



**P.S. 196**

**2008-2009**

**SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN**  
**(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 14K196**

**ADDRESS: 207 BUSHWICK AVENUE, BROOKLYN, NY 11206**

**TELEPHONE: (718) 497-0139**

**FAX: (718) 628-5134**

## 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 (SURR).**

**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: CONTRACT FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2008-09**

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

**SCHOOL NUMBER:** Public School 196K **SCHOOL NAME:** The Ten Eyck School

**DISTRICT:** 14 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** CLSO #1 Ada Orlando

**SCHOOL ADDRESS:** 207 Bushwick Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11206

**SCHOOL TELEPHONE:** 718-497-0139 **FAX:** 718-628-5134

**SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON:** Deborah Casey **EMAIL ADDRESS:** DCasey2@schools.nyc.gov

<b><u>POSITION/TITLE</u></b>	<b><u>PRINT/TYPE NAME</u></b>
<b>SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CO-CHAIRPERSONS</b>	<u>Deborah Casey</u> <u>Amanda Debel</u>
<b>PRINCIPAL</b>	<u>Janine Colon</u>
<b>UFT CHAPTER LEADER</b>	<u>Maryann Spagnoli</u>
<b>PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT</b>	<u>Tamara Bota</u>
<b>STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE</b> <i>(Required for high schools)</i>	<u></u>
<b>COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT</b>	<u>James Quail</u>

**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
Janine Colon	*Principal or Designee	
Maryann Spagnoli	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Tamara Bota	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Maria Rodriguez	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Maribel Rios	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative, if applicable	

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.

---

#### Our Vision

We see our school as a community, where all members, students, staff, and parents, support each other, address, accept, and meet the needs of individuals, and create an atmosphere where learning, creativity, and participation take place. The members of our community will be learners who are responsible, flexible, adaptable to change, accountable, and active participants in the school, community and society. They will have long term goals, high self-esteem, respect for themselves and for others. The members will develop decision-making skills, critical thinking skills, and effective communication skills.

#### Our Mission

The community of The Ten Eyck School/Public School 196 is committed to working towards the enhancement of our standards-driven instructional program, creating high levels of academic excellence for all of our students in each of the disciplines.

We will continue to provide a safe environment that empowers all children, including English language learners and students with special needs, to experience greater success and confidence in themselves, allowing them to grow socially, emotionally, and academically into well-rounded, productive citizens.

Our students will attain these goals through the collaboration of school, home, and community. Through creative and comprehensive strategies of instruction, our students of The Ten Eyck School/Public School 196 will become life-long learners prepared for the future.

Last year we implemented the Harcourt Story Town Reading Program. This year we have begun to implement the writing component. The program provides materials and instruction to differentiate and target students on every level while emphasizing test taking strategies.

This year we also implemented Kaplan Spellread, an intensive reading program, as part of our AIS Program that targets our most struggling readers in grades 2 & 3.

Our teachers have received Professional Development in data driven instruction to improve their skills in collecting, analyzing and assessing data in ELA and math to drive their instruction.

We are continuing to offer Enrichment clubs to students in grades 3 – 5. Our enrichment clubs offer opportunities in School Leadership, chorus, cooking, chess, yoga, knitting, arts and crafts, sports and photography.

We also have full time music and art teacher to offer a well rounded curriculum.

We are in our 3<sup>rd</sup> year of two grants for our ELL population. Arts Connection provides Dance/Theater to our ELL students to strengthen and build vocabulary. Family Literacy from CUE provides ESL

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

classes to our parents and homework help for their children. CUE also provides science coaching for our 4<sup>th</sup> grade students and teachers.

We are proud of our successes and accomplishments.

## 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					
<b>School Name:</b>	P.S. 196K				
<b>District:</b>	14	<b>DBN #:</b>	14k196	<b>School BEDS Code #:</b>	331400010196

DEMOGRAPHICS									
<b>Grades Served in 2008-09:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec.		
<b>Enrollment:</b>				<b>Attendance:</b>					
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)	2006	2007	2008		
Pre-K	18	42	51		91%	92%	TBD		
Kindergarten	41	38	54						
Grade 1	55	51	70	<b>Student Mobility:</b>					
Grade 2	68	55	69	(% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	44	55	73		TBD	TBD	TBD		
Grade 4	67	39	62						
Grade 5	58	64	42	<b>Eligible for Free Lunch:</b>					
Grade 6				(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7						93%	100%		
Grade 8									
Grade 9				<b>Students in Temporary Housing:</b>					
Grade 10				(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11					3	4	TBD		
Grade 12									
Ungraded Elementary				<b>Recent Immigrants:</b>					
Ungraded Secondary				(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	387	361	424		3	8	3		
<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>				<b>Suspensions:</b>					
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	21	26	24						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	33	34	40	Principal Suspensions	1	0	TBD		
Number all others	0	0	0	Superintendent Suspensions	4	1	TBD		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
				<b>Special High School Programs:</b>			
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:</b>				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants			
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants			
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	74	51	47	<b>Number of Staff:</b>			
# ELLs with IEPs	5	2	1	(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	31	41	43
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	9	5	10
<b>Overage Students:</b>							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	6	TBD	7
	0	0	0				
				<b>Teacher Qualifications:</b>			
<b>Ethnicity and Gender:</b>				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	96.8%	100%	100%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.5	0.5	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	83.9%	65.9%	67.4%
Black or African American	13.8 %	13.6%	14.2%	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	58.1%	43.9%	55.8%
Hispanic or Latino	84.7%	82.7%	82.8%				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.2 %	0.7%	0.0%	Percent Masters Degree or higher	97.0%	80.0%	81.0%
White	1.2%	3.0%	2.6%	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	84.5%	77.3%	54.8%
Multi-racial							
Male	51.8%	53.1%	52.4%				
Female	48.2%	46.9%	47.6%				

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
<b>SURR School:</b> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:	
<b>Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):</b>		<input checked="" 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 ____	<input type="checkbox"/> School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____		

**NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY**

<b>Individual Subject/Area Ratings</b>	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA:	IGA		ELA:		
	Math:	IGS		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	X	X	X			
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Black or African American						
Hispanic or Latino	X	X	X			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander						
White						
Multiracial						
<b>Other Groups</b>						
Students with Disabilities	X					
Limited English Proficient						
Economically Disadvantaged	X	X	X			
<b>Student groups making AYP in each subject</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Key: AYP Status**

√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ <sup>SH</sup>	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status		

*Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.*

**CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY**

<b>Progress Report Results – 2007-08</b>		<b>Quality Review Results – 2007-08</b>	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	Well Developed
Overall Score	A 86.3	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Well Developed
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	12.1%	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Well Developed
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	23.9%	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well Developed
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	45.8%	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Well Developed
Additional Credit	4.5%	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Well Developed

*Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.*

## 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?
- 

Based on the available data we have observed the following:

### Grade 3: NYS Math

All tested students

- The mean scale score has increased from 678.7 in 2006 to 697.6 in 2008
- The percentage of children that scored at Level 1 has **decreased** from 4.7% to 0.0%
- The percentage of children that scored at Level 2 has **decreased** from 9.3% to 6.8%
- The percentage of children that scored at Level 3 has **increased** from 62.8% to 64.9%
- The percentage of children that scored at Level 4 has **increased** from 23.3% to 28.4%

Data: All tested, ELL, Special Ed.  
2006 – 2007 – 2008

### Grade 4: NYS Math

All tested students

- The mean scale score has **increased** from 687.3 in 2006 to 697.4 in 2008
- The percentage of students that scored at Level 1 has **decreased** from 2.9% to 1.6%
- The percentage of students that scored at Level 2 has **decreased** from 8.7% to 4.8%
- The percentage of students that scored at Level 3 has **decreased** from 55.1% to 45.2%
- The percentage of students that scored at level 4 has **increased** from 33.3% to 48.4%

### Grade 5: NYS Math Test

All tested students

- The mean scale score has **increased** from 674.2 in 2006 to 712.4 in 2008
- The percentage of students that scored at Level 1 has **decreased** from 3.2% to 0.0%
- The percentage of students that scored at Level 2 has **decreased** from 12.9% to 2.4%
- The percentage of students that scored at Level 3 has **decreased** from 59.7% to 45.2%
- The percentage of students that scored at Level 4 has **increased** from 24.2% to 52.4%

In 2006 174 students were tested, 3.4% scored at Level 1; 10.3% scored at Level 2; 58.6% at Level 3 and 27.6% at Level 4. The total percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 in 2006 were 86.2%

In 2007 162 students were tested 3.7 % scored at Level 1, 7.4% scored at Level 2; 48.1% scored at Level 3 and 40.7% scored at Level 4. The total percentage of **increased** Level 3 and 4 in 2007 were 88.9%.

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

In 2008 178 students were tested, 0.6% scored at Level 1, 5.1% scored at Level 2, 53.4% scored at Level 3 and 41.0% scored at Level 4. The total percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 in 2008 increased to 94.4%.

### ELL Students Data

In 2008 the total number of ELL student tested was 28. Of the total number # of students tested 0.0% scored at Level 1, 7.1% scored at Level 2, 82.1% scored at Level 3 and 10.7% scored at Level 4.

In 2006 the total percentage of Levels 3 and 4 for ELL students was 72.7%. In 2008 the percentage of ELL students that scored at Levels 3 and 4 **increased** to 92.9%. This represents a total increase of 20.2 points percentage from 2006 – 2008.

### Special Education Students

In 2008 the total number of Special Education students tested was 53. The total percentage of students that scored at Level 1 was 1.9%. The total percentage of students that scored at Level 2 was 15.1%. The total percentage of students that scored at Level 3 was 64.2%. The total percentage of students that scored at Level 4 was 18.9%.

In 2006, the total percentage of special education students that scored at Levels 3 and 4 was 68.6%. In 2008 the percentage of special education students that scored at Levels 3 and 4 increased to 83.0%. This represents a total increase of 14.4 percentage points from 2006 – 2008.

Based on the available data we have observed the following:

#### Grade 3: NYS ELA-All tested students

- The mean scale score has **decreased** from 670.4 to 663.3 in 2008
- The percentage of Level 1's in 2007 was 8.6 **decreased** to 6.9 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's in 2007 was 20.7 and **increased** to 27.4 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's in 2007 was 56.9 and **increased** to 58.9 in 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 4's was 13.8 in 2007 and **decreased** to 6.9 in 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's in 2007 was 70.7 and **decreased** to 65.8 in 2008.

#### Grade 4: NYS ELA-All tested students

- The mean scale score has **increased** from 660.3 to 665.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 1's **decreased** from 7.9 to 5.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's **decreased** from 26.3 to 21.7 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's **increased** from 65.8 to 70.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 4's **increased** from 0.0 to 3.3 in 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's **increased** from 65.8 to 73.3 in 2008.

#### Grade 5: NYS ELA-All tested students

- The mean scale score has **increased** from 659.1 to 684.4 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 1's **decreased** from 1.5 to 0.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's **decreased** from 40.0 to 9.5 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's **increased** from 55.4 to 73.8 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 4's **increased** from 3.1 to 16.7 in 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's in 2007 was 58.5 and **increased tremendously** to 90.5.
-

### Grade 3- ELL students

- The mean scale score **decreased** from 650.0 in 2007 to 641.4 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 1's **decreased** from 28.6 in 2007 to 12.5 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's **increased** from 28.6 in 2007 to 62.5 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's **decreased** from 28.6 in 2007 to 25.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 4's **decreased** from 14.3 in 2007 to 0.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's **decreased** from 42.9 in 2007 to 25.0 in 2008.

### Grade 4-ELL students

- The mean scale score **increased** from 625.4 in 2007 to 634.2 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 1's **increased** from 28.6 in 2007 to 40.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's **decreased** from 57.1 in 2007 to 0.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's **increased** from 14.3 in 2007 to 60.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 4's remained the same at 0.0 in both 2007 and 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's **increased** from 14.3 in 2007 to 60.0 in 2008.

### Grade 5-ELL students

- The mean scale score **increased** from 649.5 in 2007 to 678.8 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 1's **remained** the same at 0.0 in both 2007 and 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's **increased** from 0.0 in 2007 to 60.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's **decreased** from 60.0 in 2007 to 40.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 4's **increased** from 0.0 in 2007 to 20.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's **increased** from 40.0 in 2007 to 80.0 in 2008.

### Grade 3-Special Education

- The mean scale score **increased** from 642.9 in 2007 to 648.6 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 1's **decreased** from 25.0 in 2007 to 11.1 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's **decreased** from 43.8 in 2007 to 40.7 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's **increased** from 18.8 in 2007 to 48.2 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 4's **decreased** from 12.5 in 2007 to 0.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's **increased** from 31.3 in 2007 to 48.2 in 2008.

### Grade 4-Special Education

- The mean scale score **decreased** from 656.3 in 2007 to 647.4 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 1's **increased** from 0.0 in 2007 to 11.8 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's **increased** from 57.1 in 2007 to 58.8 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's **decreased** from 42.9 in 2007 to 29.4 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 4's **remained the same** at 0.0 in both 2007 and 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's **decreased** from 42.9 in 2007 to 29.4 in 2008.

### Grade 5-Special Education

- The mean scale score **increased** from 661.4 in 2007 to 676.9 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 1's **remained** the same at 0.0 in both 2007 and 2008.
- The percentage of Level 2's **decreased** from 25.0 in 2007 to 0.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 3's **increased** from 75.0 in 2007 to 100.0 in 2008.
- The percentage of Level 4's **remained the same** at 0.0 in both 2007 and 2008.
- The percentage of Levels 3's and 4's **increased** from 75.0 in 2007 to 100.0 in 2008.

## **Significant Gains in ELA**

- A specific gain in ELA with our Grade 5 students was an increase of 32 percentage points from 2007 to 2008.
- Another positive gain was the increase of Level's 3's and 4's within the Grade 4.
- Grade 4 ELL students had an increase of 46 percentage points from 2007 – 2008.
- Grade 5 ELL students had an increase of 40 percentage points.
- Our Grade 5 Special Education students had an overall gain of 25% in Levels 3's and 4's.

### Significant Aids/Barriers to Schools continuous improvement

- Teacher's knowledge of Aris/Acuity
- Targeting small groups of students for intensive work.
- Support Staff pushing in classrooms
- Pacing Barriers calendars
- Grade Level meeting Pd
- Increased number of ELL students
- Increased number of Special Education Students
- Bussed students
- Training new teachers
- Keeping teacher

## SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

---

1. The achievement of Grade 4 students taking the 2008 NYS ELA test will result in a performance index increase that meets or exceeds the 2008 AYP Target.
2. The achievement of grades 3, 4 and 5 Special Education students taking the 2009 NYS ELA test will result in an increase of 16 mean scale score points.
3. The achievement of grade 4 students taking the NYS Math test will result in a performance index that meets or exceeds the 2008 AYP Target.
4. The achievement of Special Education students in grades 3, 4 & 5 students taking the 2009 NYS Math assessment will result in an increase of 16 mean scale score points.
5. Achievement of ELL Students taking the 2009 NYS ELA test will result in an increase in levels 3's & 4's.

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** ELA

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>1.The achievement of the Annual Goal for Grade 4 students taking the 2009 NYS ELA test will result in a performance index increase that meets or exceeds the 2008 AYP Target. In 2009, the students will make a gain of 2% higher in levels 3 &amp; 4's.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> 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"> <li>• PD with Principal and Coach of the Harcourt Story Town Literacy Program.</li> <li>• Year-round PD with Harcourt Staff Developers</li> <li>• Weekly grade meetings</li> <li>• Model lessons by staff developers, coaches and grade leaders is monthly</li> <li>• Daily extended literacy block with focused instruction for whole class, small groups, and individual instruction.</li> <li>• The daily extended literacy block will also include a structured writing workshop.</li> <li>• Using AIS providers to provide small group or independent instruction daily</li> <li>• Kaplan skills period implemented in all grades</li> <li>• Implementation of practice tests monthly</li> <li>• Periodic assessments</li> <li>• Reading level assessment every 6 – 8 weeks</li> <li>• Implementation of differentiated instruction throughout all disciplines.</li> <li>• Use of the Acuity Program to identify at-risk students in all of the sub groups</li> <li>• Extended day instruction Spell Read Kaplan skills, guided reading.</li> </ul> <p>All of the above strategies taken will result in a 2% gain for students by June 2009.</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Per session for Afterschool Program PD provided by Harcourt for all teachers PD provided by Kaplan for teachers of grades 3 - 5</p>

<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Informal/Formal observations  Progress tracked by Reading Assessments every 6 – 8 weeks.  Acuity Predictives and ITA's  Practice ELA Assessment  Lesson Plans  Data Binders  Conference Notes</p>
--	--

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** ELA

<p><b>Annual Goal</b>  <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>2. The achievement of grades 3, 4 and 5 Special Education Students taking the 2009 NYS ELA test will result in an increase of a 2% gain in levels 3&amp;4's.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b>  <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"> <li>• PD with Principal, and Coach of the Harcourt Story Town Literacy Program.</li> <li>• Story town Literacy Program.</li> <li>• Year-round PD with Harcourt Staff Developers</li> <li>• Weekly grade meetings</li> <li>• Model lessons by staff developers, coaches and grade leaders daily</li> <li>• Daily extended literacy block with focused instruction for whole class, small groups, and individual instruction.</li> <li>• The daily extended literacy block will also include a structured writing sorkshop.</li> <li>• Using AIS providers to provide small group or independent instruction.</li> <li>• Kaplan skills period implemented in all grades</li> <li>• Implementation of practice tests</li> <li>• Periodic assessments</li> <li>• Reading level assessment every 6 – 8 weeks</li> <li>• Implementation of differentiated instruction throughout all disciplines.</li> <li>• Use of the Acuity Program to identify at-risk students in all of the sub groups</li> <li>• Extended day instruction Kaplan SpellRead, Kaplan Skills and Guided Reading</li> <li>• All of the above strategies taken will result in a 2% gain by June 2009.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Per session for Afterschool Program          PD provided by Harcourt for all teachers          PD provided by Kaplan for teachers of grades 3 - 5</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Informal/Formal observations          Progress tracked by Reading Assessments every 6 – 8 weeks.          Acuity Predictives, ITA's          Practice ELA Assessment          Lesson Plans          Data Binders          Conference Notes</p>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Math

<p><b>Annual Goal</b>  <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>3. The achievement of grade 4 students taking the NYS Math will result in a performance index that meets or exceeds the 2008 AYP Target. Level 4's increased 15% and this will remain consistent in 2009.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b>  <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"> <li>• Teachers will provide a math period block daily with focused instruction for whole class, small groups, and individualized instruction.</li> <li>• A wide range of materials will be available to all students</li> <li>• Hire an F-status teacher 2 days a week to work with grades 3, 4 and 5</li> <li>• Teacher leaders will develop in-house lab sites</li> <li>• AIS services to all targeted Level 1 and Level 2 students.</li> <li>• Use of the Acuity Program to identify at-risk students in all of the sub groups</li> <li>• Weekly grade meetings</li> <li>• Intervisitation Kaplan DDI within and between grades to promote professional development.</li> <li>• Our 2009 Grade 4 students scores will remain consistent.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Per session for Afterschool Program          PD provided by Math coach for all teachers          PD provided by Kaplan for teachers in grades 3 – 5          F-Status Math Teacher</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Informal/formal observations          Progress tracked by Unit Assessments          Acuity/Predictives, ITA's          Practice Math Assessment          Lesson Plans          Data Binders</p>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Math

<p><b>Annual Goal</b>  <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>4. The achievement of Special Education students taking the 2009 NYS Math assessment will result in an increase of 2% levels 3&amp;4's.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b>  <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"> <li>• Teachers will provide a daily math period block with focused instruction for whole class, small groups, and individualized instruction.</li> <li>• A wide range of materials will be available to all students.</li> <li>• Hire an F-Status teacher 2 days a week to work with grades 3, 4 and 5</li> <li>• Teacher leaders will develop in-house lab sites</li> <li>• AIS services to all targeted Level 1 and Level 2 students.</li> <li>• Use of the Acuity Program to identify at-risk students in all of the sub groups</li> <li>• Weekly grade meetings</li> </ul>



<p><b>Action Plan</b>  <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"> <li>• The ESL teacher will adapt the comprehensive literacy program for use with ELL's. Each classroom will be equipped to provide high interest, leveled books to all ELL's.</li> <li>• Identify students who lack native language literacy and target them for focused remedial help in order to initiate the absence of transferable interlinguistic skills.</li> <li>• The continued implementation of the Rosetta Stone software program.</li> <li>• Professional development provided by Rosetta Stone that will guide the ESL teacher in maximum effective use of the program.</li> <li>• Purchase of a mobile laptop cart</li> <li>• The above strategies will result in a 2% increase for ELL students by June 2009.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>PD provided by Rosetta Stone          Monies for laptops</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Implementation of the Rosetta Stone Program          Measurable increases in the Reading portion of the NYSESLAT as well as the ELA          Measurable increases in the writing portion of the NYSESLAT as well as the ELA          Classroom writing portfolios</p>

## **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: CONTRACTS 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	18	18	9	9	4	0	0	0
1	17	17	6	6	1	0	0	0
2	10	10	3	3	11	0	0	0
3	25	25	5	5	5	0	0	0
4	28	28			16	0	5	0
5	30	30			6	0	0	0
6								
7								
8								
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.

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

**Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services**

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	<b>Description:</b> Provide a brief description of <b>each</b> 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.).
<b>ELA:</b>	Kaplan Spellread Program – during school – small groups Wilson Foundations – during school – small groups Harcourt Intervention Meeting – during school – small groups ELA Test Prep – afterschool – small groups Teen Tutoring – during school – individual small group Harcourt Guided Reading Books – during school small group Kaplan Test Prep – afterschool – small group
<b>Mathematics:</b>	Destination Math – during school – small group Kaplan Coach – during school – small group Kaplan – DDI – Data Driven Instruction F-Status Math Teacher Math Test Prep – afterschool, small groups Kaplan Test Prep Math Coach – small group instruction
<b>Science:</b>	CUE Science – during school & preparations for NYS Science Assessment – during the school day
<b>Social Studies:</b>	Preparation for the NYS Grade 5 Social Studies Assessment
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b>	Individual small group - during school day. monthly character keys – small group
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	Individual small group – during school day. Monthly character keys – small group

<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	Individual small group – during school day. Monthly character keys
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>	Related Service providers conduct evaluations for at-risk students

## **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 (2008-2008) LAP to this CEP.

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

---

**Type of Program:** \_\_\_ Bilingual \_\_\_ ESL \_\_\_x\_ Both      **Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2008-09:** \_\_\_\_\_ 50 \_\_\_\_\_  
(No more than 2 pages)

- I. Instructional Program for ELLs (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc). Program planning and management description, to include identification and placement of ESL/Bilingual certified teachers, utilization of appropriate instructional materials (English and other languages) and technology, school-based supervisory support, use of external organizations, compliance with ELL-related mandates and use of data to improve instruction.:
  - A. Curricular: Briefly describe the school’s literacy, mathematics and other content area programs and explain ELLs’ participation in those programs. Briefly describe supplemental programs for ELLs (i.e., AIS, Saturday Academies).
  - B. Extracurricular: Briefly describe extracurricular activities available in your school, and the extent to which ELLs participate. Such programs may include art, music, sports, clubs, etc.
- II. Parent/community: Describe parent/community involvement activities planned to meaningfully involve parents in their children’s education and to inform them about the state standards and assessments. Activities might include parent orientations, homework help, leadership development, ESL and/or math/literacy.
- III. Project Jump Start: Describe the programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL/LEP students prior to the first day of school.
- IV. Staff Development (2008-2009 activities—tentative dates and ELL-related topics): Describe how staff will participate in ongoing, long-term staff development with a strong emphasis on the State learning standards and high impact differentiated and academic language development strategies.
- V. Support services provided to LEP students: Describe other support structures that are in place in your school which are available to ELLs.
- VI. Name/type of native language assessments administered (bilingual programs only): Describe how you assess the level of native language development and proficiency of the ELLs who are in a bilingual program.





Number of LEP Students Identified and Served in Each School Building by Type of Program in 2006-07

School District: \_\_\_\_\_

School Building \_\_\_\_\_

(Complete this form for each school building with LEP students in grades 7-12 and Special Education during 2006-07)

Language	Grade 7			Grade 8			Grade 9			Grade 10			Grade 11			Grade 12			Special Education(K-12)					
	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)																								
Bengali (BEN)																								
Bosnian (BOS)																								
Chinese (CMN)																								
French (FRA)																								
H. Creole (HAT)																								
Hindi (HIN)																								
Japanese (JPN)																								
Korean (KOR)																								
Polish (POL)																								
Portuguese (POR)																								
Russian (RUS)																								
Spanish (SPA)																								
Vietnamese (VIE)																								
<b>SUB TOTALS</b> →																								

Total Number of LEP students **Identified** in the Building in 2006-07  
(Do not include long-term LEPs)

Total Number of LEP students **Served** in the Building in 2006-07  
(Do not include long-term LEPs)  Bilingual  ESL



## ADDITIONAL LANGUAGES

Acholi (ACH)	Garifuna (CAB)	Mandinka (MNK)	Sotho-Southern (SOT)
Adangme (ADA)	Georgian (KAT)	Marathi (MAR)	Sukuma (SUK)
Afrikaans (AFR)	German (GER)	Mende (MEN)	Swahili (SWH)
Akan (AKA)	Guarani (GUG)	Mohawk (MOH)	Swedish (SWE)
Algonquin (ALQ)	Gujarati (GUJ)	Ndebele (NDE)	Tajiki (TGK)
Amharic (AMH)	Hausa (HAU)	Nyanja (NYA)	Tamil (TAM)
Arabic (ARB)	Hebrew (HEB)	Oneida (ONE)	Telugu (TEL)
Arawak (ARW)	Hindi (HIN)	Papiamento (PAP)	Thai (THA)
Assamese (ASM)	Hungarian (HUN)	Pashto (PST)	Tigre (TIG)
Aymara (AYC)	Ibo (IBO)	Romanian (RON)	Tonga (TNZ)
Basque (BAQ)	Icelandic (ISL)	Romansch (ROH)	Turkish (TUR)
Bemba (BEM)	Ilocano (ILO)	Rundi (RUN)	Ukrainian (UKR)
Bengali (BEN)	Indonesian (IND)	Samoan (SMO)	Urdu (URD)
Bhili (BHB)	Kabyle (KAB)	Sanskrit (SAN)	Wolof (WOL)
Brahui (BRH)	Kamba (KAM)	Seneca (SEE)	Yoruba (YOR)
Breton (BRE)	Kashmiri (KAS)	Seri (SEI)	Zulu (ZUL)
Bulgarian (BUL)	Konkani (KNN)	Shan (SHN)	
Cebuan (CEB)	Lao (LAO)	Shona (SNA)	
Cham (CHA)	Latvian (LAV)	Shina (SCL)	
Czech (CES)	Lithuanian (LIT)	Sidamo (SID)	
Danish (DAN)	Macedonian (MKD)	Sindhi (SND)	
Estonian (EST)	Malay (MLY)	Slovak (SLK)	
Ewe (EWE)	Malayalam (MAL)	Slovenian (SLV)	
Finnish (FIN)	Maltese (MLT)	Somali (SOM)	

## Number of Teachers and Support Personnel for 2008-09

School Building: \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_

List the FTEs in your school in the Bilingual Education and ESL Programs in the appropriate column.

School Building	Number of Teachers 2006-2007				Number of Teaching Assistant Paraprofessionals*		Sub- Total
	Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers*				
Building Name	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
<b>TOTALS</b>							Grand Total

\* The number of teachers reported must represent the number of teachers holding an appropriate license for the subject area being taught (i.e., language arts and content area.)  
 Note: The Office of Bilingual Education and Foreign Language Studies will conduct a random review of the 2008-2009 teacher reported data. Districts randomly selected will be asked to electronically submit to the Department, the name of the teacher(s), social security number and type of license or certificate issued by the NYSED.  
 \*\* Examples of this may include: teachers without an appropriate New York State teaching certificate or New York City license for the subject area(s) being taught or without a valid NYS teaching certificate or NYC license.  
 \*\*\* Teaching Assistants and Paraprofessionals must be working under the direct supervision of a licensed teacher. Attach additional sheets if necessary

**Include schedules for three different students in the ESL program (*one each for Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced* English Proficiency levels based on NYSESLAT/LAB-R). The schedules must account for all periods. Use attached Freestanding ESL Schedule Template. If your school has a bilingual/Dual Language program, also provide three sample schedules (one each for Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced English Proficiency levels based on NYSESLAT/LAB-R). The schedules must reflect ESL, Native Language Art and content area instruction through use of both languages. Use attached Bilingual Schedule Template.**

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL

ESL Program Type:            \_\_\_ Free-Standing    \_\_\_ Push-in            \_\_\_x\_\_\_ Pull-out  
 Indicate Proficiency Level:    \_\_\_x\_\_\_ Beginning            \_\_\_ Intermediate            \_\_\_ Advanced

School District: \_\_\_\_\_

School Building: \_\_\_\_\_

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b>	From:	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) WORD STUDY	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) ESL
	To:					
<b>2</b>	From:	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) WORD STUDY	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) WORD STUDY	Subject (Specify) PE
	To:					
<b>3</b>	From:	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA
	To:					
<b>4</b>	From:	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH
	To:					
<b>5</b>	From:	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH
	To:					
<b>6</b>	From:	Subject (Specify) WRITING WORKSHOP	Subject (Specify) WRITING WORKSHOP	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) WRITING WORKSHOP	Subject (Specify) WRITING WORKSHOP
	To:					
<b>7</b>	From:	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES
	To:					
<b>8</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>9</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>10</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL

Bilingual Program Type:        \_\_\_ TBE                    \_\_\_ Dual Language  
 Indicate Proficiency Level:   \_\_\_ Beginning        \_\_\_ Intermediate        \_\_\_x\_ Advanced

School District:   14  

School Building:   196  

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	ELA	ESL	ESL	Word Study	Word Study
<b>2</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specific)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	MATH WORKSHOP	MATH WORKSHOP	ELA	Word study	ELA
<b>3</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	ESL	ELA	ELA	ESL	ELA
<b>4</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	ESL	SCIENCE	MATH WORKSHOP	MATH WORKSHOP	MATH WORKSHOP
<b>5</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
<b>6</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specific)
	To:	SCIENCE	Social Studies	Social Studies	ELA	SCIENCE
<b>7</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	Writing Workshop	Writing Workshop	Writing Workshop	Writing Workshop	Social Studies
<b>8</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>9</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>10</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL

Bilingual Program Type:        \_\_\_ TBE                    \_\_\_ Dual Language  
 Indicate Proficiency Level:    \_\_\_ Beginning        \_\_\_X\_ Intermediate        \_\_\_ Advanced

School District:   14  

School Building:   196  

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	ELA	ESL	ESL	ESL	ESL
<b>2</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specific)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	MATH WORKSHOP	MATH WORKSHOP	ELA	Word study	ELA
<b>3</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	ESL	ELA	ELA	ESL	ELA
<b>4</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	ESL	SCIENCE	MATH WORKSHOP	MATH WORKSHOP	MATH WORKSHOP
<b>5</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
<b>6</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specific)
	To:	SCIENCE	Social Studies	ESL	ESL	SCIENCE
<b>7</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:	Writing Workshop	Writing Workshop	Writing Workshop	Science	Social Studies
<b>8</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>9</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)

<b>10</b>	To:					
-----------	-----	--	--	--	--	--

**Part C: For schools that will receive Title III ELL Supplemental Services for 2008-09:**

**Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students**

**Form TIII – A (1)(a)**

**Grade Level(s)** K - 5 \_\_\_\_\_ **Number of Students to be Served:** 50 **LEP** \_\_\_\_\_ **Non-LEP**  
**Number of Teachers** 1 **Other Staff (Specify)** \_\_\_\_\_

**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.) Priority Programs implemented under Title III, Part A, may not supplant programs required under CR Part 154. These supplemental services should complement basic bilingual and ESL services required under CR Part 154. Direct supplemental services should be provided for: before/after-school and Saturday programs, reduced class-size, and/or push-in services. Supplemental instructional support for dual language programs is also permitted. Teachers providing the services must be certified bilingual education/ESL teachers. In the space provided below, describe

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| ✓ <b>school's language instruction program for limited English proficient (LEP) students</b>        | ✓ <b>language(s) of instruction</b>                        |
| ✓ <b>type of program/activities to improve mathematics, native and/or English language learning</b> | ✓ <b>rationale for the selection of program/activities</b> |
| ✓ <b>number of students to be served</b>  | ✓ <b>times per day/week</b>                                |
| ✓ <b>grade level(s)</b>   | ✓ <b>program duration</b>                                  |
|   | ✓ <b>service provider and qualifications</b>               |

*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. Explain how the school will use Title III funds to provide professional development to support ELLs. Describe the target audience.

*Description of Parent and Community Participation*–Explain how the school will use Title III funds to increase parent and community participation ELLs

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

**School District:** 14 **Type of Program:** ESL

**School Building:** P.S. 196 **No. LEP Students Served 2008-2009:** 50

**Name of Principal:** Janine Colon **Principal's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

The ESL Program is a Push-In/Pull Out program where students of relatively similar English language proficiencies are grouped together for ESL instruction. The language of instruction is English. Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced groups are formed and receive instruction for 360 minutes per week if they are

Beginning or Intermediate level students. Advanced students receive 180 minutes of instruction per week and an additional 180 minutes of ELA instruction.

Lessons are designed to be low-stress, high interest affairs. The Harcourt Storytown Reading Program has been integrated in alignment with the new curriculum in all classrooms. Additional instructional strategies include, but are not limited to, use of the Audio-Lingual approach and an emphasis on TPR lessons. Other approaches are employed where they are deemed to be pedagogically more appropriate for the material at hand. Homework is assigned and field trips are undertaken as a stimulating and enjoyable means of enhancing and reinforcing concepts being taught.

With respect to our newly arrived ELL's, we assign them a buddy/mentor in their class who speaks their language. This buddy is positively rewarded for assisting in the development of survival English for the new arrival, while at the same time easing his or her cultural transition. Appropriate materials are provided to students to assist in this Project Jump Start effort, including the Amazing English program from Addison-Wesley.

All long term ELL's are receiving targeted instruction that addresses their respective areas of academic deficiency with AIS providers.

We have worked with our Learning Service Organization to arrange for materials and training to meet the new higher standards now in place for ELL students. Additionally, we encourage increased parental involvement through various means, including an ELL Parent Orientation Day, Parent Workshops, and informal invitations for parents to come to the school and meet with the ESL teacher to discuss their child's progress, and to learn how the family at home can be a working partner in the education of the ELL student. Further, we have a Parent Literacy Program in our school three days per week, during regular school hours which helps to develop literacy skills for the parents of ELL's and facilitates them working with their children at home. There is also an after school program for ELL's that meets two days each week to assist students to meet ELA, Math and content area standards. An experienced teacher who regularly works with ESL students will teach the class. There are 15 students in the class. The class beginning Oct. 2, 2008 and ends May 30, 2009. Further, we intend to continue and expand our highly successful Learning through the Arts Clubs program. This innovation affords ELL students the opportunity for self-expression as well as an enriching educational experience with native speaking students in the context of an artistic modality. In addition to their regular meetings during the school day, trips are scheduled throughout the year that are relevant to each club and allow opportunities to expand what they have learned. Whether through photography, painting, jewelry-making, music or others, we have found that the artistic experience is an effective means of imparting linguistic concepts, skills and vocabulary. Therefore, we intend to purchase additional materials to further enhance this program. Our Spring Arts Festival, when parents and the community are invited to celebrate the various clubs talents and works, gives the ELL student, especially, the much needed opportunity to shine. The first two Parent Orientation Days, where parents are given information regarding their rights, available programs and other issues of relevance to bilingual and ESL education, and where they are encouraged to express their concerns and ask any questions they wish to, are scheduled at P.S. 196 on the mornings of September 12 and September 26, 2008. Additionally, our Parent Coordinator and our ESL teacher have a close, mutually supportive working relationship which benefits both parents and students. This facilitates more information being transmitted to parents more quickly, and any concerns they have being dealt with promptly.

Staff development with respect to ELL's and bilingual and ESL issues are scheduled throughout the year. This year we are making a concerted effort to create an ELL Resource Center for all staff that interface with ELL students, with special emphasis being given to classroom teachers with whom the ELL student has the most contact. Our intention is to outfit the center with a variety of materials that both educate staff as to the nature of the ELL's experience, and provide relevant and clear strategies and examples that can be easily integrated into the ELL's classroom experience and provide a meaningful and effective assist for both the teacher and most importantly the student. Examples would include at a minimum the following: a library that includes theoretical materials as well as describes how best to partner with immigrant parents to maximize their child's educational

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

experience, DVD's and videos that demonstrate actual classroom lessons and test practices for teachers with ELL students and laptop computers on which teachers can be trained by the ESL teacher to use the Rosetta Stone Program, which can then be placed in their classroom for targeted use with ELL's.

**Description of Parent and Community Participation**

We encourage increased parental involvement through various means, including ELL Parent Orientation day, Parent Workshops, and informal invitations for parents to come to the school and meet with the ESL teacher to discuss their child's progress, and to learn how the family at home can be a working partner in the education of the ELL student. Further, we have a Parent Literacy Program in our school three days per week, during regular school hours which helps to develop literacy skills for the parents of ELL's and facilitates them working with their children at home.

The first two Parent Orientation Days, where parents are given information regarding their rights, available programs and other issues of relevance to bilingual and ESL education, and where they are encouraged to express their concerns and ask any questions they wish to, are scheduled at PS 196 on the mornings of Sept. 12 and 26, 2008. Additionally, our Parent Coordinator and our ESL teacher have a close, mutually supportive working relationship which benefits both parents and students. This facilitates more information being transmitted to parents more quickly, and any concerns they have dealt with promptly.

**Form TIII – A (1)(b)**

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

<b>Allocation:</b>		
<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Budgeted Amount</b>	<b>Explanation of Proposed Expenditure</b>
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	6962.20	Afterschool Program 70 days – 2 hours each day @41.98 per hour  October 2 – May 30
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts		
Supplies and materials	8037.80	Photography Club \$3000.00 Software support \$5000.00 Instructional Materials \$37.80
Travel		
Other		
<b>TOTAL</b>	15000.00	

**This entire section must be completed for each budget submitted.**

**SECTION XVII**  
**BUDGET NARRATIVE**

School District \_\_\_\_\_ For Title **III**

BEDS Code \_\_\_\_\_

**\* MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH EACH BUDGET IN THIS DCEP ADDENDUM UPDATE**

If Transferability is used for 2008-2009, the Transferability Form must be submitted online and a hard copy must be submitted with the budget narrative to expedite the review of the FS-10.

Additionally, on the Budget Narrative and FS-10, please indicate the amount of funds to be included under transferability in the budget categories and the Title where funds will be used. Example: In the Title IIA budget under Code 15 – Transferability - Title I Reading Teacher – FTE. 35 - \$15,000.

<i>CODE/ BUDGET CATEGORY</i>	<i>EXPLANATION OF EXPENDITURES IN THIS CATEGORY (as it relates to the program narrative for this Title)</i>
<i>Code 15 Professional Salaries</i>	
<i>Code 16 Support Staff Salaries</i>	
<i>Code 40 Purchased Services</i>	
<i>Code 45 Supplies and Materials</i>	

**This entire section must be completed for each budget submitted.**

School District \_\_\_\_\_ For Title III  
BEDS Code \_\_\_\_\_

<i>Code 80</i> <i>Employee Benefits</i>	
<i>Code 90</i> <i>Indirect Cost</i>	
<i>Code 49</i> <i>BOCES Services</i>	
<i>Code 20</i> <i>Equipment</i>	

### **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.
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.

#### **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.
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.
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>.

### Language Allocation Policy 2008-2009

P.S. 196 is a Pre-K through grade five school located in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. Ours is a community that has a large Hispanic population. Among P.S. 196's 420 students, 50 are classified as ELLs. Of these ELLs, 49 are Spanish speaking, 1 speak Arabic. .

Grade	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Total
K	8			8
1	8	1		9
2	6	2		8
3	4	8		12
4	2	4	2	8
5	1	2	2	5
			Total	50

Based on a consistent trend in parent choice surveys, all of our ELL students are serviced through a free standing pull-out ESL program. Instruction is given in English 100% of the time. We believe, however, that a student's native language also supports progress in English literacy and therefore all ELLs are provided with a bilingual library for independent and home use.

NYSESLAT data and data from ELLs' scores in content area tests indicate that our ELLs' greatest needs remain in reading and writing. We are focused on improving these areas. Students receive NYS mandated instruction based on student proficiency level following Part 154 mandates. Beginners and intermediates receive 360 minutes of instruction; advanced students receive 180 minutes of instruction. Balanced literacy strategies are implemented in order to scaffold ELLs' classroom instruction. ELLs have access to bilingual and multicultural libraries, listening centers, and high-quality ESL computer programs.

To further support our ELLs, they are provided with academic Intervention Services daily. These services take place during the school day. The teachers use Wilson Reading Program, Kaplan materials, Passport Voyager and Harcourt Storytown materials. In addition, the after school program is open to all students who require additional support in reading, writing, listening and speaking. Levels 1 and 2 will be mandated to attend the 37 ½ minute small group extended day program. Instruction will target individual needs of students.

Our program for SIFE students includes all of the interventions given to our ELL students plus a buddy program with children from lower grades in which SIFE ELLs receive extra support in language arts and math. This year, we have two SIFE students.

Long term ELLs are given extra AIS services and their work is assessed to see what specific interventions are needed.

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

ESL teachers attend grade congruence meetings in order to maximize English Language acquisition for ELLs. In addition, they attend professional development workshops.

Our ESL program at P.S. 196 provides a nurturing environment that promotes effective teaching and learning. We respect the diversity of students and staff and support the linguistic, social, academic, and emotional needs of our ELLs.

Our LAP committee consists of the following staff members:

Janine Colon	Principal
Robert Burstein	ESL Teacher
Jeannette Landi	Math Coach
Deborah Casey	Literacy Coach
Maria Rodriguez	Parent Coordinator

## **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 \$372,106.00
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program \$3,700.00
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified \$19,000.00
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year 100%
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**

#### **PARENT INVOLVEMENT**

#### **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. 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

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

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 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.
  - o See Section IV – Needs Assessment
2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
  - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
    - Target students are mandated for 37.5 minutes of daily instruction.
    - Afterschool Test Prep Program in ELA and Math – offered to all students in grades 3 – 5 small group instruction in ELA & Math in K -5.
  - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:

- Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
  - Kaplan Test Prep Program in Afterschool
  - Extended Day program such as Spellread and Destination Math.
  - Extended Day (37.5 minutes) mandated for all targeted students
- Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
  - Enrichment clubs for all student in grades 3 – 5 including (yoga, dance, chess, chorus, photography, sports, art, cooking and knitting)
  - Afterschool photography club
  - Dance, Theater classes for ELL students
  - Afterschool Enrichment clubs for all grades in art, technology, sports, dance, etc.
  - Reader's theater in all grades
  - GREAT Program provided by NYCPD
  - CUE Science for Grade 4
- Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
  - Targeted students mandated for 37.5 minutes of instruction
  - Targeted students receive small group instruction by AIS providers.
- 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.
  - 37.5 minutes
  - Afterschool test prep
  - Kaplan SpellRead
  - At-Risk Counseling
  - At-Risk Sp Speech
  - At-Risk Resource Room
  - Wilson Foundations
- Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

Two staff members continue to implement strategies to become highly qualified. One attends ELL workshops consistently. The other will apply to graduate school for the September 2009 semester.

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.

- Conduct needs assessment for staff.
- Provide ongoing professional development by coaches and administration based on needs assessment
- Intervisitations between classes and grade.
- PD provided by Harcourt, Kaplan, LSO and CUE.

5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

- Best practices shared by teachers.
- Lessons modeled by experienced teachers
- New teacher mentor program

6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.

- CUE family literacy program. Parents are taught English while childcare is provided afterschool.
- PTA President sets up workshops for parents from health information to GED information.
- Parents Coordinator provides Professional Development based Parent Needs Assessments.
- Open House Week every September.
- The SLT has Parent members who attend monthly meetings.
- Parents are invited to all school performances, concerts, events.

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.

- Day Care Centers and Head Start programs in our community are invited every Spring to take a tour of our building. The Parent Coordinator sets up these visits to show prospective parents our school community.

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.

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

- All teachers will have access to ARIS
- All teachers have access to Acuity
- All teachers will have access to Harcourt/Houghton Mifflin StoryTown Online services

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.

- Mandated 37.5 minutes for all students
- Kaplan SpellRead
- "At-Risk" services
- Small Group push-in/pull-out services from support staff.
- Kaplan Lessonbank

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.

- Gang Awareness (G.R.E.A.T) Afterschool Program
- School Nutritionist
- Beacon Program
- Family Literacy Program
- Arts Connection
- Career Day
- Brooklyn Public Library
- YMCA
- Williamsburg Headstart

## **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.
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:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SURR<sup>1</sup> 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 Demographics and Accountability Snapshot, downloadable from your school's NYCDOE webpage under "Statistics"), describe the school's findings of the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified.
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.

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

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> School Under Registration Review (SURR)

**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.

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

**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:** All 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)*<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

- **English Language Learners**

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's process to assess the ELA alignment issues in written curriculum, curriculum maps, taught curriculum, ELA materials, and ELL's is through on-going professional development whether in-house or from an outside agency, monthly Teacher/Support Staff Communication meetings, student portfolio development, formal and informal observations, daily Principal/Coach walkthroughs, Instructional Team Meetings, Grade Level Meetings, LASW, vertical and horizontal planning utilizing the standards-based rubrics, and targeting individual teachers according to need with assistance from Principal, coaches, and mentor.

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 that teachers have taught a NYS standards based curriculum is justified by our 2008 ELA results of 4.6% of students in level 1 (down from 5.6% in 2007), 66.3% in level 3 (up from 58.4% in 2007), and 8.0% in level 4 (up from 6.2% in 2007)

\*Action plans have been created for individual students as well as small groups of students that incorporate the NYS standards.

\*LASW allows teachers to plan writing units for students in alignment with standards-based rubrics.

\*The chosen balanced literacy program for our school is in absolute alignment with the NYS standards.

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 processes PS 196 will engage in to assess whether these findings are relevant to our school's educational program include:

- Teacher learning objectives, lesson plans, short and long term goals and student progress reports.
- Classroom observations both formal and informal
- Teacher discussions at bi-monthly congruence meetings
- Data Driven Instruction supported by Kaplan

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

- Differentiated Instruction and small group instruction
- Instructional meetings with support staff
- Data acquired through Quality Review, Progress Reports, Learning Environment Surveys, New York State Report Card, Acuity Assessments and ARIS
- Principal scheduled walk-throughs
- Support staff pushes in to work with teams of students
- Coaches team teach and/or model daily in the classroom

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

X  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?

The following items are listed as evidence that support the relevance of this finding within our educational program:

- Acquired Data
- Bi-monthly grade congruence meetings
- Classroom observations, both formal and informal
- Teacher learning objectives, lesson plans, short and long-term goals
- Instructional team meetings
- Mentor feedback
- Feedback from Kaplan Coach working with classroom teachers
- Findings from teacher, parent and student surveys.

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.

PS 196 will address these relevant issues by:

- Having instructional objectives specific to the needs discussed.
- Conducting observations, both formal and informal.
- Providing professional development for teachers.
- Specific needs demo-lessons by Math Coach.
- Continued support to classrooms teachers by Math Coach.
- Kaplan Coach and Data-Driven Instruction.
- Small flexible grouping instruction
- Differentiated instruction
- Support staff will work with teams of students
- Coaches team teach and/or model daily in the classroom

---

## **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.

- \*Coaches team teach and/or model daily in classrooms
- \*Principal/coaches daily informal walkthroughs
- \*Principal scheduled walkthroughs
- \*Instructional Team Meetings allow for assessment of ELA instruction and delivery
- \*Classroom design allows for small group and/or independent work
- \*Literacy centers allow for small group and/or independent work
- \*Support staff pushes-in to work with teams of students
- \*Students work in pairs with technology in the classroom (computer, listening center, etc.
- \*Small groupings are flexible

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

\*Kaplan DDI (Data Driven Instruction)

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?

PS. 196 coaches build capacity in our school by supporting the teachers in the implementation of the Harcourt Storytown Balanced Literacy Reading Program. Daily Principal/Coach walkthroughs are always evident whether scheduled or not. The dominant ELA instructional method at PS 196 is the Reading and Writing Workshop model using the Harcourt Storytown Reading Program. Storytown focused on two plus two then review. On strategy and one skill for two weeks is taught then combined review. It includes components to address varied instructional needs of all students including ELL's and struggling readers with intensive work. Storytown is in alignment with the NYS standards.

The exception to the workshop model is Kaplan Spellread. Spellread is a one year small group reading instructional program that focuses on phonological automaticity and reading fluency while providing explicit comprehension and vocabulary instruction as well as writing opportunities, phonemic awareness, decoding, spelling, reading fluency, reading comprehension and writing. Spellread is a scripted program, although a necessary one to have to service our struggling readers.

Teachers utilize In-House Item Skill Analyses, Acuity, ARIS and informal assessment results to form small groups that allow for differentiated instruction. Kaplan lessonbank is also available for teachers to choose lessons by standard or skill to administer to small groups of students.

Classroom set-up allows classroom teachers and support staff to work with small groups of students on the carpet or in centers. The option to pull out small groups of students is also available. Technology is also an option in the classroom or with the technology teacher. The technology teacher is able to assign ELA work to groups of students on Acuity by skill or standard. This is evidence of the constraint communication among our staff.

Kaplan's Data Driven Instruction Program collects and analyzes classroom data to create action plans and differentiate instruction based on the specific needs of the students. Also, our ELL student population is fortunate to have Rosetta Stone where they are taught language through immersion. These students use this program in a small group setting.

Finally, our school supports our teachers by providing support staff, materials, and professional development in our endeavor to allow for small group interventions.

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.

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

---

## **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* (SOM<sup>3</sup>) 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:

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 processes PS 196 will engage in to assess whether these findings are relevant to our school's educational program include:

- Classroom observations both formal and informal
- Classroom design allows for small-group instruction
- Workshop model in place
- Principal scheduled walk-throughs
- Instructional Team Meetings
- Support Staff pushes-in to work with teams of students
- Teacher Information/feedback obtained through discussions our congruence meetings
- Feedback from Math Coach, Kaplan Coach and Mentors

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

Applicable   x Not Applicable

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.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?

- The number of Level 3's and 4's on the 2008 NYS Math Exam
- Coaches team teach and/or model daily in classrooms
- Students work in partners or small groups for daily Math Lessons
- Acquired Data
- Bi-monthly congruence meetings
- Teacher feedback
- Classroom Observations both formal and informal
- Teacher learning objectives, lesson plans, short and long-term goals.
- Feedback from Math Coach, Kaplan Coach and Mentors

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.

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?

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.

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

---

#### **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.

Our school engages in a comprehensive process that affords all staff appropriate and compelling opportunities for professional development. Information with respect to the many and varied instructional and informational seminars, whether offered through the \_\_\_\_\_ of the Office of English Language Learners, BETAC, the New York State Department of Education or our own LSO are disseminated to all staff, including teachers, administrators, school psychologist, social worker and others, whose knowledge of and interaction with English Language Learners, can make a positive difference in their education and their lives. In addition, we hold regular meetings where the ESL provider and regular classroom teachers discuss new research trends, with a focus on innovative and insightful approaches and solutions that might be engaged by us, with respect to the specific needs of various of our English Language Learners.

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?

We maintain attendance, agendas, talking points, notes and next step planning guides, for all of our regularly scheduled meetings where ELL issues are examined.

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

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.

---

**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.

We assess the English language development of our ELL’s both formally and informally. Periodic assessments are conducted, including both the NYSESLAT Interim Assessments providing by Harcourt, as well as teacher – designed assessments formulated by the ESL teacher in consultation with classroom teachers. Additionally, journals and portfolios, are used to help identify areas that are deficient. The information \_\_\_\_\_ from these instruments in shared at our bi-weekly meetings. Students who are identified as requiring additional support are referred to various of our ongoing special programs such as Kaplan’s SpellRead or one of our extended day programs.

Further, the official testing data acquired from the NYSESLAT and the ongoing Interem Assessments are compiled on an ongoing basis for each student by the ESL provider, are used by him to inform instruction and are shared with all relevant staff. Additionally, the information contained in our school report card and the Quality Review with respect to ELL’s is analyzed and discussed by or School Leadership Team.

In September we generate REXH, RLAT and RYOS report from ATS. Information contained herein disaggates data by years of ESL service and proficiency level of students. This information is compiled by the ESL provider and shared with all classroom teachers and other relevant school staff.

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?

We maintain binders containing the information referenced above. We maintain agendas, attendance, notes on relevant talking points and next step planning guides that are the result of our ongoing meetings designed to focus on the monitoring of our ELL's academic progress and achievement, with special emphasis on data sharing and analysis, and implications for instruction for each ELL student.

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 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.

The process the school will engage in to assess the relevant findings of our school's educational program will be:

- By surveying the needs of all teachers (both general education and special education), administration, parents and student;
- In the development and understanding specific academic and social goals created for students;
- Distributing testing accommodations to all teachers;
- By the use of accountable talk and professional development during weekly grade meetings;
- Ongoing collaboration between teachers and team teachers;
- By conferences with guidance and administrators to further discuss student's emotional needs;
- By conversations between the IEP (Individualized Educational Planning) Team and staff through evaluation, triennials and bi-weekly Pupil Personnel Team meetings;
- By informal and formal observations by administrators.

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

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?

Evidence that supports these findings is:

- All special needs students have access to the general education curriculum through the Least Restrictive Environment;
- Special Education teachers teach the students with special needs in the in the self contained classes;
- Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) settings are parallel to the general education curriculum with the differentiation of lessons and materials;
- Differentiated instruction has increased over the past several years through Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) setting; presently we have 7 collaborative team teaching classes – one on every grade level.
- Special Education teachers are active members of the Pupil Personnel Team;
- Teachers' professional development in the Kaplan Data Driven Instruction program: differentiating lessons to all levels of learners, provides guides for lesson planning using data-driven instruction to assess, analyze and instruct, implementing strategies and resources through reflections on assessments;
- Trained staff in Kaplan SpellRead a year long small reading intervention program that focuses on phonological awareness and reading fluency. Backed by independent research. SpellRead combines intensive phonemic and phonetic activities with leveled readers and reading level books to build reading comprehension. Direct and explicit teacher modeling and guidance strengthens vocabulary and comprehension.

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.

The school will address these issues through:

- Professional Development In and out of school for both the general and special education teachers who teach students with special needs;
- The differentiation of instruction will be utilized upwards to further meet the needs of these children;
- More Professional Development for general education teachers to read am implement goals and objectives on child's IEP:
- Professional Development to further enhance the Behavioral Plans for students in collaborative and Resource settings;
- Workshops and training for Paraprofessionals to become active participants in the classroom;
- Assessing where the teacher is, analyzing what they have to do and changing their instruction.

## 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, IEPs 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:

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.

The school will:

- Survey teachers, students, guidance counselors, parents, and related service providers;
- Review teacher made exams in the classroom to meet the needs of students as stated on their IEP;
- Survey staff to see what behavioral plans have been implemented in the classroom;
- Observation, both formal and informal by administrators;
- Best practices through interclass visitations.

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 these findings is:

- According to chapter 408 all teachers who teach students with IEP's have secured copies on file;
- Behavioral plans have been implemented for students who have behavioral issues;
- Ongoing support from the IEP teacher to further meet the needs of teachers to better understand, develop and implement IEP's

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.

The school will address these issues through:

- Accountable talk at staff meetings to address the needs of the staff;
- Continuous professional development for general education teachers in how to read and implement IEP's in the classroom;
- Continuous professional development for general education teachers in using modifications during class exams not just on the New York State exam;

**UPDATED – APRIL 6, 2009**

- Further staff development for all teachers on how to address student's behavioral issues and implementing behavioral plans in the classroom; develop common planning for general and special education teachers to write goals and objectives using ACUITY to address strengths and weaknesses for students with IEP's