESTED, AND TAUGHT CURRICULUM IN ELA AND MATHEMATICS**

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

From 2006 to 2008, the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) and the New York State Education Department (NYSED) commissioned an “audit of the written, tested, and taught curriculum” to fulfill an accountability requirement of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act for districts identified for “corrective action.” The focus of the audit was on the English language arts (ELA) and mathematics curricula for all students, including students with disabilities (SWDs) and English language learners (ELLs). The audit examined the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment as well as other key areas—such as professional development and school and district supports—through multiple lenses of data collection and analysis. The utilized process was a collaborative one, intended not to find fault but to generate findings in concert with school and district constituency representatives to identify and overcome barriers to student success. As such, the audit findings are not an end in themselves but will facilitate important conversations at (and between) the central, SSO, and school levels in order to identify and address potential gaps in ELA and math curriculum and instructional programs and ensure alignment with the state standards and assessments.

Directions: Schools are expected to reflect on the seven (7) key findings of the “audit of the written, tested, and taught curriculum” outlined below, and respond to the applicable questions that follow each section.

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

Overall: There was limited evidence found to indicate that the ELA and mathematics curricula in use are fully aligned to state standards. Although New York City is a standards-based system, teachers do not have the tools they need to provide standards-based instruction to all students at all levels, particularly ELLs. There is a lack of understanding across teachers, schools, and audited districts regarding what students should understand and be able to do at each level in ELA and mathematics.

1A. English Language Arts

Background

A curriculum that is in alignment will present the content to be taught (as outlined by the state standards), with links to the following: an array of resources from which teachers may choose in teaching this content; a pacing calendar and/or suggested timeframe for covering the curriculum material; a description of expectations for both the teacher’s role and the student level of cognitive demand to be exhibited; and a defined set of student outcomes—that is, what the student should know and be able to do as a result of having mastered this curriculum. The New York State ELA Standards identify seven different areas of reading (decoding, word recognition, print awareness, fluency, background knowledge and vocabulary, comprehension, and motivation to read) and five different areas of writing (spelling, handwriting, text production, composition, motivation to write) that are addressed to different degrees across grade levels. Although listening and speaking are addressed within the New York State ELA Standards, they are not further subdivided into topic areas. A written curriculum missing literacy competencies

or performance indicators at any grade level will impact the alignment of the curriculum to state standards. A written curriculum that does not address the areas in reading identified by the state standards will also impact vertical and horizontal alignment within and between schools by creating gaps in the Grades K–12 curriculum. *Vertical alignment* is defined as the literacy knowledge addressed at a grade level that builds upon and extends learning from the previous grade level, whereas *horizontal alignment* refers to agreement between what is taught by teachers addressing a common subject across a single grade level.

ELA Alignment Issues:

- **Gaps in the Written Curriculum.** Data show that the written curriculum in use by many schools is not aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required. All reviewed curricula had gaps relative to the New York State ELA standards. The fewest gaps were found at Grade 2, but the gaps increased as the grade levels increased. Interviewed staff in a number of the schools that were audited reported less consistent and effective curriculum and instruction at the secondary level. These data further indicated that curricula were not adequately articulated—less articulated in secondary than elementary schools.
- **Curriculum Maps.** The curriculum alignment analyses noted that although a number of curriculum maps had been developed, the mapping has been done at a topical level only and does not drill down to an expected level of cognitive demand that will indicate to teachers what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. These curriculum maps addressed only content topics—not skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, or student outcomes to be attained.
- **Taught Curriculum.** The *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* (SEC)² data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.
- **English Language Learners**

² To examine whether instruction was aligned to the New York state standards and assessments, teachers in the district completed the *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* (SEC). Based on two decades of research funded by the National Science Foundation, the SEC are designed to facilitate the comparison of enacted (taught) curriculum to standards (intended) and assessed curriculum (state tests), using teachers' self-assessments. The data for each teacher consist of more than 500 responses. The disciplinary topic by cognitive-level matrix is presented in graphic form, which creates a common language for comparison and a common metric to maintain comparison objectivity.

Multiple data sources indicate that there is a great deal of variation in the curriculum and instruction that ELL students receive, by grade level, by type of ELL program or general education program, and by district. For example, some of the best instruction observed by site visitors was found in ELL program classrooms at the elementary level, which contrasted sharply with the generally lower quality of ELL program instruction at the secondary level. The auditors found that planning for ELL education at the city and even district levels did not percolate down to the school and teacher levels. Consequently, planning for ELL education in the audited schools generally occurred at the level of individual teachers or ELL program staff, contributing to the variations in curriculum and instruction observed across ELL and general education programs. Further, there is a general lack of awareness of the New York State Learning Standards for ESL.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 1A:

1A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. The school will utilize the following strategies to assess whether this finding is relevant to our school's educational program: Feedback on the Quality Review, formal and informal classroom Observations, Monthly Learning Walkthroughs by the school's administrators and Coaches, Teacher Study Groups, Monthly teacher surveys, Yearly survey of all ELA and ELL materials, textbooks, novels, resources both print and online.

1A.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable **Not Applicable**

1A.3: Based on your response to Question 1A.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Evidence which dispels the relevance of this finding at our school:

The school retains a full time Asst. Principal for ELA/ELL and a Literacy Coach

The school retains a full time certified School Librarian

Use of Standards based curriculum in all ELA classes

Use of Skill of the Week to compliment the curriculum maps, also providing teachers with weekly strategies and resources

Use of Predictive and Interim Assessments, Data binders to track student outcomes

Use of 6 class novels a year in every ELA and ELL classroom which requires all teachers to formulate in depth activities in all strands

Use of Write Source writing programs in every ELA class

Use of online enrichment and differentiated learning systems in ELA and ELL.

1A.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

1B. Mathematics

Background

New York State assessments measure conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem solving. In the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, these are represented as *process strands* and *content strands*. These strands help to define what students should know and be able to do as a result of their engagement in the study of mathematics. The critical nature of the process strands in the teaching and learning of mathematics has been identified in the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, revised by NYS Board of Regents on March 15, 2005: The process strands (Problem Solving, Reasoning and Proof, Communication, Connections, and Representation) highlight ways of acquiring and using content knowledge. These process strands help to give meaning to mathematics and help students to see mathematics as a discipline rather than a set of isolated skills. Student engagement in mathematical content is accomplished through these process strands. Students will gain a better understanding of mathematics and have longer retention of mathematical knowledge as they solve problems, reason mathematically, prove mathematical relationships, participate in mathematical discourse, make mathematical connections, and model and represent mathematical ideas in a variety of ways. (University of the State of New York & New York State Education Department, 2005, p. 2) When curriculum guides lack precise reference to the indicators for the process strands, then explicit alignment of the curriculum to the process strands is left to the interpretation of the individual classroom teacher.

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

- A review of key district documents for mathematics shows substantial evidence that the primary mathematics instructional materials for Grades K–8 (*Everyday Mathematics* [K–5] and *Impact Mathematics* [6–8]) are aligned with the New York state *content strands* except for some gaps that appear at the middle school level in the areas of measurement and geometry and number sense and operations. The instructional materials that were available at the high school level during the time of the audits (New York City Math A and B [8–12]) were aligned with the 1999 standards but not with the newer 2005 standards. Furthermore, these documents show that there is a very weak alignment to the New York state *process strands* for mathematics at all grade levels.
- The SEC data for mathematics curriculum alignment (similar to Key Finding 1A for ELA), shows that there is a lack of depth in what is being taught in the mathematics classroom as compared to what is required by the state standards.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 1B:

1B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. The school will utilize the following strategies to assess whether this finding is relevant to our school's educational program: Feedback on the Quality Review, formal and informal classroom Observations, Monthly Learning Walkthroughs by the school's administrators and Coaches, Teacher Study Groups, Monthly teacher surveys, Yearly survey of all ELA and ELL materials, textbooks, novels, resources both print and online.

1B.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable Not Applicable

1B.3: Based on your response to Question 1B.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Classroom observations.

1B.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

The school began in 2007 to retain a full time Math Coach and continues to do so. The school relies on ICI, the selected SSO to supplement professional development for Math teachers.

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

Overall: Multiple data sources indicate that direct instruction and individual seatwork are the predominant instructional strategies used by teachers in audited districts; there is indication of limited use of best practices and research-based practices, including differentiated instruction. A number of schools in audited districts further evidenced a lack of student engagement in classrooms, particularly at the secondary level. These data also show that there is an intention to use research-based and best practices; yet according to the interviews, SEC, and classroom observations, there is limited evidence of implementation and monitoring of such practices. Interview data indicate that in audited districts, teachers indicate a need for more support focused on differentiation of instruction for all learners.

2A – ELA Instruction

Classroom observations in audited schools show that direct instruction was the dominant instructional orientation for ELA instruction in almost 62 percent of K–8 classrooms. (In direct instruction, the teacher may use lecture- or questioning-type format. It includes instances when the teacher explains a concept, reads to students, or guides students in practicing a concept.) Direct instruction also was observed either frequently or extensively in approximately 54 percent of the high school ELA classrooms visited. On a positive note, high academically focused class time (an estimate of the time spent engaged in educationally relevant activities) was observed frequently or extensively in more than 85 percent of K–8 classrooms visited, though this number fell slightly to just over 75 percent of classrooms at the high school level. Student engagement in ELA classes also was observed to be high (observed frequently or extensively) 71 percent of the time in Grades K–8, but this percentage shrank to 49 percent at the high school level. Finally, independent seatwork (students working on self-paced worksheets or individual assignments) was observed frequently or extensively in approximately 32 percent of the K–8 ELA classrooms visited and just over 34 percent of classrooms in high school.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 2A:

2A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. The school will utilize the following strategies to assess whether this finding is relevant to our school's educational program: Feedback on the Quality Review, formal and informal classroom Observations, Monthly Learning Walkthroughs by the school's administrators and Coaches,

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

Teacher Study Groups, Monthly teacher surveys, Yearly survey of all ELA and ELL materials, textbooks, novels, resources both print and online.

2A.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable Not Applicable

2A.3: Based on your response to Question 2A.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

- Classroom observations (formal and informal)
- Teacher Surveys
- Formal testing results

2A.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

- Supervision of the ELA program by a dedicated Asst. Principal and full time Literacy Coach
- Identify teachers and provide in need of in depth professional development on differentiated instruction including in house study groups, intervisitations, lunch and learns and demonstration lessons.
- Identify and provide teachers with technology skills for instructional practice
- Implementation of technology based differentiated learning resources ,Achieve 3000

2B – Mathematics Instruction

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (SOM³) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 2B:

³ To examine instruction in the classrooms, the School Observation Measure (SOM) was used to capture classroom observation data for the district audit. The SOM was developed by the Center for Research in Educational Policy at the University of Memphis. The SOM groups 24 research based classroom strategies into six categories: (1) instructional orientation, (2) classroom organization, (3) instructional strategies, (4) student activities, (5) technology use, and (6) assessment. Two to seven key classroom strategies are identified within each category for a total of 24 strategies that observers look for in the classroom. These 24 strategies were selected to address national teaching standards

2B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

The school will utilize the following strategies to assess whether this finding is relevant to our school's educational program: Feedback on the Quality Review, formal and informal classroom Observations, Monthly Learning Walkthroughs by the school's administrators and Coaches, Teacher Study Groups, Monthly teacher surveys, Yearly survey of all ELA and ELL materials, textbooks, novels, resources both print and online.

2B.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable **Not Applicable**

2B.3: Based on your response to Question 2B.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Classroom observations (formal and informal)

Quality Review

Teacher Surveys

Technology Assessments of use in Classrooms

2B.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

In a number of audited schools, respondents stated that teacher turnover was high, with schools accommodating a relatively high percentage of new and transfer teachers each year.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

3.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

We review information provided in the NYS Report Card and the NYC DOE Accountability snapshot

We review the School Organization Chart and compare it to prior years.

These documents indicate that there is a rise in teachers teaching in this school for 2 or more years over the past 3 years.

3.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable Not Applicable

3.3: Based on your response to Question 3.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program? As we see that more teachers are teaching for more than 2 years in our school we find this is relevant to the stability in the school's educational program. In particular, the safety data shows improvements since we have more teachers who are not new to the school. Staff attendance and student is also impacted in a more positive way since stability and regular routines are in place to support better attendance.

3.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Interview data (from classroom teachers and principals) indicate that professional development opportunities regarding curriculum, instruction, and monitoring progress for ELLs are being offered by the districts, however, they are not reaching a large audience. Many teachers interviewed did not believe such professional development was available to them. A number of district administrators interviewed mentioned the presence of QTEL (Quality Teaching for English Learners) training, but few classroom teachers seemed aware of this program. Although city, district and some school-based policies (e.g., Language Allocation Policy) and plans for ELL instruction do exist, rarely were they effectively communicated to teachers through professional development and other avenues.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

4.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. In 2007-07 school year we compiled an in-house survey of teacher professional development needs. WE found that most teachers desired more training in ELL and we provided our own in-house workshops since almost all of the district offerings were costly and we could not pay for these services. .

4.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable Not Applicable

4.3: Based on your response to Question 4.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

This finding is relevant to our school's educational program because we have 41 ELL students and our number grows each year in this population. Thus, all teachers must be prepared to teach these students using research based strategies that will jump start their progress.

4.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

Because we cannot pay for additional PD we are utilizing the services of our ELA/ELL Asst. Principal, the Literacy Coach, and the ELL teacher to turnkey trainings to the entire staff on the PD days in the Fall and Spring.

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

Data from district and teacher interviews indicate that there is very little specific monitoring of ELLs' academic progress or English language development. Testing data, where they do exist (for example, the NYSESLAT yearly scores) either are not reported to all teachers involved in instructing ELLs or are not provided in a timely manner useful for informing instruction. If and when testing data are provided, the data are not disaggregated by proficiency level of ELL student, students' time in the United States, or type of program in which the ELL is enrolled (i.e., ESL, TBE, Dual Language, or general education).

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

5.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. All teachers in our school receive information on the following: ELL's level of English Language Proficiency as determined by the NYSESLAT/Testing eligibility, exemptions, modifications/Program Model (ESL Pull out)/Periods of ESL per week/Modified ELL Promotional Criteria/Data on weakest and strongest modalities of English Language Development (specific to each student).

5.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable Not Applicable

5.3: Based on your response to Question 5.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Professional development and data dissemination is provided to all teachers by our Asst. Principal, Data Specialist and/or our licensed ESL teacher. ESL testing strategies, identification, procedures, testing modifications, model lessons, common planning and alternate assessment methods are thoroughly explored. Every September all teachers receive detailed reports which include each ELL's level of English Language Proficiency as well as the amount of units of ESL that they are entitled to each week as per Part 154. Through these methods our teachers are made fully aware of all the facets of our ELLs' English language development.

5.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

While the DOE and individual schools have made a substantial investment in professional development for special and general education teachers, classroom observations, IEP reviews, and interviews indicate that many general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators do not yet have sufficient understanding of or capacity to fully implement the range and types of instructional

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

approaches that will help to increase access to the general education curriculum and improve student performance. Further, many general education teachers remain unfamiliar with the content of the IEPs of their students with disabilities, have a lack of familiarity with accommodations and modifications that would help support the students with disabilities in their classrooms, and are not knowledgeable regarding behavioral support plans for these students.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

6.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. We had a state audit to see if our General Ed. Teachers were reading IEP which proved very successful and we received a fully positive response on our work in this areas. We have done extensive work around ensuring that our General Ed. teachers can support our special needs population including classroom observations, one on one conferencing with teachers by the Asst. Principal of Special Ed, placement of a Special Ed. Coordinator and specialized PD for General Ed teachers to learn about differentiated instruction for mixed ability learners.

6.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable Not Applicable

6.3: Based on your response to Question 6.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

This finding is extremely relevant to our school's educational program since over 10% of our student population consists of special education students. Further, since the majority of our students are in CTT classes we must be certain that our general education teachers are well trained and equipped to meet the needs of these students.

6.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

Currently we are training all General Education teachers in the same areas that the Special Education teachers receive. We will continue to maintain the position of the Special Ed. Coordinator who can work with the Asst. Principal and continue to offer support to all teachers in the school. On Election Day we ran a full session on "How to Read an IEP" for all General Education teachers and we will continue a series of trainings this year.

KEY FINDING 7: INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS (IEPS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES)

Although IEPs clearly specify testing accommodations and/or modifications for students with disabilities, they do *not* consistently specify accommodations and/or modifications for the *classroom environment* (including instruction). Further, there appears to be lack of alignment between the goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria that are included in student IEPs and the content on which these students are assessed on grade-level state tests. Finally, IEP's do not regularly include behavioral plans—including behavioral goals and objectives—even for students with documented behavioral issues and concerns.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

UPDATED – MARCH 2009

7.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. This fall (2008) our Special Education Asst. Principal and Coordinator did an assessment with the School Support Team to ensure that every student with an IEP had a Behavioral Plan including goals and objectives. Likewise, all administrators and Coaches are now continually assessing classes to see whether or not the classroom environment (specifically instruction) is modified and differentiated.

7.2: Indicate your determination of whether this finding is, or is not, applicable to your school.

Applicable Not Applicable

7.3: Based on your response to Question 7.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Evidence that supports the relevance of this finding includes: Formal Classroom observations and Learning Walks by the Administrators, Individual conferencing with teachers and reviews of all IEP's and Behavioral Plans.

7.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

We have already begun the work of training all teachers in differentiated instruction and have included this as one of the major goals in our CEP. We have already begun the work of monitoring Behavioral Plans and supervision of the School Support Team in this effort.

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

This electronic version of the CEP Appendix 8 allows you to submit details about your proposed 2008-09 Contracts spending within the six eligible program areas.

1. This form must describe your preliminary plans to use the total amount of funds allocated to your school in the Excellence allocation category in Galaxy. If you do not know this amount, please refer to Galaxy.
2. The sum of the allocations you list in each program area must match the total amount allocated to you in G
3. Please provide all of the information requested for each of the program strategies to which you've allocated fund requirements.

This survey must be completed by Tuesday July 15 at 6pm.
Thank you!

Submit date: **Jul 23, 2008** Email address: **pmarino3@schools.nyc.gov**

Please provide the following information about your school. You must complete all of the fields on this page in or survey to be valid.

School DBN	22k078
School Name	Is 78/Roy H. Mann
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 264,262
Principal Name	Phyllis F. Marino
Principal Email	pmarino3@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7187634701

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to reduce class size?

- Yes
 No

How much do you plan to allocate for each of the following program strategies?

Creation of additional classrooms	
Reducing teacher-student ratio through team teaching strategies	\$ 73,829

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to reduce class size via the creation of additional classrooms?

- Yes
 No

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to reduce class size by reducing teacher-student ratios in existing (e.g., team teaching models, creation of additional CTT classes, etc.)?

- Yes

No

What grade(s), subject(s), and/or special populations are being targeted using C4E resources in school year 2008- existing classrooms will be targeted for school year 2008-09?

* If you plan to use C4E funds to target more than one grade, please fill out one row per grade.

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14

C4E Target #2: 8 - Math - Students with Disabilities - 18 - 1 - 17

* If you plan to target more than one special population in a single grade, please fill out a separate row for each su

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14

C4E Target #2: 6 - ELA- Students with Disabilities - 16 - 1 -14

* If you plan to target more than one subject area in a single grade, please fill out a separate row for each subject :

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14

C4E Target #2: 6 - Math - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14

	Targeted Grade	Targeted Subject	Targeted Population	Students per Teacher 2007-08	# Classrooms / Sections Targeted
C4E Target #1	6	Math	Students with Low Academic Achievement	33	1
C4E Target #2	7	Math	Students with Low Academic Achievement	33	1
C4E Target #3	7	English Language Arts	Students with Low Academic Achievement	33	1
C4E Target #4	8	English Language Arts	Students with Low Academic Achievement	33	1
C4E Target #5	7	All (ES only)	Students with Disabilities	33	1
C4E Target #6					

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to increase student time on task?

Yes

No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for teacher and principal quality initiatives?

Yes

No

How much do you plan to allocate for each of the following program strategies?

Programs to recruit/retain Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)

Professional mentoring for beginning teachers and principals

Instructional coaches for teachers

School leadership coaches for principals

\$ 190,428

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to support new or expanded programs or strategies to recruit or retain Qualified Teachers (HQT) (e.g., Lead Teacher program)?

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to support new or expanded professional mentoring for beginning and/or principals (consistent with SED mentor-teacher certification requirements and limited to 1st and 2nd years teacher/principal assignment)?

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for new or expanded programs offering instructional coaching for appropriately certified coaches or highly qualified teachers providing support in content areas needed to attain learning standards)?

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

The school will utilize a Math Coach and a Literacy Coach. Coaches will provide teachers with individualized and small group trainings, utilization, differentiated instruction, core curriculum planning and instruction. Coaches will model and provide model instruction. Coaches on the Inquiry team and head up this work on a school wide level. Coaches will continue teacher training around ACUITY, SCANTRON and iM that teachers have the capacity to utilize these tools drive instruction and plan academic interventions.

Please indicate the student population(s) you intend to target via this initiative.

- English Language Learners
- Students with Disabilities
- Students in Poverty
- Students with Low Academic Achievement / at Risk of Not Graduating

Is the program described above a first-time implementation of the program/strategy, or an expansion of an existing program/strategy?

- New implementation
- Program Expansion

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for new or expanded programs offering coaching for principals (e.g., appropriately certified school leadership coaches, with records of demonstrated success, providing instructional development across all curriculum areas)?

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for middle and high school restructuring efforts?

- Yes

No

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to implement a new full-day pre-kindergarten program, or to expand a pre-kindergarten program at the school?

Yes

No

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to expand and/or replicate a model instructional program for English Learners (ELLs)?

Yes

No