



**P.S. 203  
THE FLOYD BENNETT SCHOOL**

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

**SCHOOL: 22K203**

**ADDRESS: 5101 AVENUE M, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11234**

**TELEPHONE: 1-718-241-8488**

**FAX: 1-718-209-9641**

Revised March 22, 2009

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

## 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:** 203      **SCHOOL NAME:** The Floyd Bennett School

**DISTRICT:** 22      **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SCHOOL ADDRESS:** 5101 Avenue M, Brooklyn, New York 11234

**SCHOOL TELEPHONE:** 1-718-241-8488      **FAX:** 1-718-209-9641

**SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON:** Mrs. Lisa Esposito      **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Lesposi3@schools.nyc.gov

**POSITION/TITLE:** PRINCIPAL

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

Mrs. Heather Hodges-Traylor

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mrs. Lisa Esposito

**PRINCIPAL**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mrs. Vivian Goodman

**UFT CHAPTER LEADER**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mrs. Robin White

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION  
PRESIDENT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
N/A

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE**  
*(Required for high schools)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mrs. Marianne Ferrara

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SUPERINTENDENT**

**SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE**

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

Name	Position/Constituency Represented	Signature
Ms. Lisa Esposito	*Principal or Designee	
Ms. Pamela Jones	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Ms. Robin White	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Ms. Rose Edwards	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	Resigned
Ms. Nicoletta Gargano	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
N/A	Student Representative, if applicable	
Mr. Gregory Bennett	Parent	
Ms. Lauren Alfarano	Teacher	
Ms. Shuanna Telford	Teacher	
Ms. Heather Hodges-Traylor	Parent	
Mr. Rodney Greaves	Parent	
Ms. Tracey Braithwaite	Parent	

\* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

## **SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE**

### **Part A. Narrative Description**

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

---

At P.S. 203 we are constantly looking for ways to obtain the most complete picture of student performance we can to inform our instruction. This is done while also devoting great effort to establishing an environment where quality instruction will take place for all students.

We have partnered with AUSSIE for the past 10 years in raising the quality of literacy instruction within the school. This partnership has sparked a level of professional dialogue about how students learn. In literacy we use authentic student work coupled with measurement tools to track student progress in reading. A similar approach is used in gathering data in mathematics. Here we track student progress in Everyday Mathematics using authentic assessments for grades K-5 joined with formalized assessments in grades 3-5.

The manner in which we have improved the quality of instruction our students with special needs receive has evolved in a positive direction over the past several years. Our Collaborative Team Teaching classes are identical in rigor and expectation to every other general education class on the grade except for the presence of two teachers in the room. There is equal access to all programs and activities. Parents are invited to tour the classrooms on the grades whenever they are considering an evaluation for their child so their decisions can be informed within the realm of having seen "real" classrooms. Our self-contained classes (12:1 and 12:1:1) also follow the same curriculum as the classes on the grades with the appropriate modifications in place. Participation and access to all school functions are extended equally across the school.

Our school gave very careful thought to selecting the Knowledge Network as our Learning Support Organization. With the shared belief that school should be a place where students' experiences and knowledge are broadened, our responsibility is to increase the scope and depth of what we offer. Core Knowledge, the focus of the Knowledge Network LSO, offers our students in grades K-5 a rigorous and scaffolded curriculum. At present we offer our students the Core Knowledge curriculum in History and Geography and Language Arts. During the course of the year, our students study World History and American History. Topics in the early childhood grades include studies of the continents, Ancient Egypt, Ancient Greece and our early government. Our upper grade topics include the Vikings, the Middle Ages, the exploration of the Americas, the American Revolution and the Civil War.

Our school's involvement with Character Education and Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) has aided us in our desire to create an environment where instruction is productive. Our SOAR program (**S**how self-control; **O**n Task; **A**ct kindly and follow directions; **R**esponsible and respectful) is the visual enactment of PBIS and Character Education. It is a way for the school community to improve the environment of the larger spaces within our building. Our students are receptive to the benefits of making positive choices, and that has impacted on tone and student achievement.

We believe the narrative above supports our school's Mission statement: *We are dedicated to having all our students achieve high academic standards and raising the level of academic rigor and accountability for our entire school community. Through high quality standards-based instruction, within the setting of a nurturing environment, all of our students will develop social, civic and technological skills to create a community of life long learners.*

**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. 203				
<b>District:</b>	22	<b>DBN #:</b>	22K203	<b>School BEDS Code #:</b>	332200010203

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	53	60	69		94.2	94.2	94.2		
Kindergarten	130	130	134						
Grade 1	128	134	144						
Grade 2	152	135	138	<b>Student Mobility:</b> (% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	157	153	138		93.5	93.9	90.9		
Grade 4	183	152	158						
Grade 5	178	178	154	<b>Eligible for Free Lunch:</b>					
Grade 6	0	0	0	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7	0	0	0		72.2	73.9	73.9		
Grade 8	0	0	0						
Grade 9	0	0	0	<b>Students in Temporary Housing:</b>					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11	0	0	0		0	4	13		
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded Elementary	0	0	2	<b>Recent Immigrants:</b>					
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0	(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	981	942	935		10	4	5		
<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	35	33	31						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	34	68	76	Principal Suspensions	9	15	33		
Number all others	42	32	29	Superintendent Suspensions	16	14	34		
<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	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	46	35	38	<b>Number of Staff:</b>			
# ELLs with IEPs	6	7	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	59	68	71
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	21	9	23
<b>Overage Students:</b>							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	12	N/A	12
	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	98.3	98.5	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4	0.5	0.1	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	72.9	73.5	74.6
Black or African American	79.8	81.5	84.2	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	54.2	60.3	60.6
Hispanic or Latino	10.2	9.8	9.7				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	3.3	2.4	2.2	Percent Masters Degree or higher	85.0	88.0	90.0
White	6.3	5.7	3.7	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	94.9	91.9	99.2
Multi-racial							
<b>Male</b>	49.8	49.8	49.6				
<b>Female</b>	50.2	50.2	50.4				

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

Individual Subject/Area Ratings	Elementary/Middle Level		Secondary Level	
	ELA:	IGS	ELA:	N/A
	Math:	IGS	Math:	N/A
	Science:	IGS	Grad. Rate:	N/A

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	✓	✓	✓			
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-			
Black or African American	✓	✓	✓			
Hispanic or Latino	✓	✓	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-			
White	-	-	-			
Multiracial						
<b>Other Groups</b>						
Students with Disabilities	✓	✓	-			
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	✓	✓	✓			
<b>Student groups making AYP in each subject</b>	5	5	3			

#### Key: AYP Status

v	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
v <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

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	W
Overall Score	69.3	Quality Statement Scores:	
<b>Category Scores:</b>		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	W
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	9.7	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	W
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	18.1	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	?
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	34.7	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W
Additional Credit	6.8	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	W

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?
- 

The data that is available to us as a school allows much reflection on the performance of our tested students. After reviewing these multiple sources, P.S. 203 has noticed encouraging trends that we will be able to build upon this coming school year.

General Education Students: According to the Department of Education test results from 2006-2008 on the ELA exam, tested general education students have displayed encouraging results. Levels 3 and 4 have been steadily increasing whereas the number of students scoring level 1 has decreased. Similar success has been made on the State Math exam where the number of students scoring level 1 has decreased sharply and increases in levels 3 and 4 have been noted. What we can attribute to this success is the school's understanding of the benefits of teaching the individual learner. Every teacher in the building focuses on intensively supporting five students that he or she can work with on skill development. These strategies are then replicated to other students in the group/class/grade/school. Our morning Extended Day program is an excellent place where this can happen. In addition, the high level of Academic Intervention Services, coupled with proactive student support services, creates a standard that supports the long and short-term needs of the student body. As we further disaggregate the General Education population, by gender, as per the recommendations made in the 2007-2008 Quality School Review, P.S. 203 will continue its efforts to enhance the academic program and success for all tested students.

**Males:** Males make up only a slightly larger percentage of tested students at P.S. 203. From 2006-2008 there has been an increase of boys who have scored at a level 4. A slight increase of level 1's from the 2007-2008 testing years shows the need to reevaluate the needs of this subpopulation. P.S. 203 has already begun to focus on all tested males and the specific needs they present. We have increased the varieties of genres available to read in our school library that will be more pleasing for them, as well as forming some and activities that may foster an increasing love of coming to school. P.S. 203 has also recognized the parental role in the lives of their sons through evening professional development sessions hosted by our Parent Coordinator and informal invitations from the PTA to increase paternal attendance at all school functions.

**Females:** There are slightly fewer female students that make up the student body at P.S. 203. However, the female population of students has consistently raised their numbers of levels 3's and 4's over the past three years. Subsequently, they score the fewest level 1's. However, it will be necessary to decrease the number of tested females who score a 1 in the school terms prior to entering the fifth grade. We continue to support them academically, athletically, and

socially. Parents, too, play a large role in their daughters' success. We tap in to this resource through Mother/Daughter evenings hosted by our Parent Coordinator and PTA Executive Board.

#### ELL Students:

The Department of Education testing results from 2006-2008 have displayed exciting trends to note on the ELA exam. Tested ELL students, over the course of three years, have significantly reduced level 1 scores. This trend signifies our intent to increase student achievement for tested ELL students from level 1 to level 2 and above. The State Math exam delivers the same encouraging results. From 2006-2008 the number of tested ELL students scoring at levels 3 and 4 has increased over this time period. It should be noted the decrease in number of students who scored a level 1 and level 2 is equally impressive. What has supported these results is our school's determination of raising the achievement level of this group of students.

#### Special Education Students:

Tested Special Education students have experienced positive results on the ELA exam with a downward trend on the number of students scoring at level 1. P.S. 203 does recognize the need to build upon this success, again from level 1 to level 2 and above. The State Math exam delivers the same encouraging results. From 2006 through 2008, P.S. 203 enjoys a significant decrease in the number of Special Education students testing at level 1 and an increase of students scoring in levels 3 and 4. It is recognized that these outcomes are a direct result of our professional development foci of differentiation of instruction and the mutual relationships between Collaborative Team Teachers and para-professionals. P.S. 203 will continue to elaborate on the roles of pedagogues in the lives of Special Education students during the 2008-2009 school year.

Student success on New York State exams at P.S. 203 can be attributed to the strong commitment by all staff members whose desire it is to mold young minds into the leaders of the future. The Academic Intervention providers at P.S. 203 supports students' academic progress in concert with the efforts of the classroom teacher. We pride ourselves on this collaborative practice and understand that it takes input from different sources to attain high standards. AIS teachers spend time targeting skill development at an early age, identifying weaknesses and remediating them well in advance of the testing grades. After appraising the Quality School Review Report for the 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years, P.S. 203 recognizes that we have already begun to improve upon current approaches for raising the achievement of the students who are in most need of improvement, especially in literacy.

Our commitment to raising achievement in ELA and Math is further promoted through the productive work initiated by the Inquiry Team members. This team reviews all forms of assessments, especially the results for the periodic assessments reported online. They uses that item analysis data, as found in Acuity, to enhance student achievement through effective and concise planning. Classroom teachers, as well, tap into this resource as they use it as a tool to prepare lessons, differentiate instruction, and get to know their students as individuals.

P.S. 203 also recognizes that without a firm understanding of order and discipline, student success in the classroom may falter. We pride ourselves on the incorporation, and rising success, of our PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports) initiatives since the 2006-2007 school year. Our SOAR program (**S**how self-control; **O**n Task; **A**ct kindly and follow directions; **R**esponsible and respectful) is the visual enactment of PBIS and Character Education. With the entire P.S. 203 staff on board, inclusive of teachers, para-professionals, school aides, and administration, we anticipate a decrease in the number of negative behaviors school wide. These expectations are ongoing and are immediately disseminated to any new admits, or visitors to our school, to ensure a smooth transition into the climate of success we have worked so hard to create. Currently, our student body is

receptive to the benefits of making positive choices, and that has impacted on tone and student achievement.

## 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.

---

**Goal 1:** By June 2009, the percentage of all K-5 students including ELL's and Special Education students reaching grade level proficiency as measured by ECLAS-2 (in Grades K-2) and Benchmarks (in Grades K-5) and Standardized test scores (in Grades 3-5) will increase by 3-5%.

Description: To engage in a collaborative process with key school staff to identify students in greatest academic need in literacy and develop strategies for improvement.

**Goal 2:** By June 2009, the percentage of all K-2 students including ELLs and Special Education students reaching grade level proficiency, and all tested students in Grades 3-5 including ELL's and Special Education students moving up one level on state math assessments will increase by 3-5 percent.

Description: To ensure that all students are working to their fullest potential and are prepared for standardized exams, the staff at P.S. 203 is diligently working in a proactive manner, teaching every student as an individual. P.S. 203 is affording at-risk students with multiple forms of intervention services, which include Extended Day small group instruction and after school AIIP as well as pull-out services during the school day.

**Goal 3:** By June 2009, 90% of faculty conferences and grade meetings will consist of professional development that is based on goal setting from data analysis of periodic assessments, Acuity data, student portfolios, and teacher created classroom assessments. To further support this goal, 85% of the teaching staff will participate in 1:1 conferences with supervisors, 5-7 times a year, to analyze student work as measured by assessment binders, conference notes, supervisory logs, and student work.

Description: To provide professional development opportunities strategically targeted to utilizing student performance progress data, teacher needs, and interest.

**Goal 4:** By June 2009, the percentage of all students in Grades 1-5, including ELLs and Special Education students, reaching grade level proficiency in Core Knowledge strands of History and Geography and Sayings and Phrases, as measured by Core Knowledge unit assessments will increase by 75%.

Description: To extend the implementation of the Core Knowledge curriculum to grades 3-5, in History and Geography and Sayings and Phrases, and to expand students' knowledge base in selected content area topics with several Grade K classes immersing in all aspects of Core Knowledge.

**Goal 5:** By June 2009 the number of students school wide responding to Tier 1 Universal PBIS strategies will increase by 5 percent as evidenced by “in-flight” log journals, office referrals and occurrence reports.

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

Description: PBIS, or Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, is an ongoing school wide initiative supporting all students in the school building. Its purpose in the building is to build from the results found from the work we have done in Character Education. All faculty members support students. A small group has been targeted by our SOAR Team for more intensive Tier 2 support, and that is a group that can build the numbers of students embracing the Universal principles.

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

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

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, the percentage of all K-5 students including ELL’s and Special Education students reaching grade level proficiency as measured by ECLAS-2 (in Grades K-3) and Benchmarks (in Grades K-5) and Standardized test scores (in Grades 3-5) will increase by 3-5%.</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>	<p><u>Target Population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students in grades K-5</li> </ul> <p><u>Staffing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coach, facilitators, supervisors, AIS teachers, consultants, classroom and cluster teachers, paraprofessionals, Data Specialist, Literacy Team, Professional Development Team, and Inquiry Team</li> </ul> <p><u>Actions/Strategies/Activities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further implementation of Balanced Literacy for 120 minutes in Grades K-5.</li> <li>• Continued support for all others previously trained.</li> <li>• Continued use of Making Meaning on grades K-5.</li> <li>• Adherence to pacing and scope and sequence as put forth in CAB Planning Guides for Literacy</li> <li>• Increased availability of appropriate texts to support Balanced Literacy.</li> <li>• Administration of ECLAS-2 and identification of student needs in grades K-3.</li> <li>• Administration of periodic assessments via Predictives and Instructionally Targeted Assessments for identification of student needs.</li> <li>• Continued expansion of the current collection of leveled materials in the Literacy room to include more titles for the younger grades, books of high interest and low readability for older less accomplished readers, and texts of high readability yet developmentally</li> </ul>

appropriate for younger more accomplished readers. It will be of high importance to purchase texts that are of a desirable nature to males and those that are as enjoyable to females.

- Further expansion of the materials available to ELL's.
- Continued reinforcement of staff development in Writing Workshop with a focus on using assessments to inform instruction and raising the level of questioning, particularly during conferences.
- Ongoing scaffolding of professional development in Writing Workshop with a focus on using accrued data to inform instruction and set goals.
- Active representation from staff from grades K-5 on Literacy team and Professional Development Team.
- Professional development guided by working with shared professional texts (Assessing Writers, One-On-One the Art of Conferring, Teaching the Qualities of Writing, Better Answers, and the Non-Fiction Craft Lessons.)
- Intervisitations, modeled lessons, collaborative planning opportunities, and curriculum mapping.
- Updated classroom Libraries Grades K-5
- Waterford Early Reading program in Grades K-1 to provide diagnostic and prescriptive individualization of independent instruction (with accompanying staff development)
- Wilson Foundations for most at risk lower grade students and Wilson Reading program for most at risk upper grade students.
- Great Leaps Reading 1:1 instruction in fluency for at risk students.
- Quick Reads, Think Alongs and Thing Reading in comprehension for at risk students.
- Leap Frog technology (Leap pads), SkillsTutor, and Acuity with accompanying Professional Development where needed.
- On-going assessment using Rigby Benchmarking, DRA or WRAP as well as rubric-based structures for evaluation.
- Family Literacy evenings and days scheduled in conjunction with our Parent Coordinator for parents to experience, with their children, the skills involved with the state exams in ELA and Social Studies.
- Informal testing using CTB Terra Nova, Grades 1 - 2 to further assess literacy skills.
- AIS (including before/after school programs like Project Read, AIIP, and Extended Day morning program).
- Reduced class size wherever possible.

### Implementation Timeline

Sept 2008-June 2009 for students-Balanced Literacy implementation in grades K-5, daily 120 minutes per day for grades K-5.

Sept 2008-June 2009 – for staff – Professional Development 2-3x per year 90-120 minutes each during school day.

Sept 2008- June 2009—Monthly Grade Conferences focusing on student work and goal setting

Sept 2008-June 2009—Implementation of Waterford Early Reading Program (Grades K-1), Making Meaning (Grades K-5), and SkillsTutor (Grades 2-5 through January and K-5 from Feb-June)

Sept 2008-June 2009—Skill of the Week lessons and tracking

Sept 2008-June 2009—Literacy and Inquiry Team meetings 2 times per month

Sept 2008-June 2009—Extended Day sessions AIS (37 ½ minutes four days per week)

Sept 2008- June 2009—Consultancy cycles in literacy (AUSSIE)

Sept 2008- October 2008 – administration of ECLAS-2

October 2008-June 2009—Goal setting and Spotlight 5 targeted instruction

October 2008- May 2009—Rubric based assessment of writing with supervisory review after each published genre (Grades K-5)

October 2008 Predictive ELA Assessment #1 (Grades 3-5)

October 2008- June 2009—AIS (Foundations, Wilson Reading, New Heights, Acuity, Great Leaps, Leap Track/Leap Frog technology and QuickReads) small group instruction for Grades K-5

October 2008 – March 2009 – AIS (Project Read) 3 days per week for Grades 1-5, 3-5 hours per week

October 2008-January 2009—AIIP in Reading after school (Grades 3-5—academic intervention)

October 2008-November 2008-- Family ELA Nights/Reading Series

Nov/Dec 2008, April/May 2009 – (Grade K); Sept/Oct 2008, Dec.2008/Jan/2009, April/May 2009 (Grades 1-5) Benchmarking data (Rigby, WRAP, Fountas and Pinnell) collection and Tracking of data

November 2008 Instructionally Targeted Assessment (ITA) #1 (Grades 3-5)

January 2009—New York State ELA exams (Grades 3-5)

March- April 2009—ITA #2 in ELA (Grades 3-5)

April 2009—Bedtime Bears, and Books Literacy Night

May 2009 Kindergarten ECLAS-2 second administration (optional) Grades1-3 required second administration

May 2009—ITA #3 in ELA (Grades 3-5)

May 2009 – E-PAL administration and NYSESLAT administration

	June 2009—Predictive ELA Assessment #2 (Grades 3-5)
<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><u>Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Tax Levy and Title I SWP monies to fund coach, consultant, Data Specialist, AIS teachers; purchase of specific content area materials; per session and per diem funds to support planning of curriculum units; budget allowance for celebrations, events to involve parents, parent newsletter, additional supplies for projects, and trips.</li> <li>• Use of C4E monies to lower class size.</li> </ul>
<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>Ongoing throughout the school year, the pedagogical staff will use the following as indicators of accomplishment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracking sheets from Benchmarking maintained on an ongoing basis all grades – reviewed by supervisors 3 times per year.</li> <li>• Running records, goal-setting sheets, and conference notes to be maintained on an ongoing basis and to be reviewed in collaboration with supervisors at conferences 3-5 times per year.</li> <li>• Rubric-based assessments of student writing – reviewed by teachers and students on an ongoing basis (portfolios, conferences, etc), and supervisors to review 4 times a year.</li> <li>• Great Leaps tracking sheets reviewed by supervisor monthly.</li> <li>• Skill of the Week sheets (Grades 3-5)—reviewed by supervisors 3 times a year.</li> <li>• NYSESLAT (Spring Administration).</li> <li>• Leap Track individualized plans/progress charts, SkillsTutor and prescribed support on Acuity (teacher review weekly, supervisor review 3 times a year).</li> <li>• Standardized test scores (Grades 3, 4, and 5).</li> <li>• CTB Terra Nova in Reading Grades 1-2 (Spring administration).</li> <li>• ECLAS –2 twice a year (Grades K-3).</li> <li>• E-PAL Grades 2 and 3 (Spring administration).</li> <li>• Waterford individualized plans/progress charts (teacher review weekly, supervisor review three times a year).</li> </ul>

	<p>Projected Gains Fountas and Pinnell levels will progress for 85% of all students every 3 months</p>
--	--

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, the percentage of all K-2 students including ELLs and Special Education students reaching grade level proficiency, and all tested students in grades 3-5 including ELL's and Special Education students moving up one level on state math assessments will increase by 3-5 percent.</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>	<p><u>Target Population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All tested students in grades 3-5; All students in grades K through 2.</li> </ul> <p><u>Staffing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coach, supervisors, lead teachers, consultants, classroom and cluster teachers, paraprofessionals, AIS providers, Data Specialist, Professional Development Team, and Math Team.</li> </ul> <p><u>Actions/Strategies/Activities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full implementation of Everyday Math in grades K-5</li> <li>• 60 minutes math block in Grades K-2, 75 minutes in grades 3-5</li> <li>• Pacing and Scope and Sequence provided by CAB in Mathematics and aligned with the NYS Standards.</li> <li>• Benchmark assessments and Strand of the Week aligned to NYS standards.</li> <li>• Intense Professional development, mentoring, modeling and collaboration by Math Coach, and staff developer.</li> <li>• Opportunities for Professional Development intervisitations.</li> <li>• Leap Frog technology (Leap pads, Quantum pads, and Leap Track), SkillsTutor and Acuity to individualize math skills application and corresponding professional development to formulate prescriptive individualization of skill practice.</li> <li>• Increased utilization of mathematics manipulatives that may prove beneficial to the different strengths and weaknesses of our male and female populations.</li> <li>• Family Math Nights</li> <li>• Embedded product assessment; looking at student work to identify the strengths and weaknesses of our male and female populations.</li> <li>• 100<sup>th</sup> Day activities to develop number sense.</li> <li>• Expanding upon Journal writing in mathematics in grades K-5.</li> <li>• Administration of CTB Terra Nova in Math for Grade 2.</li> <li>• Collaborations to create rubric-based assessments.</li> </ul>

- Raise the level of Accountable Talk and heighten quality of questioning in mathematics
- Periodic Assessments in Mathematics three to four times a year for grades 3-5.
- Everyday Mathematics Unit Assessments and conferences with supervisors.
- Leap Track individualized plans/progress charts, SkillsTutor and prescribed support on Acuity (teacher review weekly, supervisor review 3 times a year).
- Small group instruction for students most at risk (including use of Great Leaps Math, Leap Track).
- Intense Professional development, mentoring, modeling and collaboration by Math Coach, and staff developer.
- Representation of all grades on Professional Development Team and Math Team
- AIS (including before/after school programs like Project Read, AIIP, and Extended Day morning program).
- Reduced class size wherever possible

#### Implementation Timeline

Sept 2008-June 2009 CAB in Mathematics pacing and Scope and Sequence

Sept 2008- June 2009 – implementation of Everyday Math curriculum 60-75 minutes per day (Grades Pre-K-5)

Sept 2008-June 2009—Checking Progress Unit Assessments in Everyday Math administered 10 times per year (Grades 1-5); Guidepost assessments in Grade K

Sept 2008-June 2009—Checking Progress Unit Assessment results and student work reviewed with teacher and supervisor (1:1) 3-4 times per year (Grades 1-5)

Sept 2008- June 2009—Monthly Grade Conferences focusing on student work and goal setting

Sept 2008-June 2009—AIS (Great Leaps Mathematics, Math Fact Fluency, Leap Track/LeapFrog and Acuity technology, and SkillsTutor) small group instruction for Grades K-5

Sept 2008-June 2009—Math Team meetings 2 times per month

Sept 2008- June 2009—Extended Day AIS (37 ½ minutes four days per week)

September 2008/June 2009—Benchmark assessment in mathematics (Grades 2-5 in the fall and Grades 2 and 3 in the spring)

Sept 2008-February 2009—Hundred Day Activities (cumulative)

October 2008-June 2009—Goal setting and Spotlight 5 targeted instruction

October 2008- May 2009 – Consultancy cycles in mathematics (e.g. Fordham)

November 2008—Instructionally Targeted Assessment (ITA) #1 in Mathematics (Grades 3-5)

December 2008 Predictive Math Assessment #1 (Grades 3-5)

December 2008-March 2009—Strand of the Week lessons and tracking

	<p>January 2009-February 2009 – Family Math Nights (Grades 3-5)  January 2009-March 2009—AIP in Mathematics after school (Grades 3-5 academic intervention)  March 2009—New York State Mathematics exams (Grades 3-5)  March- April 2009—ITA #2 in Mathematics (Grades 3-5)  May 2009—ITA #3 in Mathematics (Grades 3-5)  June 2009—Predictive Math Assessment #2 (Grades 3-5)</p>
<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><u>Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Tax Levy and Title I SWP monies to fund coach, consultant, Data Specialist, AIS teachers; purchase of specific content area materials; per session and per diem funds to support planning of curriculum units; budget allowance for celebrations, events to involve parents, parent newsletter, additional supplies for projects, and trips.</li> <li>• Use of C4E monies to lower class size.</li> </ul>
<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>Ongoing throughout the school year, the pedagogical staff will use the following as indicators of accomplishment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubric-based assessments of student work – reviewed by teachers and students on an ongoing basis (portfolios, conferences, etc), and supervisors to review 3 times a year.</li> <li>• Everyday Mathematics pacing calendars and assessment, ongoing and reviewed at 1:1 conferences between teachers and supervisors 4 times a year.</li> <li>• Standardized Test scores (Grades 3-5)</li> <li>• Periodic Assessments including Predictives and Instructionally Targeted Assessments three to four times a year.</li> <li>• Great Leaps Math tracking sheets reviewed by supervisor monthly.</li> <li>• Strand of the Week sheets (Grades 3-5)—reviewed by supervisors 2 times a year.</li> <li>• Math Benchmarks (Fall and Spring administration)</li> <li>• CTB Terra Nova in Math results and results analysis for Grade 2 (Spring administration)</li> </ul> <p>Projected Gains  Secure goals on Checking Progress assessments will be mastered by 85% of all students with a minimum of 75% accuracy.</p>

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Goal Driven Professional Development

<p><b>Annual Goal</b>  <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2009, 90% of faculty conferences and grade meetings will consist of professional development that is based on goal setting from data analysis of periodic assessments, Acuity data, student portfolios, and teacher created classroom assessments. To further support this goal, 85% of the teaching staff will participate in 1:1 conferences with supervisors, 5-7 times a year, to analyze student work as measured by assessment binders, conference notes, supervisory logs, and student work.</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>	<p><u>Target Population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students in grades K-5 including ELLs and Special Education students.</li> </ul> <p><u>Staffing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coaches, facilitators, supervisors, consultants, classroom and cluster teachers, paraprofessionals, Data Specialist, Professional Development Team, Literacy Team, Math Team, and Inquiry Team will work collaboratively to closely monitor and analyze performance data to reflect upon practice and revise goals.</li> </ul> <p><u>Actions/Strategies/Activities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule grade meetings, pre- and post-observation conferences and 1:1 goal-setting conferences with supervisors, and professional development sessions with coach and consultants to include study groups, curriculum mapping, Lunch &amp; Learns, inter visitations in model classrooms, and demo lessons. Meetings are devised to focus on sub groups of the student body (males, females, ELLs, and their families) in order to adequately address their needs.</li> <li>Schedule common preps/extended preps, teacher-administrator conferences, lunch &amp; learns, grade meetings, faculty conferences, per session for study groups, and per diem for Curriculum Mapping and intervisitations.</li> <li>Work with Data Specialist, team members, coaches, and consultants to deepen staff awareness &amp; understanding of data (hard/soft).</li> <li>Support teachers in the use of technology to access data from the predictive and targeted assessments.</li> <li>Provide opportunities to attend external Professional Development sessions.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase awareness of those male and female students who need support in the area of Literacy and Math.</li> <li>• Collaborate with DOE and LSO staff to enhance our Professional Development offerings.</li> </ul> <p><u>Implementation Timeline</u></p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009—Monthly Grade and Faculty Conferences with focus on student work, goal setting, and turn keying professional development received from DOE/LSO PD attendees</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009—1:1 meetings between teacher and supervisor to review student work, data, and goals (5-7 times per year)</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009—pre- and post- observation conferences (a minimum of 2 per year per teacher)</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009—Professional Development sessions (90-120 minutes per grade) 5-8 times per year for curriculum planning and/or mapping</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009—Professional Development Team meetings twice per month</p> <p>Sept 2008- June 2009—Common preparation periods (each grade once a week and Collaborative Team Teaching teams once per day)</p> <p>Sept 2008-May 2009—DOE Professional Development offerings attended as appropriate</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009 – LSO Professional Development offerings attended as appropriate</p> <p>October 2008-June 2009—Intervisitations intra- and inter- school scheduled as needed</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b></p> <p><i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p><u>Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Title I SWP and Tax Levy monies to provide consultants, planning time, purchase use of computer programs related to gathering/interpreting data (Student Growth Monitor, SkillsTutor, Leap Track, Waterford, etc.), per session for study groups, and per diem for Curriculum Mapping and intervisitations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b></p> <p><i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Ongoing throughout the school year, administrators will use the following as indicators of accomplishment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agendas and minutes and handouts from team meetings held bi-weekly, grade conferences held monthly, and Professional Development days held 3 times a year.</li> <li>• Conference notes (1:1 and Spotlight 5) reviewed with teacher and supervisor 2-3 times per year</li> <li>• Lesson plans reviewed periodically</li> </ul>

- LSO - Professional Development Calendar provided monthly
- DOE Professional Development offerings provided weekly
- Availability of teacher professional resources
- Study Groups 2-3 times per year
- Visitation schedules
- Technology printouts and student assessments reviewed 5-7 times per year 1:1 with teachers
- Coach logs
- Faculty Notes monthly
- Needs Assessments

Projected Gains

Increase in levels of student achievement by indicators in content areas where PD has been provided.

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Core Knowledge: Social Studies/Language Arts

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, the percentage of all students in Grades 1-5, including ELLs and Special Education students, reaching grade level proficiency in Core Knowledge strands of History and Geography and Sayings and Phrases, as measured by Core Knowledge unit assessments will increase by 75%.</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>	<p><u>Target Population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All enrolled students in grades K-5 including ELLs and Special Education students will be affected by History and Geography and Sayings and Phrases Core Knowledge components.</li> <li>• Thirty percent of the Kindergarten classes will implement all instructional Core Knowledge components.</li> </ul> <p><u>Staffing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Knowledge facilitator, coaches, arts teachers, lead teachers, classroom teachers, supervisors, and external content specialists.</li> </ul> <p><u>Actions/Strategies/Activities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule common planning time to create model lessons, enhance professional dialogue on content topics, and plan for future performances.</li> <li>• Extended Core Knowledge Professional Development sessions in house every 8 weeks with lead teachers and/or teachers on the grade and Core Knowledge facilitator.</li> <li>• Family Core Knowledge evenings scheduled in conjunction with our Parent Coordinator.</li> <li>• Intervisitations between Core Knowledge elementary schools.</li> <li>• Core Knowledge celebrations on each grade 2 times a year.</li> <li>• Off site experiences</li> <li>• In-house collaboration with Visual arts and Music specialists.</li> <li>• Collaboration with New York Cares’ artists and volunteers to create Core Knowledge themed murals for hallway displays.</li> </ul>

	<p><u>Implementation Timelines</u></p> <p>July 2008-Sept 2008—Initial roll out of implementation of Core Knowledge curriculum in Grades 3-5</p> <p>Sept 2008- June 2009—Pre- and Post- Unit Assessments in Core Knowledge History and Geography and Sayings and Phrases strands</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009—Professional Development sessions for curriculum planning/pacing (each grade 90-120 minutes 4-6 times per year)</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009—Implementation of entire Core Knowledge Curriculum in 30% of classes on Grade K</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009—Off-site experiences (museum, tours, festivals) to support Core Knowledge content studied</p> <p>Sept 2008-June 2009— Culminating projects as outgrowths of 6-8 week cycles, Rubric-based assignments in writing, art, etc. to evidence gains in knowledge (ongoing displays)</p> <p>March 2009-May 2009—Performances (one per grade) for units of Core Knowledge studies</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b></p> <p><i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p><u>Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Tax Levy and Title I SWP monies to fund purchasing of specific Core Knowledge content area materials; per session and per diem funds to support planning of curriculum units; budget allowance for celebrations, events to involve parents, parent newsletter, additional supplies for projects, and trips.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b></p> <p><i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Ongoing throughout the school year, administrators will use the following as indicators of accomplishment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student portfolios/projects ongoing.</li> <li>• Core Knowledge pre- and post-assessments 4-6 times per year.</li> <li>• Photographs of student work displays.</li> <li>• Student trips to support Core Knowledge curriculum twice a year.</li> <li>• Programs from celebratory events twice per year per grade.</li> <li>• Agendas from professional development.</li> <li>• Sample unit plans/exemplary lesson plans ongoing and cumulative.</li> <li>• Teacher lesson plans that include Core Knowledge topics &amp; materials.</li> <li>• Formal observations once a year.</li> </ul>

	<p>Projected Gains</p> <p>Increased achievement on Standardized test scores (Fall, Winter, Spring administration) and measured increase of students performing at grade level proficiency to 75% on Core Knowledge post-unit assessments.</p>
--	---

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** **PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports)**

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, the number of students school wide responding to Tier 1 Universal PBIS strategies will increase by 5 percent as evidenced by “in-flight” log journals, office referrals, and occurrence reports.</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>	<p><u>Target Population</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students in Grades K-5 including ELLs and Special Education students.</li> </ul> <p><u>Staffing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lead PBIS teacher, PBIS team, Pupil Personnel Team, consultants, supervisors, pedagogical staff, school aides, custodial and office staff, crossing guards and SSAs, and substitute teachers.</li> </ul> <p><u>Actions/Strategies/Activities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full value contracts in each classroom</li> <li>Universal lessons created by PBIS team and modeled in larger spaces as identified by needs assessments</li> <li>Check-In/ Check-Out approach for Tier 2 students</li> <li>PBIS consultants to work with in-house liaison.</li> <li>Celebration periods for classes earning many gold coupons</li> <li>Celebrating individual achievement by earning green coupons</li> <li>Maintaining the SOAR Port Gift Shop to redeem green coupons for a variety of items.</li> <li>Dissemination of PBIS/Character Education literature on a monthly basis.</li> <li>Inclusion of PBIS/Character Education philosophies on daily Morning Message and in Vision/Mission statements.</li> </ul> <p><u>Implementation Timeline</u></p> <p>Aug 2008-October 2008—Review previous year’s data to identify students for “in flight” program</p> <p>October 2008- June 2009—Implementation of Check-in Check out for in flight students (following goal setting, daily checking in at line-up, lunch time, end of the day)</p> <p>Sept 2008- June 2009—PBIS Team meetings (weekly)</p>

	<p>Sept 2008-June 2009—Whole school (universal) lessons in various common spaces (school yard, auditorium, morning line-up locations, hallways, cafeteria) initially in fall and refresher lessons throughout the year as needed</p> <p>Sept 2008- June 2009—Expanding green/gold ticket program to include substitutes, crossing guards, neighborhood businesses</p> <p>Sept 2008- June 2009—Lesson plans to facilitate classroom exploration of Character Education values (every 1-2 months) supported by daily morning announcements praising students who embody Character Education values and Student of the Month recognition</p> <p>Sept 2008- June 2009—Data entry onto SWIS system to track office referrals</p> <p>Sept 2008- June 2009—Distribution of Green and Gold SOAR tickets (school wide incentive plan)</p> <p>Sept 2008- June 2009—Class and individual visits to SOARport Gift Shop (4-6 times a year)</p> <p>Sept 2008—Creation of Full Value Contracts in all classrooms</p> <p>November 2008- June 2009—SOAR dances for classes with largest numbers of gold tickets</p>
<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><u>Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Tax Levy and Title I SWP monies to fund the purchase of instructional materials, per session, per diem for professional development support activities including team meetings, inter/intra visitations, lead teacher PBIS position, external professional development, and consultants.</li> </ul>
<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>Ongoing throughout the school year, Lead PBIS teacher and administrators will use the following as indicators of accomplishment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty Conferences and professionals development agendas</li> <li>• In-Flight Goal setting sheets reviewed daily</li> <li>• Inter/Intra- visitation schedules</li> <li>• Availability of and access to teacher professional resources and texts</li> <li>• Sample lesson plans 3-4 times a year</li> <li>• Exemplary student behavior growth in targeted areas on the P.S. 203 campus; auditorium, lunchroom, school yard, hallways, and classrooms, etc. as documented on SWIS</li> <li>• Assessments indicating increase in student skills and achievement.</li> <li>• OORS incident reports daily.</li> </ul>

	<p>Projected Gains</p> <p>The number of students school wide responding to PBIS strategies will increase by 5%, improving the overall climate of the school as evidenced in surveys and OORS reports.</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	52	52	N/A	N/A	1	0	2	0
1	150	122	N/A	N/A	1	0	2	0
2	90	90	N/A	N/A	3	0	3	0
3	142	128	N/A	N/A	2	0	4	0
4	153	144	0	0	1	0	3	0
5	102	135	33	24	3	0	1	0
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o Students in Grade 9 who performed at Level 1 or Level 2 on NYS Grade 8 ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies assessments.
- o Students in Grades 10 – 12 who scored below the approved passing grade on any Regents examination required for graduation in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

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

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	<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>	<p>Project READ is an after school remedial program in reading and math. It is conducted three afternoons a week for one and one-half hour sessions. It is provided to students in grades 1-5. The Balanced Literacy approach is used, emphasizing diagnostic prescriptive teaching. AILP is a before/after school intervention program in literacy conducted for approximately thirty hours either during one and one-half hour sessions twice a week. A Balanced Literacy approach is utilized, incorporating test taking techniques and strategies. A diagnostic/prescriptive approach with small group instruction is used. AIS is provided to Gr. K-5 students as part of our Extended Day program (37.5 minutes four days a week). This before-school intervention is limited to a group size of ten students.</p> <p><u>The Wilson Reading System</u> is administered to 53 at risk students in grades 3-4 during the school day, 5x a week for 45-60 minutes each day. Each group consists of 4-6 children. The Wilson Reading System is a research-based program utilizing a multisensory, interactive approach “to teach total word structure for decoding and encoding”.</p> <p><u>Wilson Foundations</u>, incorporating Wilson Reading System principles is provided to 28 at risk and IEP children in grades 1 &amp; 2.</p> <p><u>“The Great Leaps” Reading Program</u> is administered to 70 students in grades 1-4 5x a week during the school day for 15-minute sessions. This is a remedial reading program designed to build fluency and train students in “essential phonics”.</p> <p><u>“New Heights”</u> instruction is provided to 20 ESL children, grades 2-5, 5x a week during their 45 minute scheduled time. New Heights is a research based audio facilitated program. The teacher monitors students for accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, after they practice reading books at their instructional level with the support of an audiotape.</p> <p><u>Think Along and Think Reading</u> are administered to 450 students in Grades K-2 and Grades 3-5 respectively two days a week during Extended Day (37.5 minutes). They present a metacognitive approach to reading to facilitate the students’ thinking about their thinking as they read.</p>

<b>Mathematics:</b>	<p>AllIP is a before/after school intervention program that begins at the turn of the year for small groups in math conducted for thirty hours during one and one-half hour sessions twice a week. A diagnostic/prescriptive approach is utilized, incorporating test taking techniques and strategies. AIS is provided to Gr. 3-5 students in-school using small group pull-out intervention 45-minutes 3x a week. Group size is limited to six students. AIS is provided to Gr. K-5 students as part of our Extended Day program (37.5 minutes four days a week). This before-school intervention is limited to a group size of ten students.</p> <p>“Great Leaps” Math program was provided to 63, Grade 3-5 students during the school day in a ratio of one student per teacher within a pull-out program. This research based program moves through concrete, representational and abstract levels. Components taught include math facts and operations and concepts and rules. Each student’s progress is monitored with corrective feedback provided until a mastery level is reached.</p>
<b>Science:</b>	<p>AIS in science is provided on an on-going basis during instructional time. Small group and individual instruction occur based on the specific needs of each student. The students who fell short of the promotional criteria in science receive this intervention by the classroom teachers.</p>
<b>Social Studies:</b>	<p>AllIP In Social Studies is provided after school to 24, 5<sup>th</sup> graders, with an emphasis on comprehension of main points and supporting details with reiteration of those facts in writing.</p>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b>	<p>Individual counseling, group counseling, and full-class guidance lessons are provided. In addition, family-school problem solving meetings and conflict resolutions were conducted as crisis interventions for those at-risk.</p>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	<p>Educationally related services (ERSS) are short term early intervention services provided to general education students in Grades K-5 to help them overcome academic, social, or emotional difficulties so they may improve their academic achievement and attendance.</p>
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>	

## **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 (2008-2009) LAP narrative to this CEP.

---

### **Language Allocation Policy**

School: P.S. 203

District: 22

Superintendent: Ms. Marianne Ferrara

### **Team Members**

\_\_\_Lisa Esposito\_\_\_  
Principal

\_\_\_Brian Sadowski\_\_\_  
Assistant Principal

\_\_\_Sheryl Cohen\_\_\_  
ESL Coordinator

\_\_\_Juliana Primo\_\_\_  
Parent Coordinator

\_\_\_Peggy Hayes\_\_\_  
Literacy Coach

\_\_\_Jeanie Denaro\_\_\_  
Math Coach

P.S. 203 is a school in the neighborhood of Flatlands, Brooklyn. It houses approximately 935 students. There are 69 in pre-kindergarten, 138 in kindergarten, 144 in first grade, 138 in second grade, 138 in third grade, 158 in fourth grade, and 154 in fifth grade. There are also 38 children in three self-contained special education classes. There are 41 ELL students in the school, which is comparable to last year's numbers. In 2007-2008 there were 2 in kindergarten, 12 in first grade, 6 in second grade, 8 in third grade, 10 in fourth grade, and 3 in fifth grade. The languages spoken by the ELL students are Spanish (14), Haitian (18), Urdu (4), Arabic (1), French (2), and Chinese (2). The trend in parental letters was mainly for English as a Second Language services. There were those who chose bilingual or Dual language. Our school has only an ESL pullout program.

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

There is no Native Language Arts program because there are no native languages spoken in the school. There are translations available for children taking State tests.

In 2008, children scored in 4 different categories on the NYSESLAT. The score totals were as follows: Beginner level was 6, Intermediate level was 11, Advanced level was 12 and Proficient was 12. Children who are here more years tended to score in the Intermediate levels and higher. Newcomers to the country scored as Beginners. Students tended to score the highest on the Speaking section, next on the Listening section, third on the Reading section, and last on the Writing section of the NYSESLAT. The scores for the children in the higher grades tended to have scores within a similar range for the four modalities. The children in the lower grades scored much higher on the first two modalities. Many students went up a level in categories as compared to their scores the year before. Children who score out of ESL may still be picked up by other academic intervention programs to keep strengthening their skills. Examples of these programs are: Foundations, Wilson, and Great Leaps. This gives them confidence to succeed in their regular classrooms.

Children continue to receive ESL services based on the NYSESLAT scores from the previous year. Children in the Beginner and Intermediate levels receive 360 minutes a week, divided into 5 days. The Advanced children receive 180 minutes a week divided into the 5 days. New children, upon entering the school, receive the Home Language survey. The parent fills out the survey. The child is given the LAB-R test, if it is appropriate. If he/she fails the test then he/she will be placed into the ESL program. Lessons focus on the four modalities of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Children work on main ideas, drawing conclusions, critical thinking, and sequencing skills. Within the ESL class children participate in Shared Reading experiences and Guided Reading groups, much as they do within the classrooms. The ESL teacher has had collaborative planning with our school's AUSSIE consultant. Children have a chance to express themselves in a smaller setting which helps bring out their speaking skills, giving them more confidence in their own classrooms. There is one ESL teacher at P.S. 203 with the correct qualifications for teaching ESL. The instructional materials being used in the ESL classroom include: New Heights, Leap Frog, Rigby Theme Packs leveled library books, Amazing English skills, journal and activity books on five levels, Flash grammar books on five levels, and Lakeshore Learning bags (including objects, books and activities for that book). They were ordered on the school level. The teacher speaks to the classroom teachers to see how the students are doing in the official classroom. Students' strengths are enhanced and needs are worked on as a focus of the discussions during ESL. The Making Meaning program used in every classroom fosters discussions used with the literature read aloud to students. This program has a strong vocabulary component addressing specific needs of ESL students.

Students entering P.S. 203 are generally not SIFE. They are students coming from other cities or countries where they have been in school. Long term ELL students in our school and academically struggling students are placed in extra programs. We have before school (Extended Day) and after school programs. We also have other academic intervention programs during the school day offered to all students not yet meeting the standards in ELA. Children who may benefit from different settings within the school are tested, and may be placed in alternate programs. We have Collaborative Team Teaching classes, and 1R and 3R classes. At present we have 11 ELL students with IEPs. There are 2 students who have their own bilingual paraprofessionals for extra support, as determined by their IEP. Students who are here less than 1 year do not take the state exam. There is also a list of extension of services for those children who continue to require ESL services.

## Part B: CR Part 154 (A-4) Bilingual/ESL Program Description

---

Type of Program: \_\_\_ Bilingual  ESL \_\_\_ Both      Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08: 41  
(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).

P.S. 203 is a school that contains 930 students serving Pre-Kindergarten – Fifth Grade. The free-standing ESL program has one certified teacher and about 40 students. It is a pull-out program taught in English. The children are pulled out every day for services according to their level on the NYSESLAT exam. We do not have a bilingual program. The main languages are Haitian Creole and Spanish. Other languages include Arabic and Urdu. P.S. 203 has a special education program which includes some ELL students.

New admits, upon entering the school, fill out the new home language survey. They are given the LAB-R test, if it is appropriate. If they score below the cut-off then they will be placed into the ESL program. Students are placed into groups according to their age and level. Lessons focus on the 4 modalities of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Children work on main ideas, drawing conclusions, critical thinking, and sequencing skills. Children participate in Shared Reading and Guided Reading groups within the ESL program. Some instructional materials are: New Heights, Leap Frog, Rigby Theme Pack books, Flash grammar books, the Amazing English series, and Lakeshore Learning bags. ELLs participate during literacy and math programs.

B. Extracurricular: Briefly describe extracurricular activities available in your school, and the extent to which ELLs participate.

ELLs participate in all Extended Day and after school AIS programs. There's also an after school program (OST) with Bergen Beach Youth Organization.

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.

Working together, the ESL teacher and Parent Coordinator handle the ELL parent outreach, providing native language information whenever possible. Parents are invited to attend PTA meetings and monthly parent workshops on parenting/health issues. The Parent Coordinator works with the parents on evening events. Some evening events include Family Literacy Night, Family Math Night and our Annual Spring Gala. The PTA coordinates plant and book sales as well as Picture Day, and our Annual Pumpkin Patch. All parents are invited to participate.

III. Project Jump Start: Describe the programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL/LEP students prior to the first day of school.

P.S. 203 does not have a Jump Start program.

- 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.

NYS ESL Learning Standards are distributed to each staff member each year, as part of their Faculty Notes, along with action steps teachers can take to assist ELLs in meeting the ELA standards. Included in those are considerations for ELLs regarding study skills and test taking skills.

The ESL teacher confers often with the classroom teachers regarding student progress and offers suggestions for addressing the instructional needs of our ELL students. Teachers are aware that resources to support existing Leap Frog technology in the classrooms are available for loan from our ESL teacher to mirror the content covered in her class.

- V. Support services provided to LEP students: Describe other support structures that are in place in your school which are available to ELLs.

We have other programs to assist children. They include: Waterford, Wilson, Foundations, Great Leaps Reading and Math, SkillsTutor, and Leap Frog. Some of these programs are technology-based and others require children to be pulled out in small groups.

- 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.

N/A

**Part C: CR Part 154 – Number of Teachers and Support Personnel for 2007-08**

**School Building:** \_\_\_ P.S. 203K \_\_\_\_\_ **District**  22  \_\_\_\_\_

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

Number of Teachers 2007-2008				Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals***		Total
Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**				
Bilingual Program: N/A	ESL Program: 1	Bilingual Program: N/A	ESL Program: 0	Bilingual Program: N/A	ESL Program: 0	
						1

\* 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 2006-2007 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.

**Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules**

Include schedules for students on three different levels 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 the NYSESLAT/LAB-R). The schedules must reflect ESL, Native Language Arts and content area instruction through use of both languages. Use attached Bilingual Schedule Template.

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL) (Grade One)

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

School District: \_\_\_\_\_ **22** \_\_\_\_\_                      School Building: \_\_\_\_\_ **203** \_\_\_\_\_

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b>	From: 8:37 To: 9:22	Subject (Specify) Read Aloud (RA)	Subject (Specify) Shared Reading (SR)	Subject (Specify) RA	Subject (Specify) SR	Subject (Specify) SR
<b>2</b>	From: 9:22 To: 9:55	Subject (Specify) Guided Reading (GR)	Subject (Specify) GR	Subject (Specify) GR	Subject (Specify) GR	Subject (Specify) GR
<b>3</b>	From: 10:00 To: 10:45	Subject (Specify) Prep (Ms. Stein)	Subject (Specify) Phonics	Subject (Specify) Prep (Art)	Subject (Specify) Prep (Music)	Subject (Specify) Phonics
<b>4</b>	From: 10:50 To: 11:30	Subject (Specify) Phonics	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Phonics	Subject (Specify) Phonics	Subject (Specify) Writers' Workshop (WW)
<b>5</b>	From: 11:30 To: 12:20	Subject (Specify) L	Subject (Specify) U	Subject (Specify) N	Subject (Specify) C	Subject (Specify) H
<b>6 ESL 1:00- 2:10</b>	From: 12:30 To: 1:15	Subject (Specify) WW	Subject (Specify) WW	Subject (Specify) WW	Subject (Specify) WW	Subject (Specify) Math

<b>7</b>	From: 1:20 To: 2:05	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Prep (Dance)
<b>8</b>	From: 2:05 To: 2:50	Subject (Specify) Social Studies Independent Reading (IR)	Subject (Specify) Prep (Math)	Subject (Specify) SS/IR	Subject (Specify) Science/IR	Subject (Specify) SS/IR

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL (Grade Three)

ESL Program Type:        \_\_\_ Free-Standing    \_\_\_ Push-in        \_\_\_x\_Pull-out

Indicate Proficiency Level:    \_\_\_ Beginning    \_\_\_X\_Intermediate        \_\_\_Advanced

School District:   22  

School Building:   203  

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b> <b>ESL</b> <b>8:30-</b> <b>9:40</b>	From: 8:37	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 8:50	Morning Routines	Morning Routines	Morning Routines	Morning Routines	Morning Routines
<b>2</b>	From: 8:52	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 9:35	Reading (Guided Reading/Shared Reading Independent Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading
<b>3</b>	From: 9:35	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 10:20	Reading (Guided Reading/Shared Reading Independent Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading
<b>4</b>	From: 10:20	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 11:05	Math	Gym Prep	Art Prep	Math	Math
<b>5</b>	From: 11:05	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 11:40	Math	Literacy Continued	Literacy Continued	Prep (computer)	Writing
<b>6</b>	From: 11:40	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 12:20	Writing	Math I	Math I	Prep (Computer)	Writing

<b>7</b>	From: 12:25 To: 1:15	Subject (Specify) L	Subject (Specify) U	Subject (Specify) N	Subject (Specify) C	Subject (Specify) H
<b>8</b>	From: 1:20 To: 2:05	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Math II	Subject (Specify) Math II	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) SS
<b>9</b>	From: 2:05 To: 2:55	Subject (Specify) Prep (Writing)	Subject (Specify) SS	Subject (Specify) Writing	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Prep (Science)

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL (Grade Four)

ESL Program Type:        \_\_\_ Free-Standing    \_\_\_ Push-in        \_\_\_x Pull-out

Indicate Proficiency Level:    \_\_\_ Beginning        \_\_\_ Intermediate        \_\_\_X Advanced

School District:   22  

School Building:   203  

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b>	From: 8:37 To: 9:22	Subject (Specify) Making Meaning (MM)	Subject (Specify) Shared Reading (SR)	Subject (Specify) MM	Subject (Specify) SR	Subject (Specify) MM
<b>2</b>	From: 9:22 To: 9:55	Subject (Specify) Mini Independent Reading (MIR)	Subject (Specify) MIR	Subject (Specify) MIR	Subject (Specify) MIR	Subject (Specify) Science Assist
<b>3 ESL 10:25 - 11:10</b>	From: 10:00 To: 10:45	Subject (Specify) Independent Reading (IR)	Subject (Specify) IR	Subject (Specify) IR	Subject (Specify) Prep (Gym)	Subject (Specify) Prep (Science)
<b>4</b>	From: 10:50 To: 11:35	Subject (Specify) Prep (Computer)	Subject (Specify) Prep (Art)	Subject (Specify) Guided Centers (GC)	Subject (Specify) IR	Subject (Specify) IR
<b>5</b>	From: 11:40 To: 12:25	Subject (Specify) GC	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) TQW	Subject (Specify) GC	Subject (Specify) GC
<b>6</b>	From: 12:25 To: 1:15	Subject (Specify) L	Subject (Specify) U	Subject (Specify) N	Subject (Specify) C	Subject (Specify) H

<b>7</b>	From: 1:20 To: 2:05	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
<b>8</b>	From: 2:05 To: 2:50	Subject (Specify) TQW	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Prep (Writing)	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) TQW

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

**Form TIII – A (1)(a)**

**Grade Level(s)** \_\_\_\_\_ **Number of Students to be Served:** \_\_\_\_\_ **LEP** \_\_\_\_\_ **Non-LEP**

**Number of Teachers** \_\_\_\_\_ **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.) Programs implemented under Title III, Part A, may not supplant programs required under CR Part 154. In the space provided below, describe the school's language instruction program for limited English proficient (LEP) students. The description must include: type of program/activities; number of students to be served; grade level(s); language(s) of instruction; rationale for the selection of program/activities; times per day/week; program duration; and service provider and qualifications.

---

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

---

A Title III program will run approximately from November through early April. It will include 2 groups after school three days a week. It will be for one and a half hours per session. This will be offered to the ELL students in Grades 2-5, about 25 students. Scores range from beginner to advanced on the NYSESLAT exam and Level 1- Level 2 on the ELA (for Grade 4 and 5 students). Supplies will be purchased to help increase the ELLs' skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. All classes will be given in English. The teachers are certified by the State of New York to teach K-6. These will be teachers within the school who are already teaching a class during school hours and have experience in working with ELL and non-ELL children. The goal would be to improve the reading and math scores on the NY State exams.

**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.

---

It is planned that the Title III teachers will be given professional development five times throughout this time period, approximately once a month. Title III will be attending ELL professional development off site. This professional development is only for the teachers in the Title III program. It is supplemental to the general school professional development venue. It will be conducted in English.

**Parent and Community Participation:** Off site experiences (trips to museums or community points of interest) to facilitate language development and cultural exposure on student and parent levels. Computer orientation sessions will be held for parents to allow them opportunities to become more aware of sites their children may find helpful for their education. Books for parents to read to their children will be purchased in addition to parenting books that may be available in different languages.

---

**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)	\$9,900	2 teachers for 15 weeks at 4.5 hours per week
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts		
Supplies and materials	\$3,210	Books from Options (Speedy Spelling, Number Pals, Let’s Read!, Comprehension Skills) and Rosen (Big Books); bookcase for

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

		storage of materials
Travel	\$ 600	Buses for off-sites
Other	\$1,200	Parent Involvement
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	

### **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.

The school has created a parent survey to be administered early in the school year to determine both the need for and the availability of translation services.

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

In 2008-2009 the surveys were distributed and collected. Additional families requested translations, besides the list from the Home Language Surveys. All families who requested translations received them whenever possible.

#### **Part B: Strategies and Activities**

---

1. Describe the written translation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Include procedures to ensure timely provision of translated documents to parents determined to be in need of language assistance services. Indicate whether written translation services will be provided by an outside vendor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

The school makes sure notices go out to the ELL students when it comes in other languages. In addition, the Translation Unit for the NYC Dept. of Education has provided translations of school wide notices. When individual communications are needed, the school has enlisted the services of staff members who are able to write in the languages needed. Our Parent Coordinator has become a certified Translator with the DOE as a result of an intensive training course given in the summer of 2008.

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.

As a result of the survey we distributed, a cadre of parents is established to provide translations services at Parent Teacher Conferences. The Parent Coordinator also has the capability of accessing the Dept. of Education's Translation unit with oral interpretation services, if need be.

The school has also purchased a translation device called "Talk and Listen". It will enable us to have up to three individuals translate the on goings at meetings from English into the native language.

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

The school identifies children with another language through the Home Language Survey. The Department of Education's Translation and Interpretation Unit is available to translate certain documents. Parents are notified of their rights to have translations available through signage at entrances to our school, main office and Parent Coordinator's office.

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

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

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

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>2</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>3</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>4</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>5</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>6</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>7</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	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 (Bilingual)

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

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

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>2</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>3</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>4</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>5</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>6</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
<b>7</b>	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	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:					

## **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 \_\_\_\_\_ \$815,574 \_\_\_\_\_
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program \_\_\_\_\_ \$8,150 \_\_\_\_\_
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified \_\_\_\_\_ \$40,750 \_\_\_\_\_
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**

#### **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 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.

*The Floyd Bennett School*  
**P.S. 203 K**  
East 52<sup>nd</sup> Street and Avenue M  
Brooklyn, New York 11234  
**718-241-8488** Fax: **718-209-9641**  
**Danielle O'Connor, Assistant Principal**  
**Brian Sadowski, Assistant Principal**

**Lisa Esposito**  
**Principal**

---

### SCHOOL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY

#### PART I – GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

##### **P.S. 203 agrees to implement the following statutory requirements:**

?As a Title I Schoolwide Project School (SWP), P.S. 203 will put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of all parents. The programs, activities and procedures will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children such as Family Nights, Read Aloud Day, Information Nights, Promotional meetings, etc.

?In carrying out the Title I, Part A Parental Involvement requirements, to the extent practicable, the school will provide opportunities for the participation of parents with limited English proficiency (LEP), and parents of students with special needs. This will include providing information and school reports in an understandable and uniform format, including alternative formats upon request, and to the extent practicable, in a language parents understand.

?The school will involve the parents of children served in Title I, Part A program(s) in decisions about how the Title I, Part A funds reserved for parental involvement is spent through the School Leadership Team and monthly P.T.A. meetings.

?The school will carry out programs, activities and procedures in accordance with this definition of parental involvement:

*Parental involvement means the participation of parents in regular, two-way, and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including:*

- >Ensuring that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning;*
- >Ensuring that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school;*
- >Ensuring that parents are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child;*
- >Ensuring the carrying out of other activities to encourage greater parent involvement.*

#### PART II – DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE SCHOOL WILL IMPLEMENT THE REQUIRED SCHOOL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY COMPONENTS

1. P.S. 203 will take the following actions to involve parents in the development of the Parental Involvement plan:  
Through the involvement of the School Leadership Team where there are five (5) parent members, participation of the Parent Teacher Association meetings, and the Annual Title I meeting, the parental involvement policy will be reviewed and developed.
2. P.S. 203 will take the following actions to involve parents in the process of school review and improvement:  
Through the School Leadership Team, all members of the school community discuss and review the academic achievement of the school. Parents will be invited to participate in the PASS review, Quality School Review, and Learning Environment Survey. This information is reported to the parents at the Parent Teacher Association meetings.
3. P.S. 203 will take the following actions to conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of this parental involvement policy in improving the quality of its Title I, Part A program. The evaluation will include identifying barriers to greater participation by parents in parental involvement activities. The school will use the findings of the evaluation about its parental involvement policy and activities to design strategies for more effective parental involvement, and to revise, if necessary, its parental involvement policies. The evaluation will be conducted by the Parent Teacher Association and reviewed with the School Leadership Team. Parents' feedback will be considered and changes will be made if appropriate.

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

4. P.S. 203 will build the parents' capacity for strong parental involvement, in order to ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership among the school involved, parents, and the community to improve student academic achievement through the following activities:
  - ?The school will provide assistance to parents of children served by the school, as appropriate, in understanding the state's academic content standards; the state's student academic achievement standards; the State and Local assessments; how to monitor their child's progress and how to work with the educators.
  - ?The school will provide materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve their children's academic achievement through workshops.
  - ?The school will ensure that information related to the school and parent programs, meetings, and other activities, is sent to the parents school wide in an understandable and uniform format, including alternative formats upon request, and to the extent practicable, in a language parents can understand.
  - ?The school will hold Parent Orientation meetings for the parents to learn about the grade curriculum and standards.
5. P.S. 203 will maximize parental involvement and participation in their children's education by arranging school meetings at a variety of times; Parent Teacher Association meetings are held in the morning and the evening most usually on alternating months; Parent Teacher Conferences are held twice a year during the afternoon and the evening; phone calls and letters are sent home to contact the parent as needed.

This policy will be in effect for the 2008/2009 school year.

---

I have received and read the School Parental Involvement Policy and the Parent Compact for the 08-09 school year.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Student's name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Class

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## 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.

## **P.S. 203 VISION STATEMENT: SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT**

We envision our school as a community where we will provide a meaningful and integrated curriculum; one that will empower all of our students to reach high academic standards, to develop decision making and problem solving skills, and to develop an appreciation of and have experiences in the arts. Our goals will foster the development of each student's positive self-esteem and create a love of learning in an atmosphere of collaboration among supportive educational staff, parents, and the surrounding community.

**SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITIES:**

**P.S. 203 will:**

?Provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables the participating children to meet the State’s student academic achievement standards through the Balanced Literacy Approach: Read Aloud, independent reading, guided reading, phonemic awareness; Accountable Talk; Hands-on mathematics teaching with an emphasis on problem solving; Hands-on science program; Social Studies curriculum and developmental programs in technology, the arts, and Core Knowledge.

?Conduct classroom orientations and Information Night early in the school year.

?Hold parent/teacher conferences twice a year in November and in March to discuss the individual child’s achievement.

?Provide parents with frequent reports on their children’s progress. Specifically, the school will provide reports as follows: State and city assessments, portfolio assessment, report cards three times a year, Predictive and Instructionally Targeted assessments in October, December, January, and May, results of teacher made tests, assessed writing assignments with teacher comments and rubrics. Individual conferences will be arranged as the need arises.

?Provide parents reasonable access to staff. Specifically, staff will be available for consultation with parents during the school day according to the teacher’s schedule. Appointments should be prearranged with the classroom teacher for a mutually convenient time. The Parent Coordinator is always available to act as the liaison between the home and the school.

?Provide parents opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child’s class, and to observe classroom activities during Open School Week in November. If parents wish to observe, this can be arranged with the classroom teacher. In addition, parents are invited to join for special activities (trips, presentations, etc.). If parents wish to become Learning Leaders, training will be arranged.

?Provide parents with an opportunity to view the school’s CEP to ensure school’s compliance with goals established.

Principal \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_

**PARENT RESPONSIBILITIES:**

**We, as parents will support our children’s learning in the following ways:**

- Monitoring attendance.
- Sending my child to school on time.
- Picking my child up on time.
- Making sure that homework is completed and signed.
- Monitoring the amount of television my child watches.
- Monitoring my child’s use of the Internet and/or other interactive technologies.
- Volunteering in my child’s school and/or classroom, as needed.
- Participating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to my child’s education.
- Promoting positive use of my child’s extracurricular time.
- Staying informed about my child’s education and communicating with the school by promptly reading all notices from the school or the region either received by my child or by mail and responding when requested.
- Participating in the Parent/Teacher Association.
- Attending school programs such as Family Nights, Read Aloud Day, assemblies, Poem in Your Pocket Day, etc.
- Ensuring that my child is dressed appropriately for school.
- Monitoring my child’s behavior with peers and staff.

Parent \_\_\_\_\_

## 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.

Please refer to Sections IV and V in the main body of the CEP.

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
  - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
  - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
    - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities. (See section V and VI)
    - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. (See Goals 1,2 and 4)
    - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations. (See Sections IV, V, and VI)
    - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs. (See Appendix 1)
    - o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

At P.S. 203 we are anticipating that all of our teachers will be fully state certified for the 2008-2009 school year. To meet that end, 5% of our Title I SWP funds will be set aside to provide equitable financial assistance to those taking courses for completion of their certification requirements.

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.

Utilizing Title I SWP funds, consultants (e.g.AUSSIE) will continue to be contracted to provide professional development for our staff in both literacy and mathematics. Through their in-class demonstration lessons, collaborative planning, and mentoring, they will assist in ensuring that the implementation of the Uniform Curriculum is of high caliber.

A Professional Development team consisting of coaches, teachers, paraprofessionals, service providers and administrators meet on a biweekly basis to address needs identified by staff and Region. Grade meetings and curriculum mapping meetings will occur once-twice a month

throughout the year, and topics are differentiated based on a variety of factors (staffing position, grade, content area, etc.) Presenters are coaches, teachers, administrators, or consultants—each selected for their area of expertise.

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

Insideschools.org visited and toured our school. There have been several potential candidates for teaching positions that have referenced what they have read in the write up on that site as reasons for wishing to interview with us. The Dept. of Ed. Website also provides data to the public that includes our school report card Progress Report and Quality School Review.

When appropriate, we extend the opportunity for potential teaching candidates to tour the building, and schedule and conduct demonstration lessons. Supervisors debrief with candidates as well.

Our school's long standing relationship with local universities keeps us connected with highly qualified new teachers. Student observers can become student teachers who can become appointed staff, if they appear to be a good match to forward our school's mission.

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

Please refer to Action Plans in Section VI.

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.

Our school will offer pre-school children attending local CBOs and their parents, and those registering in the spring, an opportunity to tour our kindergarten classrooms in action. Our Parent Coordinator and Pre-K support staff (part-time social worker) will answer questions as well as serve as "tour guides" during this event.

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.

Individual teacher-administrator conferences are held 5-7 times per year regarding student progress. Assessment information is reviewed and collaborations occur to determine next steps that will allow students to meet the Standards.

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.

For 2008-2009 students have already been recommended to participate in Extended Day academic programs by their previous year's teachers with additional recommendations being made by current teachers. In addition every student identified in Grades 4 and 5 as a Level 1 or 2 students has automatically been scheduled to receive AIS during the school day by the end of September. Grade 3 holdovers and Promotion in Doubt students (from the previous school year) are also being addressed. Grade 1 and 2 at-risk students are prioritized based on ECLAS-2, Terra Nova and Benchmarking results. The AIS team and Inquiry Team meet on a regular basis to ensure that all identified students are being serviced. This allows us to accommodate new admits or previously not identified students as needs arise.

### **Activities in Literacy**

The Wilson Reading System is administered to at risk students in grades 2-5 during the school day, 5x a week for 60 minutes each day. Each group consists of 4-7 children. The Wilson Reading System is a research-based program utilizing a multi-sensory, interactive approach to "teach total word structure for decoding and encoding".

Wilson Foundations, incorporating Wilson Reading System principles, is provided to students in Grades 1 and 2 along the same time guides as the Wilson Reading System.

"The Great Leaps" Reading Program is administered to students in Grades 1-5. This is a remedial reading program designed to build fluency and train students in "essential phonics" in daily 15-minute blocks 1:1.

New Heights is a research-based audio facilitated program. The teacher monitors students for accuracy, fluency, and comprehension, after they practice reading books at their instructional level with the support of an audiotape.

Quick Reads program consists of short texts that are designed to be read quickly while obtaining full meaning. The program's function is to improve the fluency and comprehension of the students.

Project Read is an after school remedial program in reading and math. It is conducted 3 afternoons a week for 1 ½ - hour sessions for students in Grades 1-5. The Balanced Literacy approach is used, emphasizing diagnostic prescriptive teaching.

AIIP is an after school intervention program in literacy conducted for about 36 hours during 1½ hour sessions twice a week. Group size is usually limited to 15.

## **Activities in Mathematics**

“Great Leaps” Math program is a research-based program that moves through concrete, representational and abstract levels. Components taught include math facts, operations, concepts, and rules. Each student’s progress is monitored with corrective feedback provided until a mastery level is reached

AIPP is an after school intervention program in math, incorporating test-taking strategies, conducted for about 36 hours during 1½ hour sessions twice a week. Group size is usually limited to 15.

AIS is also provided to Grade 3-5 students in-school using small group pull-out intervention. Group size is usually limited to 6 students. Support personnel provide pull-out instruction in test-taking strategies 3-5 periods a week while the classroom teacher remains with a small group of students to continue to provide intervention using similar approaches as well.

## **Activities in Science**

AIS in science is provided on an on-going basis during instructional time. Small group and individual instruction occur based on the specific needs of each student. The students who fall short of the state criteria in science receive this intervention by classroom teachers.

## **Activities in Social Studies**

AIS in social studies is provided on an on-going basis during instructional time. Small group and individual instruction occur based on the specific needs of each student. The students who are at risk of not meeting the promotional criteria in social studies receive this intervention by support personnel using push-in and pull-out models.

DBQ AIPP classes are provided before/after school to 5<sup>th</sup> graders, with an emphasis on comprehension of main points and supporting details with reiteration of those facts in writing.

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.

State AIS funding and State and Federal Magnet monies comingled with Title I SWP allocations will allow us to fund additional personnel to provide AIS to at-risk students. In 2008-2009 we are funding an early childhood (Grade 1-2) in-school AIS position to structure a program that replicates the success we have experienced with intervention for Grades 3-5 (Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.)

Similar funding sources will be combined to conduct after-school programs in literacy, math, social studies, and science (Project Read, AIPP, etc.).

Our PBIS initiatives and Connect with Kids program each serve to promote a positive school climate, thus reducing violence in the school. Violence Prevention funds support the latter of these endeavors.

**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>1</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>1</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.

P.S. 203 has developed its Literacy curriculum as a result of a collaborations between the Literacy Team (consisting of early childhood and upper grade representatives as well as a coach, consultants and supervisor(s)), grade level professional development sessions that include curriculum mapping and its Professional Development Team which includes representation above as well as content specialist and paraprofessional representation and a Core Knowledge facilitator. We will review the findings noted above to determine if our current reflection on this finding is indeed accurate and as thorough as it might be.

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

Applicable   x   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?

The curriculum maps that have been developed in literacy are twofold. One map does deal with a year-long view of Reading, Writing, Word Work, Special Events (driven by Core Knowledge) and Character Education and their relative assessments. The other deals with month-long objectives in Reading, Independent Reading, Writing, Word Study/Vocabulary Development, Core Knowledge and Assessment. The programs utilized in the school-- Balanced Literacy, Units of Study in Primary Writing (Grades K-2) and Teaching the Qualities of Writing (Grades 3-5), and the rubrics that are generated for them are aligned with the NYS Standards. Teachers are cognizant of the Standards in their planning and that is also reflected on work displayed.

Students are involved with Goal Setting with their teachers to establish realistic and attainable goals to better themselves as readers and writers, and these goals are revisited often throughout the year. This leads to differentiation of instruction that is supported both with the direct classroom instruction as well as technology that can be prescribed to meet children at their need. The materials available are also able to be differentiated to meet the needs of the students. Our Literacy room is well-stocked with materials on a variety of levels and we continually update the inventory to ensure that we have enough books to meet the demand. Similarly, the technology available to the students via Waterford, Leap pads, SkillsTutor and Acuity can be differentiated in our classrooms.

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

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.

If the finding should be applicable for our ELL population, then the school will work on systems to differentiate the materials used specifically with our ELL population within the Guided Reading, Spotlight 5, and technology venues.

---

## **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.

Our Math Team (consisting of early childhood and upper grade representatives as well as a coach, consultants and supervisor(s)) and Professional Development Team which includes the representation above as well as a content specialist, a paraprofessional, and a Core Knowledge facilitator, met and continue to meet on a regular basis to ensure that instruction is aligned with the NYS Standards in Mathematics.

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

Applicable   x   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?

Each classroom has a set of NYS Math Standards posted. These standards are evident in formal plans that are submitted. We have noticed that the content strands cannot be addressed without engaging students in the process strands, and that is a critical component of Everyday Mathematics. Extensive Professional Development in and out of school in mathematics takes place with aligning the curriculum to the Standards. Our Spotlight 5 Goal Setting refers to the NYS Standards as do alignment documents generated by our Math coach to accompany test preparation and Extended Day materials. We have found that the Everyday Mathematics curriculum is often more rigorous than the NYS Standards, presenting topics anywhere from 1-3 years above the State's grade level expectations.

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.

---

## **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.

We will engage in Learning Walks where the percentages noted above will be explored. Given the Balanced Literacy model we follow, however, there is always some kind of direct instruction being provided during one and three-quarter hour Literacy block but in different configurations.

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

Applicable   x   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?

As stated above, the Balanced Literacy model requires students’ needs to be addressed with different levels of support. Differentiation of instruction occurs in the direct instruction provided during Guided Reading and conferences both during writing and independent reading. The configurations utilized vary following a TAPS (Total group, Alone, Partner groups and Small group instruction) format. The teacher is constantly engaged with students, but all students are not always directly involved with the teacher during the 100+ minutes of Literacy instruction each day.

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.

---

## **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>2</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.

This statement is currently under review by our Math and Professional Development teams. We will engage in Learning Walks to determine if this percentage is accurate. It is our belief that our students are engaged.

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

At present it is thought that the last part of the findings is accurate for our school. Our teachers do provide a great deal of direct instruction and hands-on learning experiences, but the configurations noted above in ELA (TAPS) are not as evident in mathematics. We do, however, have access to differentiating materials for our students in math via the Everyday Math Assessment Assistant, SkillsTutor, Acuity, Leap Track, and Games Day every Friday.

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.

It would be our intent to raise the percentage of classrooms that do adopt the TAPS format to math instruction – more along the lines of a Reading/Writing workshop, and increase the use of technology in the classrooms for differentiation in mathematics school wide.

---

### **KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY**

---

<sup>2</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.

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.

Our Professional Development Team conferred about these findings as they pertained to our school.

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

Applicable   x   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?

Longitudinal data as evidenced on our Annual School Report card and our Organization sheets over the past 3-5 years indicate this finding is not relevant to our school at this time.

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

---

#### **KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

Teacher participation in these offerings would be the source of our response to these findings.

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

X 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?

Our classroom teachers, other than our ESL teacher, do not participate in the offered Professional Development opportunities. Oftentimes the costs of these workshops become prohibitive as the funding to attend the courses themselves need to be commingled with the cost of covering the teacher's programs when they attend.

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.

The support that can be offered by Central would be to include, or earmark, some funding allocation to promote more participation.

---

#### **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.

This is an area our school will need to monitor more closely to determine if in fact it is applicable to us. Our Data Specialist will collaborate with our ESL teacher and Literacy and Math coaches to gather the data in question.

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

X 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?

At present our ELL students' Reading Benchmark levels are disaggregated by our use of the Student Growth Monitor. This data, however, seems to remain limited to the purview of the personnel mentioned in 5.1 above. There is a need to disseminate it and create opportunities to articulate it to the classroom teachers.

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.

Internally, we must create opportunities for the data in Reading and Math to be articulated to all parties who are involved in educating our ELL students. In addition, it is hoped that ARIS will provide classroom teachers with a way to disaggregate that data within their classrooms.

---

### **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 members of our Professional Development Team meet on a regular basis to determine where there is a need for Professional Development and what type of Professional Development would make the most sense for the particular constituencies represented. In addition our school's IEP coordinator participates in evaluating the effectiveness of the manner in which dissemination of information and practice are presented.

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

Applicable   x   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?

Over the course of the past few years, we have differentiated the Professional Development offered to our teachers and paraprofessionals to address the exact issues covered in the findings above. Quite recently, the compliance with Chapter 408 has made awareness of the content of IEPs/their respective modifications and accessibility to them all the more possible. In addition, we have provided our own Professional Development for paraprofessionals and teachers on modifying instruction in the classrooms for our special needs students, while maintaining the same levels of expectation as we have for those students who do not have IEPs. From a scheduling perspective we have paired a special educator with a general educator in our CTT classes in *all* content areas while affording the homeroom teachers common planning time each day. In this manner every teacher who comes in contact with students having IEPs has the time to plan instruction that can meet each child at his/her need. The ultimate learning goal is the same, but the modifications that are needed to present the information may differ from one student to the next.

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.

---

### **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.

It is our understanding that as of this writing the DOE has recently issued a new SOPM on Special Education where some of the matters in this finding are addressed. The Principal and IEP coordinator will attend Professional Development sessions to better gauge the extent to which the finding is applicable.

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

X 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?

At present, the Standardized tests are administered according to grade level and do not take into account the students' goals, objectives or modified promotional criteria. This often causes extreme frustration and leads to a sense of defeat in the students who attempt to achieve their

best. On a positive note, however, the newer way of viewing students' scores on these tests is now taking into account performance and not only achievement. This allows one to take into account growth and celebrate it.

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.

Should the parameters of testing be reviewed in the future, our school will need additional support ensure that we are matching the assessments with the students' IEP goals.

## CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

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

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

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

Submit date: **Jun 19, 2008**      Email address: **lesposi3@schools.nyc.gov**

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

School DBN	22K203
School Name	Floyd Bennett School
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 110,556
Principal Name	Lisa Esposito
Principal Email	lesposi3@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7182418488

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

- Yes  
 No

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

Creation of additional classrooms	\$ 110,556
Reducing teacher-student ratio through team teaching strategies	

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

- Yes  
 No

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

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

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 25 - 1 -24

C4E Target #2: 8 - Math - Students with Disabilities - 26 - 1 -25

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

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 25 - 1 -24

C4E Target #2: 6 - ELA - Students with Disabilities - 25 - 1 -24

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

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 25 - 1 -24

C4E Target #2: 6 - Math - ELLs - 25 - 1 -24

	Targeted Grade	Targeted Subject	Targeted Population	Average Class Size 2007 -08	# New Classrooms / New Sections
C4E Target #1	2	All (ES only)	Students in Poverty	25.0	22
C4E Target #2					
C4E Target #3					
C4E Target #4					
C4E Target #5					
C4E Target #6					

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

Yes

No

---

**CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence**