



EILEEN E. ZAGLIN

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

**SCHOOL: 21K225
ADDRESS: 1075 OCEANVIEW AVENUE
BROOKLYN NEW YORK 11235
TELEPHONE: 718-743-9793
FAX: 718-743-7096**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 225 SCHOOL NAME: Eileen E. Zaglin

DISTRICT: 21 SSO NAME/NETWORK #: ESO#12 / Anya Hurwitz

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 1075 Oceanview Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11235

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-743-9793 FAX: 718-743-7096

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Joseph Montebello EMAIL ADDRESS: jmonteb@schools

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON Lori Izen

PRINCIPAL Joseph Montebello

UFT CHAPTER LEADER Paul Greco

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT Maria Del Valle

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools) N/A

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT Richard D'Auria

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
Joseph Montebello	*Principal or Designee	
Paul Greco	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Maria Del Valle	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Gabriella Kiernan	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
N/A	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
N/A	Student Representative, if applicable	
Lori Izen	Teacher PS 225	
Anastasia Palominos	Teacher PS 225	
Jared Shapiro	Teacher PS 225	
Irene Entin	Parent Family College	
Nicole Amuquandoh	Parent Family College	
Caroline Martinez	PTA PS 225	
Margaret Benzrioul	PTA PS 225	
Denise Singer	Teacher, Family College Annex	

* 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.

School Vision and Mission

P.S. 225 is a school that strives to make a difference in the lives of our students. We see our school as a community where all students, staff and parents support each other, address, accept, and meet the needs of individuals and create an atmosphere where learning, creativity, and participation takes place. Ideally, the students in our school will become life-long learners that think critically and creatively to solve problems. They will create long-term goals, have high self-esteem, be respectful of themselves and others, and develop the ability to communicate their thoughts and ideas.

We are a multiethnic-multicultural school. Our vision is to provide the highest quality education for our students through standards driven instruction in a nurturing environment. The members of our school community believe that all children can and will learn given ample time and exemplary instruction. We all believe all students can meet or exceed high academic expectations by participating in a rigorous performance-based Pre-K-8 core curriculum. Staff, parents and community work together to provide the excellent and equitable education to which all children are entitled, regardless of individual backgrounds, talents, or abilities.

Contextual Information about the School's Community and its Unique/Important Characteristics

P.S. 225 is located in the Brighton Beach community of South Brooklyn. The school population reflects that of the largely immigrant community of approximately 50 different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. P.S. 225 services the educational needs of the largest student immigrant population in the borough. More than 70% of the students have emigrated from Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Latvia, Moldova, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Georgia and other parts of the Russian Federation. Other countries from which our students come include: Pakistan, Mexico, India, China, Korea, Germany, Poland, Romania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Italy, Israel, Yemen, Syria, Egypt, Turkey, Greece, Canada, Cuba, El Salvador, Honduras, Peru, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Africa and many parts of the U.S

SECTION III – Cont’d

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	Eileen E. Zaglin				
District:	21	DBN #:	21k225	School BEDS Code #:	332100010225

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec.		
Enrollment:					Attendance:				
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)			2006	2007	2008
Pre-K	33	26	47				91.7	91.2	91.2
Kindergarten	103	89	95						
Grade 1	121	109	103	Student Mobility:					
Grade 2	90	127	103	(% of Enrollment as of June 30)			2006	2007	2008
Grade 3	94	81	112				89.7	88.9	91.4
Grade 4	97	100	85						
Grade 5	95	102	94	Eligible for Free Lunch:					
Grade 6	75	83	105	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)			2005	2006	2007
Grade 7	155	91	107				71.2	66.5	66.5
Grade 8	107	178	100						
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing:					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(Total Number as of June 30)			2006	2007	2008
Grade 11	0	0	0				1	1	7
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded Elementary	9	0	5	Recent Immigrants:					
Ungraded Secondary	979	986	956	(Total Number as of October 31)			2006	2007	2008
Total							60	64	62
Special Education Enrollment:					Suspensions:				
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30)			2006	2007	2008
Number in Self-Contained Classes	25	29	38						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	37	49	69	Principal Suspensions			14	47	39
Number all others	0	0	0	Superintendent Suspensions			11	13	8
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									
Special High School Programs:									
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:					(Total Number)				
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants			2006	2007	2008
							TBD	TBD	TBD

DEMOGRAPHICS							
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	TBD	TBD	TBD
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	363	407	368	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	12	23	10	(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	79	82	88
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	22	13	27
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	10	TBD	18
	1	1	1				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender:				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	98.7	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2	0.1	0.1	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	81.0	79.3	75.0
Black or African American	4.8	5.8	4.7	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	58.2	62.2	64.8
Hispanic or Latino	24.0	25.8	27.4				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	16.0	16.7	17.7	Percent Masters Degree or higher	92.0	94.0	90.0
White	55.0	51.6	50.1	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	93.6	91.5	99.3
Multi-racial							
Male	54.1	55.8	54.7				
Female	45.9	44.2	45.3				

2008-09 TITLE I STATUS				
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Title I		
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:	<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				
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:		
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):		<input type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input checked="" 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 ____			
Individual Subject/Area Ratings	Elementary/Middle Level		Secondary Level	
	ELA:	SINI 1	ELA:	
	Math:	IGS	Math:	
	Science:	IGS	Grad. Rate:	
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:				

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	√	√	√			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Black or African American	√	√	√			
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	√			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	√	√	√			
White	√	√	√			
Multiracial						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	X*	√	-			
Limited English Proficient	√	√	√			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	7	8	7			
Key: AYP Status						
√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only	
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status			
<i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i>						

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08	
Overall Letter Grade	C	Overall Evaluation:	Proficient
Overall Score	49.1	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Proficient
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	7.8	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Proficient
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	10.6	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Proficient
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	24.7	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Proficient
Additional Credit	6.0	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Underdeveloped with proficient features
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

What student performance trends can you identify:

An analysis of Progress Report ELA scores for 2008 indicates that 58.8% of our students performed at either a Level 3 or 4, as compared to 48.5% performing at proficiency for 2007. This reflects a 10.3% increase in student performance for the current school year. The percentage of students making at least one year of progress increased from 50.2% in 2007 to 58.8% in 2008, an 8.6% increase over last year.

Summary of Data Analysis of NYS English Language Arts Assessment

Grade 3

An analysis of Grade 3 State ELA assessment results indicates a decrease in the percent of students performing at Level 1, from 12.8% in 2007 to 7.9% in 2008. The percent of students performing at Level 2 decreased from 30.8% in 2007 to 20.8% in 2008. The overall percent of students performing on Level 3 & 4 increased from 56.4% in 2007 to 71.1% in 2008.

Grade 4

An analysis of Grade 4 State ELA assessment results indicates an increase from 6.6% in 2007 to 9.9% in 2008 for students scoring at Level 1. The percent of students performing at Level 2 decreased from 34.8% in 2007 to 28.4% in 2008. The overall percent of students performing at Levels 3 & 4 increased from 59.3% in 2007 to 61.7% in 2008.

Grade 5

An analysis of grade 5 State ELA assessment results indicates a decrease in the percent of students in Level 1 from 2.1% in 2007 to 0% in 2008. The percent of students in Level 2 also decreased from 32.8% in 2007 to 23.3% in 2008. The overall percent of students performing at Level 3 & 4 increased from 65.3% in 2007 to 76.6% in 2008.

Grade 6

An analysis of Grade 6 State ELA assessment results indicates a 2.1% decrease in the percent of students at Level 1, from 5.1% in 2007 to 3% in 2008. The percent of students in Level 2 also decreased from 57% in 2007 to 44.6% in 2008. The overall percent of students performing at Level 3 & 4 increased from 38.8% in 2007 to 52.5% in 2008.

Grade 7

An analysis of Grade 7 State ELA assessment results indicates an 8.1% decrease in the percent of students at Level 1, from 11.5% in 2007 to 3.4% in 2008. . The percent of students in Level 2 increased from 43.6% in 2007 to 54% in 2008. The overall percent of students performing at Level 3 & 4 decreased from 44.9% to 42.5% in 2008.

Grade 8

An analysis of Grade 8 State ELA assessment results indicates a 4.3% decrease in students performing at Level 1 from 10.6% in 2007 to 6.3% in 2008. . The percent of students in Level 2 decreased from 54.4% in 2007 to 51.3% in 2008. The number of students at Level 3 & 4 increased from 35% in 2007 to 42.6% in 2008.

Summary of Data Analysis NYS Mathematics Assessment

An analysis of Progress Report Math scores for 2007-8 indicates that 76.1 % of our students performed at either a Level 3 or 4, as compared to 67.7% performing at proficiency for 2006-7. This reflects an 8.4% increase in student performance for the current school year. The percentage of students making at least 1 year of progress increased by 8.6% from 50.2% in 2006-7 to 58.8% for 2007-8. A breakdown by grade follows:

Grade 3

An analysis of Grade 3 NYS Mathematics Assessment indicates the following: Results for all tested students indicate a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 1 from 7.0% in 2007 to 1.8% in 2008. There was a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 2 from 8.1% in 2007 to 4.7% in 2008. The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or 4 increased from 84.9% in 2007 to 93.4 in 2008.

Grade 4

An analysis of the NYS Mathematics Assessment for Grade 4 indicates the following: Results for all students tested indicate a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 1 from 5.2% in 2007 to 0% in 2008. There was a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 2 from 1.5% in 2007 to 7.1% in 2008. The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or 4 increased from 78.8% in 2007 to 92.9% in 2008.

Grade 5

An analysis of the NYS Mathematics Assessment for Grade 5 indicates the following: Results for all students tested indicate a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 1 from 3.8% in 2007 to 2.2% in 2008. There was a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 2 from 19.2% in 2007 to 11.5% in 2008. The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or 4 increased from 76.9% in 2007 to 86.5% in 2008.

Grade 6

An analysis of the NYS Mathematics Assessment for Grade 6 indicates the following: Results for all students tested indicate a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 1 from 14.1% in 2007 to 3.7 % in 2008. There was an increase in the number of students performing at Level 2 from 9.4% in 2007 to 19.3% in 2008. The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or 4 increased from 76.5% in 2007 to 77.1% in 2008.

Grade 7

An analysis of the NYS Mathematics Assessment for Grade 7 indicates the following: Results for all students tested indicate an increase in the number of students performing at Level 1 from 5.7% in 2007 to 6.7% in 2008. There was a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 2 from 36.8% in 2007 to 24.6% in 2008. The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or 4 increased from 57.5% in 2007 to 58.7% in 2008.

Grade 8

An analysis of the NYS Mathematics Assessment for Grade 8 indicates the following: Results for all students tested indicate a decrease in the number of students performing at Level 1 from 15.3% in 2007 to 13.5% in 2008. There was an increase in the number of students performing at Level 2 from 38.6% in 2007 to 40.6% in 2007. The percentage of students achieving a Level 3 or 4 decreased from 46.0% in 2007to 45.9% in 2008.

Implications Based on Data

- Based on the above ELA and Math data, we realize that a more concerted effort and specific plans to improve the proficiency levels for all students and in particular our Middle School students in Reading and Math need to be undertaken. The emphasis of our instructional program is moving students from performance levels 1 and 2 to 3 and 4, focusing on academic intervention strategies for Special Education, ELL and low performing students. During small group instruction, students falling into the lowest quartile of level 3 (students at the cusp) are being serviced by AIS providers along with our lower performing students.
- In response to our educational needs, two additional Certified Math teachers were hired to provide instruction and intervention for our elementary and middle school at risk students and those on the cusp. In our plan to further differentiate instruction we instituted an Integrated Algebra Regents course to our qualifying 8th grade students.
- A certified Academic Intervention Services English Language Arts Teacher works with our Middle School students to improve their skills by introducing strategies that have proven to be successful with our lower performing and ELL Elementary grade students. The incorporation of a strategy/skills based approach is now schoolwide, thereby bridging our elementary and middle school students through the grades. Furthermore, intervisitations are occurring between the middle and elementary teachers so that middle school teachers can benefit from observing and articulating with elementary teachers.
- Teachers are using standardized and authentic classroom data along with Acuity's Item Skills Analysis to set goals in both Language Arts and Math to address students' specific needs. Each teacher is using this data to set next steps for their students, as well as assisting students in assessing their own needs and setting their own next steps.
- The acquisition of classroom libraries in content areas will support various reading levels which will benefit all students, in particular, our Special Education population, our ELL's, and our lower performing students.

Analysis of NCLB/SED SINI Designation

- Because we did not meet the participation rate of 95% for the school year 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, we were designated as a School In Need of Improvement. Our participation rate for 2006-2007 was 93% and for 2007-2008 94%.

What have been the greatest accomplishments over the last couple of years?

- 2007-2008 Progress Report indicates substantial improvement for all student subgroups. ELLs showed exemplary proficiency gains of 31.5% in ELA and 22.7% in Math. Data analysis for low performing students showed an approximate 50% decrease in the number of students performing at Level 1 in Grades 3-8 in ELA and Math. AIS providers used Individual Student Planning Worksheets to help set initial instructional benchmarks for students being serviced which are revised monthly.
- Preliminary response rate information for the 2008 Learning Environment Survey indicates 74% of teachers completed surveys and 79% of parents completed surveys. These statistics more than doubled the percentage of respondents for both teachers and parents completing surveys compared to the 2007 results. 88% of our students completed surveys as well – approximately 2% gain for 2008.
- Our School Library Media Center has been designated a “Best Practice” site in the NYCDOE for its flexible schedule/open access program, and for integrating technology in teaching. A certified Library Media Specialist in our LMC motivates reading while teaching information literacy skills as per the Information Fluency Continuum, New York State information literacy

standards, and AASL guidelines. The SLMS maintains a web-based catalog and resources page which provides a virtual library at all times on the Internet (library, classroom, home, etc.). The Independent Investigation Method of research is incorporated as a school-wide model for research and inquiry-based learning with the SLMS team-teaching with classroom and subject teachers to impart library skills to content in an authentic manner. Multimedia resources offer a rich content base in multiple formats (databases, streamed video and audio, recorded books, DVDs, CDs, videos) to assist in differentiating instruction. Up-to-date technology includes: A Smart Board, 29 wireless laptops, laser printers, listening center, cable/TV connection, and wireless access.

- A series of five spring 2008 professional development sessions focused on giving AIS providers multiple opportunities to discuss their practice and study student work with the lens on improving instruction. Ms. Sharon Funk, of Professional Curriculum Associates, presented various strategies for differentiated instruction according to need and readiness. Teachers worked in small groups, discussing and preparing Individual Student Plan Worksheets, planning goals and next steps that could be implemented during summer school, if applicable, as well as by classroom and support staff during the 2008-2009 academic year.
- A series of seven spring 2008 professional development sessions, presented by staff from NYC SEM Network (The Schoolwide Enrichment Model) encouraged participating teachers to improve the academic performance of all students in areas of the regular curriculum and to blend into the standard curriculum activities that will engage students in meaningful and enjoyable academic pursuits. Since most of these teachers are also involved with afterschool and Saturday programs, it additionally provided them strategies and hands-on resources to enhance students' academic and personal development by promoting their talent potentials and providing engaging enrichment activities.
- The agenda for this year's first Chancellor's Professional Day on 8/29/08 encouraged continual evaluation and revision of classroom practice by providing differentiated grade appropriate presentations on the IIM (Independent Investigation Model) which teaches students the foundation skills of research. Our library media specialist is IIM trained and is integrating this methodology during library research lessons as well.
- Model classrooms on every grade have provided staff with on site inter-visitation opportunities. In order to improve middle school scores, intervisitations are being extended so that middle school teachers can benefit from observing and articulating with elementary grade teachers who effectively use explicit instruction within a workshop model framework.
- CAASS automated attendance and lateness monitoring system for middle school students is in place. In addition Messaging Service software is providing a support service that connects students and parents with the school's commitment to improve attendance across the grades.
- 8th grade holdover rate averages 2% despite language barriers. Over 36% of 5th graders are accepted to District 21 Magnet School Gifted and Talented programs and are replaced with incoming 6th grade zoned students.
- A one million dollar state-of-the art chemical science lab opened in the fall of 2008. The lab is equipped with a Plasma flat screen television, a LCD projector, and wireless computers. The lab services all of our middle school students in grades 6 – 8; including our special education classes a minimum of 4 times a week. We have also been provided with an opportunity to be part of the Museum of Natural History's Moveable museum which commences in December of 2008 and will provide our students with hands on learning experience.
- For the first time, we are offering an Intermediate Algebra Regent Course to those 8th grade students who met criteria, based on 7th Grade NYS Mathematics Exam, a qualifying entrance exam, and teacher review and recommendation. The students enrolled have 120 minutes of

instruction each day, and commencing in January will be expected to attend afterschool sessions Monday through Thursday, from 3:00 to 4:30, until the Regent is offered in June.

- We are continuing to develop cutting-edge technology resources. Several Smart Boards and eight Mimio Boards have been placed in classrooms to enhance student engagement and provide interactive instruction. Hopefully this will lead to greater academic achievement, particularly in middle school. Ongoing professional development is being provided.
- Laptop carts and five computer banks were installed in several classrooms, improving student access to technology. We have begun use of Dimension M's Tabula Digita math enrichment program. Our technology specialist has compiled a schoolwide software catalogue for teachers' use. For greater accessibility, this information is being made available in several school sites, including the Lending Library.
- Acuity training has been turn keyed to help all teachers' access and analyze data. AIS providers have been trained to set up their own class rosters in order to develop item skill analysis for the students that they service.

What are the most significant aids to the school's continuous improvement?

- We have continued implementation of the workshop model approach in reading, writing, Everyday Math and Impact Math in order to differentiate instruction and actively engage students. Test preparation is being integrated into an interactive workshop model format.
- We have continued expansion of the lending library resources to support shared and guided reading. A shared big book reading program (*Good Habits, Great Readers*) enhances the teaching and learning of reading strategies and skills, promoting self-extending systems and fostering greater independence and better test results. A variety of other instructional resources to support differentiated instruction in reading, math and other content areas is also available.
- Development of classroom libraries to support a variety of reading levels for independent reading and integration of literacy into the content areas. Requisition of additional core libraries for ESL and Special Education classrooms for NYCDOE supports a wide range of reading levels in all classrooms for these sub-groups.
- We have successfully transitioned to the Everyday Math Edition 3 in grades Pre-K through fifth grade. We are acclimating to Impact Math's 3rd Edition in grades 6 through 8 and have initiated an Integrated Algebra Regents class using Prentice Hall text materials. An additional Certified Math teacher was hired to provide instruction and intervention for our 8th grade students, and an Interventionist was hired to service our 6th and 7th grade at-risk students in math.
- We have purchased a new kindergarten literacy program in order to provide a systematic format of teaching, learning and assessment for this challenging group of young English language learners. Weekly grade meetings and ongoing professional development is being provided to assist teachers in further differentiating instruction and encouraging collaborative, reflective efforts in developing best practices.
- We have continued our policy of establishing a newcomer ELL class for 7th grade students new to the country and homogeneous grouping of beginner, intermediate and advanced ELL students in other classrooms. Leap Frog and Imagine Learning English interactive technology is available in most of these classrooms.
- Our Literacy and Math Coaches are providing mentoring to new teachers as well as ongoing professional development through co-teaching, demonstrations and reflective discussion. An open-access Lending Library and Coaches room allows teachers to meet and explore resources in a collegial setting.

- Laptop mobile computer centers promote computer literacy for all staff and students and integrate technology into the classroom environment. Our wireless and interactive footprint in the building has been successfully increased.
- Our full-time School Library Media Specialist supplements classroom literacy instruction and research methodology in our new School Library Media Center whose current collection supports all curriculum areas at every reading level and has a flexible scheduling/open access program. Library book circulation by students has increased substantially to 3,933 books loaned from September 2nd to November 18, 2008. Our full-time music and art teachers support Arts Count initiatives in order to provide a high-quality arts education for our students. Integration of arts education has a positive impact on the healthy development of students, both intellectually and socially. It effectively engages students and is an entry point for reaching our diverse population of learners.
- The principal and administrative staff encourages open dialogue to resolve problems, and there is ongoing evidence of collegiality and shared vision among most staff members.
- A Reading Recovery teacher services at-risk 1st grade student's one-to-one as well as small group instruction for wait-listed 1st graders and at-risk second graders. She works closely with early childhood classroom teachers and is the coordinator of ECLAS. She is a member of the PPT team as well.
- A full-time School Assessment Team addresses at risk behavior and referrals to special education. A "Coney Island Hospital on Site Service Program" psychologist services referred students with their parent's consent.
- Our Inquiry Team is building on our initial case study, which used a Collaborative Team Teaching classroom as an opportunity for action research to evaluate new teacher resources, explore more effective models of Academic Intervention Services, and utilize Smart Board technology to promote greater and more interactive student engagement. We are now focusing on the influence of student selection criteria on ongoing student achievement, and building on our repertoire of strategy prompts, cue systems and questioning techniques to extend comprehension in reading. For additional information see Appendix 7- Key Finding 7.
- The "After school Literacy Program" at Family College is funded by The Office of Collaborative Team Teaching Programs at Kingsborough Community College. The program is geared towards, but not limited to, parents who go to the college and have children attending the Family College Annex. It gives the parents extra study time after school and provides the children with emergent literacy skills, snacks, arts and crafts, and physical activities. The program enhances the education both parents and children.

What are the most significant barriers to the school's continuous improvement?

There is a lack of continuum of our high achieving population from the elementary to middle school grades. High performing 5th grade students test into specialized gifted and talented District 21 middle schools. There is great instability in our school population. This exacerbates problems with instructional continuity and impacts on attendance record-keeping. Mandates for the State ELA test require that English Language Learners take the test in English after just one year in school.

We are a Title I school which services a diverse immigrant community. Students with limited English proficiency need to adapt and adjust to their new homes, school, language, environment and lifestyles quickly in order to perform on standardized assessments. Last year 172 ELL students' took the New York State ELA Assessment. The breakdown is as follows:

Year 0	1 student
Year 1	29 students
Year 2	15 students
Year 3	29 students
Year 4	20 students
Year 5	27 students
Year 6	41 students

Because we are a Targeted Assistance Title I School all of our Title I Funds are allocated to those students receiving a Level 1 or Level 2 on State exams. This year we hope to hold a vote to go to School Wide Programs, so that all of our students can benefit from this selection. There will be a greater flexibility in using these funds for the benefit of all our students.

Our physical plant houses two separate Pre K-8 schools (P.S. 225, P.S. 771). Lack of adequate building space creates overcrowding issues which impact on instruction and makes effective programming more difficult. Petition to restructure to create more space denied 1/08. The combination of two separate sites (P.S. 225 and the Kingsborough Family College Annex two miles away) reorganized into one school presents administrative challenges to staff cohesiveness and fulfilling goals relating to the mission and vision of the school. However, great strides are being made to address this situation. For example, professional development providers are visiting Family College on a regular basis and increasing numbers of teachers and parents are attending meetings held at the main site.

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.

SECTION V: Annual School Goals

Goal 1: By June 2009, all teachers in core subject areas will have examined, analyzed, and utilized at least four (4) sources of hard data and the results of a least six (6) authentic assessments to develop monthly individual student goals (based on appropriate benchmarks), and plan appropriate instructional strategies aligned with these goals.

Goal 2: By June 2009, school leaders and faculty will increase Exemplary Proficiency Gains by 3% for students in all applicable subgroups in Mathematics and ELA, through a continuous and uniform method of assessment and progress monitoring.

Goal 3: By June 2009, all students, including students in all subgroups and Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, will meet or exceed the state standard of 95% participation on all New York State Testing Program examinations.

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.

N/A

Subject/Area (where relevant): _____

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, all teachers in core subject areas will have examined , analyzed, and utilized at least four (4) sources of hard data and the results of at least six (6) authentic assessments to develop monthly individual student goals (based on appropriate benchmarks), and plan appropriate instructional strategies aligned with these goals.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Starting September, 2008 a common protocol to develop consistency in data collection and record-keeping has been established for all classroom teachers and AIS providers. Teachers will maintain binders collecting standardized and classroom data, which will be analyzed and used to set goals and next steps for each student, using data to drive instruction. Administrators and coaches are working with teachers at grade conferences, monthly ELL and Title I funded teachers meetings, and during individual conferences, to set goals that incorporate skills, strategies, graphic organizers, questioning and note taking techniques that will empower students to develop self-extending systems to increase student achievement.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>We have purchased additional test preparation materials, aligned to NYS Standards, to be used in generating lessons in the workshop model that simulate test taking situations. C4E allocations are funding an “F” status mentor, our Literacy and Math coaches, and our School Enrichment Model per session funds for the afterschool program. In an effort to assist middle school students to meet instructional targets, Chapter 57 School Quality Grant is used to fund the afterschool tutorial program.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Review of teacher data binders will show on-going data collection analysis and use. Analysis of classroom formative and summative assessments will indicate that individual student goals are being met each month. Fountas and Pinnell independent reading levels, determined by ECLAS, WRAP, Columbia Quick Assessment, or Fountas and Pinnell Assessment Kits, as well as Unit Assessment in mathematics should continue to increase towards grade appropriate benchmarks. The Progress Report will reflect 3% Exemplary Proficiency Gains in closing the Achievement Gap.</p>

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.

N/A

Subject/Area (where relevant): _____

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009 school leaders and faculty will increase Exemplary Proficiency Gains by 3% for students in all applicable subgroups in Mathematics and ELA, through a continuous and uniform method of assessment and progress monitoring.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>All academic intervention providers will assess and track the progress of these students as per Goal 1 and will keep attendance for students being serviced, In addition, AIS providers must articulate their specified goals and next steps with the students’ classroom teachers and verify this process by signing off on monthly individual Goal/Objective sheets. Coaches and an “F” status mentor routinely visit our annex at Family College to ensure consistency. A CAASS automated attendance and lateness monitoring system for middle school students is in place. In addition, Messaging Service software is providing a support service to teachers ensuring that parents are aware of their child’s absence. Family assistants are available for translation services to teachers who need this help when calling students’ homes. Our middle school Assistant Principal has initiated an incentive program for students with excellent attendance. An “F” status teacher offers academic help to middle school Special Education classes monitors their attendance and works closely with the School Assessment Team.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Allocation for CAASS Supplies (\$600.00) and School Messaging Service Systems (\$585.00), Attendance Incentive , Title I F status teacher (\$20,000.00 SINI Grant); C4E allocations for F Status mentor at Kingsborough Family College (\$18,812.00)</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Classrooms formative and summative assessments will indicate 3% achievement gains for these subgroups. The Progress Report will reflect 3% Exemplary Proficiency Gains in closing the Achievement Gap. Reading levels should increase towards grade appropriate benchmarks. AYP will be met in all areas.</p>

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.*

N/A

Subject/Area (where relevant): _____

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2009, All students, including students in all subgroups and Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, will meet or exceed the state standard of 95% participation on all New York State Testing Program examinations.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>All academic intervention providers assess and track the progress of all students and will keep attendance for students being serviced. A CAASS automated attendance and lateness monitoring system for middle school students is in place. In addition, telephone messaging service software is providing a support service to teachers ensuring that all parents are aware of school meetings. Family assistants are available for translation services to teachers who need this help when calling students’ homes. Our middle school Assistant Principal has improved an existing incentive program for students with excellent attendance. An “F” status teacher offers academic help to middle school Special Education classes monitors their attendance and works closely with the School Assessment Team.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Allocation for CAASS Supplies (\$600.00) and School Messaging Service System (\$585.00). Attendance Incentive, Title I F status teacher (\$20,000.00 SINI Grant); Chapter 57 School Quality Grant (\$30,000) supports these initiatives.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Daily, weekly and monthly ATS attendance reports are closely monitored by the administration and classroom teachers. Absence reports are utilized to identify students and families for attendance outreach and support according to the school attendance plan. Periodic attendance assemblies, individual student incentives, as well as prominent public graphic displays, celebrate and reward demonstrated progress in attendance.</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: CIH Mental Health Counsel	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K			N/A	N/A	5	0	4	1
1	12		N/A	N/A	5	2	6	2
2	2		N/A	N/A	6	3	2	3
3	17	14	N/A	N/A	7	2	4	2
4	10	4	4	10	5	6	3	1
5	21	12	12	21	5	6	3	2
6	12	8	8	12	7	1	2	1
7	21	16	31	21	10	1		4
8	31	17	17	45	10	2		2
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

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p>During the course of the school day, funded reading teachers provide small group instruction in reading and writing to students who have been identified as “at risk”, level 1 or level 2. This small group instruction is implemented in either a pull-out or push-in setting. The funded reading teachers are continuously collaborating with the classroom teacher and the PPT leader to discuss ways to differentiate instruction to meet the individual academic goals of each student, which are aligned with State Standards.</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p>During the course of the school day, the funded math teachers provide small group instruction to students who have been identified as “at risk”, level 1 or level 2. This small group instruction is implemented in a push-in setting. The funded math teachers are continuously collaborating with the classroom teacher and the PPT leader to discuss ways to differentiate instruction to meet the individual academic needs of each student.</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>A science cluster specialist works with grades Pre-K - 3 one period per week, and the 4th and 5th grade classes twice a week. The Middle School is serviced by two teachers in a state of the art science lab where exploration and hands on activities are encouraged and individual attention is given to all students particularly to at risk students.</p>
<p>Social Studies:</p>	<p>A social studies cluster teacher works with students in grades 1-5 approximately two times per week. Curriculum is based on grade appropriate State Standards.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<p>At risk counseling students receive related services from the school Guidance Counselor on a weekly basis through out the school day. Non-mandated students are seen by the Guidance Counselor on a need to basis.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</p>	<p>The School Psychologist screens for learning difficulties, meets with parents and teachers to discuss the needs and remediation for the identified students.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</p>	<p>The school Social Worker provides prevention and when necessary intervention services with identified children with behavior and learning problems.</p>
<p>At-risk Health-related Services:</p>	<p>The school nurse works with asthmatic children doing “open airways” to help minimize absenteeism. The school nurse works with identified diabetic students to provide privacy to take care of their daily and unexpected needs in order to enable them to meet their educational needs.</p>

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.

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:** 391
(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. 225 is a Pre-K -8 school located in Brighton Beach, Brooklyn in a multi-ethnic community. The schools population is made up of approximately 918 students. Presently we service 420 English Language Learners, which is approximately 46% of the student body. P.S. 225s ESL Program consists of seven full-time and one part time licensed/certified teacher funded under Fair Student Funding. Students are grouped according to grade level and either received a total number of 360 minutes if they fall into the beginner or intermediate level of proficiency or 180 minutes if they are at an advanced level of proficiency. Based on this year's numbers we are currently servicing our ELL population in 22 groups, which range from kindergarten through eight grade both general and special education. In addition to these services, funding from the Title III Supplemental Services was used to create a seventh grade Newcomer's class.

P.S. 225s licensed/certified ESL teachers are well versed in team teaching collaborative learning and the Chancellor's recommendations on aligning instruction and curriculum in literacy and mathematics. In addition to our ESL staff, both our library media specialist and our computer teacher are trained in ESL strategies and methodologies. Our library has specific materials and resources geared towards our Limited English Proficient student body. Moreover, we provide technology based language instruction to our target population using interactive web based instructional material.

The primary goal of our ESL Department is to improve the four modalities; listening, speaking, reading and writing of our ELL population. English is the language of instruction in our ESL program and our ESL teachers will work closely with homeroom teachers to collaborate and develop coordinated activities to instruct all students. ELL teachers will continue to use various techniques such as scaffolding, supplemental textbooks and school supplies which include student made Bingo games, the Oxford picture dictionary, flash cards, crosswords, and books on tape and the Rigby Language Development program. ELL teachers also use an array of leveled readers to develop appropriate instruction incorporating skills and strategies that will lead to better achievement on formal and informal assessments. Based on a school wide initiative to align collection and use of data to drive instruction, ESL providers will set monthly goals for all students being serviced. These goals will work towards having students meet New York State Standards while using language acquisition strategies appropriate for English Language Learners.

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

The Shorefront YM-YWHA Stars at PS 225 via a Task 21st Century Community Learning Center Grant provides LEP Students the opportunity to socialize in extra curricular activities as well as providing over 300 students with academic services in tutoring and homework assistance. In addition, our after-school Test Prep Program concentrates on developing skills and strategies necessary to achieve success on the New York State Assessments and the School Enrichment Model program is employed to incorporate the philosophy and pedagogy of enrichment learning and teaching to improve performance, enhance motivation and enjoyment

in learning. The Shorefront Family Literacy Program was instituted to help families acclimate to the cultural and social demands that a new country brings. The focus is on teaching adults and their children the English language.

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.

We believe that parent involvement is critical to the success of any school program but especially to our ESL program due to the high number of children in our school. Initial contact with parents of newly enrolled targeted ELL students occur via the Parent Orientation meeting which is held in the fall and periodically thereafter. Information and requirements, in each native language, is provided regarding the ELL mandated program. The parents will view a video describing the three different program choices in their native language as well as speak to the ESL teacher with any questions they may have. A translator is always provided. In the past few years, the trend seems to be that parents have been selecting a Free Standing ESL program after receiving materials and viewing the programs selection video/DVD at their initial Parent Orientation Meeting. The program that P.S. 225 offers ELL students is a push-In ESL program, which satisfies the wants of the parents. Our parent coordinator Ms. Mezhibovsky is located in room 202A. She is here to assist and welcome parents. It is her responsibility to see that all of the ELL parents understand everything that is happening in the school and in the region.

PS 225 has a Parent Teacher Association composed of parents of the children that attend this school. They hold monthly meetings attended by other parents from the school body. At these meetings they discuss worthwhile activities that benefit the children as well as raise funds for the children's benefit. They work collaboratively throughout the year holding fundraisers that involve the school population. For example: annual school pictures book fair and candy sales. The PTA along with administration, decide where these funds will be best put. In the past they have been used for assembly programs, aiding the media specialist in purchasing more books for our school library and assisting children in class trips.

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

This year are planning on implementing a new ESL program called Imagine Learning English. Imagine Learning English, is a computer-based instructional program, teaches children English and helps develop literacy skills. Students receive one-on-one instruction through hundreds of engaging activities specifically designed to meet their individual needs, so they progress quickly. Last year was the first year we created a seventh grade Newcomer's class. Due to its success, we have continued with this class again this year. Of the 14 students that were on register, eight students improved from beginner to intermediate or advanced levels. The classroom teacher used all the senses and incorporated art and music in all content areas. The primary goal is to improve the listening, reading, speaking and writing skills of ELL students.

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.

The entire staff will participate in workshops provided by school based and Citywide professional development that focuses on ESL issues throughout the 2008-2009 year. Some of these workshops will concentrate on integrating ESL strategies and techniques with core curriculum in the mainstream classroom. ESL staff will meet with administration and mainstream staff to articulate program goals and objectives. The ESL staff will model activities for mainstream personnel to ensure that our LEP population is receiving ESL services throughout the day.

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

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. 224 District 21

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	ESL Program	
Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program			
N/A	8	N/A	0	N/A	0	8

* 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 2007-08 ESL --3rd grade

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

School District: 21

School Building: PS 225

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 To: 8:46 A.M.	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) Social Studies (ESL Push in)
2	From: 8:46 To: 9:32 A.M	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)
3	From: 9:32 To: 10:18 A.M	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA
4	From: 10:18 To: 11:08 A.M	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) Music	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) ELA
5	From: 11:08 To: 11:58 A.M	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch
6	From: 11:58 To: 12:48	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Computers (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
7	From: 12:48 To: 1:34	Subject (Specify) Math / Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Math (ESL-Push-in)	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
8	From: 1:34 To: 2:20	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Gym	Subject (Specify) Science
9	From: 2:20 To: 2:57	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify)
10						

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2007-08 ESL --7th grade

ESL Program Type: Free-Standing Push-in Pull-out

Indicate Proficiency Level: Beginning Intermediate Advanced

School District: 21

School Building: PS 225

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 To: 8:46a.m.	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA
2	From: 8:46 To: 9:32	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA
3	From: 9:32 To: 10:18	Subject (Specify) Art	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Foreign Language
4	From: 10:18 To: 11:08	Subject (Specify) Gym	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Foreign Language	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
5	From: 11:08 To: 11:58	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
6	From: 11:58 To: 12:48	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch
7	From: 12:48 To: 1:34	Subject (Specify) Science Lab	Subject (Specify) Foreign Language	Subject (Specify) Science Lab	Subject (Specify) Art	Subject (Specify) Science
8	From: 1:34 To: 2:20	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Gym	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science Lab	Subject (Specify) Social Studies
9	From: 2:20 To: 2:57	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify)

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2007-08 ESL --1st grade

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

School District: 21

School Building: 225

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 To: 8:46a.m.	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) Music	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA
2	From: 8:46 To: 9:32	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) Gym	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA
3	From: 9:32 To: 10:18	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) ELA (ESL Push-in)	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) ELA
4	From: 10:18 To: 11:08	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch	Subject (Specify) Lunch
5	From: 11:08 To: 11:58	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) Math
6	From: 11:58 To: 12:48	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
7	From: 12:48 To: 1:34	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Music	Subject (Specify) Music
8	From: 1:34 To: 2:20	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Art
9	From: 2:20 To: 2:57	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify) Extended Day	Subject (Specify)

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) 7 **Number of Students to be Served:** 12 LEP _____ Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 1 **Other Staff (Specify)** _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

Language Instruction Program – Language instruction education programs funded under Title III, Part A, of NCLB, must help LEP students attain English proficiency while meeting State academic achievement standards. They may use both English and the student's native language and may include the participation of English proficient students (i.e., Two Way Bilingual Education/Dual Language program.) 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.

As of October 31st, there were 12 seventh grade students enrolled in our newcomer's class. They are serviced by one teacher with an MS in TESOL. The instruction is given in English with translation provided by the classroom teacher, a paraprofessional and/or students with enough English language understanding to translate. In addition, these students also receive eight periods of ESL instruction per week by a fully licensed ESL teacher.

Some of the programs introduced into the classroom are Imagine Learning English and Leapfrog. These programs help accelerate English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing skills. These programs are used on average three times per week. Three times per week, the classroom teacher also provides read alouds in Reading, Math and Social Studies in an effort to enhance listening and vocabulary skills. Approximately four times a week students are engaged in shared reading in all content areas which also helps increase reading and listening skills as well as raise vocabulary levels.

Instruction is differentiated based on the students' English proficiency levels obtained from the Lab-R. Visuals, drawings, and realia provided real-life, or hands-on models of vocabulary, while singing in English enhances reading, listening and speaking skills and at the same time teach vocabulary. This takes place at least once a week. Independent reading teaches new vocabulary and reading skills. Writing tasks reinforce content area lessons such as literature, character analysis and description, grammar skills, sequence of events, and autobiographical writing. Videos and movies enhance content area work such as www.brainpop.com for math or power-point presentations in Social Studies.

This occurs on a weekly basis. Spelling and Language Arts workbooks enhance everyday use of English. Daily use of graphic organizers

UPDATED – MARCH 26, 2009

breakdown content area learning for English Language Learners and provide a pre-writing tool.

Students enhance speaking, reading and listening skills during shared reading of PowerPoint presentations in content areas.

Right-brain learning of language is utilized with TPR (Total Physical Response) and by using student-made artwork to integrate mathematical concepts.

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.

A series of five Spring 2008 professional development sessions focused on giving ELL providers multiple opportunities to discuss their practice and study student work with the lens on improving instruction. Ms. Sharon Funk, of Professional Curriculum Associates, presented various strategies for differentiated instruction according to need and readiness. Teachers worked in small groups, discussing and preparing Individual Student Plan Worksheets, planning goals and next steps that could be implemented during summer school, if applicable, as well as by classroom and support staff during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Imagine Learning English is a computer-based instructional program that teaches children English and develops their literacy skills through individualized instruction. The program delivers specific data reports for each student, highlighting their needs at any time as they progress through the program. The curriculum is founded on scientifically based research and No Child Left Behind guidelines. This program teaches direct vocabulary development (including academic language), listening and speaking, phonemic awareness, emergent literacy, and school readiness with individualized lessons and powerful graphic support. In addition, we will be implementing Imagine Learning English. The ESL teachers were trained on the different components of the program and how it should be implemented as well as how to use the program's student progress reports. The ESL teachers will train the classroom teachers that will be using this program.

The entire staff will participate in workshops provided by school based and Citywide professional development that focuses on ESL issues throughout the 2008-2009 year. Some of these workshops will concentrate on integrating ESL strategies and techniques with core curriculum in the mainstream classroom. ESL staff will meet with administration and mainstream staff to articulate program goals and objectives. The ESL staff will model activities for mainstream personnel to ensure that our LEP population is receiving ESL services throughout the day.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

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

Allocation:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	61,186.00	Teacher salary for the reduced register class.
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts		
Supplies and materials		
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL	61,186.00	

Language Allocation Policy (LAP)

P.S./I.S 225

Eileen E. Zaglin

2008-2009

I. The Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

P.S. 225 The Eileen Zaglin School of District 21 is a K-8 school located in the Brighton Beach community of Brooklyn. The Language Allocation Policy Team Composition includes:

Principal	Joseph Montebello
Assistant Principals	Samantha Maisonet Michael Cosmai Naomi Levine
Parent Coordinator	Luiza Mezhibovsky
Literacy Coach	Brenda Halperin
Guidance Counselor	Nephtali Rodriguez
Math Coach	Mary Ann Calabrese
Related Services	Lydia Friedman
Title I Funded Reading	Helen Franki Dena Levinson

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Rosalba Scala	AnnaMaria Nigro
Amy Finegold	Lorianne Gilroy-Erickson
Karlene Dinal	Mufti Farooqi
Dana Lombardi	

Suzanne Wren is C4E self contained ESL classroom teacher.

II. Teacher Qualifications

P.S. 225's freestanding ESL Program consists of seven teachers (all licensed in ESL) full-time and one part time licensed/certified teacher funded under Fair Student Funding. Students are grouped according to grade level and either receive 360 minutes (8 periods) or 180 minutes (4 periods) of ESL service per week depending on level of proficiency. In addition to these services, funding from C4E was used to create a seventh grade Newcomer's class.

III. ELL Demographics

The 2007-2008 school population of 912 reflects that of the largely immigrant community of approximately 50 different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, a multi-ethnic community. 44.5 % of the student body is made up of English Language Learners. The ELL population is 391. The school implements a Free Standing English as a Second Language program.

The breakdown of our 391 ELLs is as follows:

kindergarten	42 students
grade one	67 students
grade two	57 students
grade three	48 students
grade four	35 students
grade five	45 students
grade six	43 students
grade seven	29 students
grade eight	25 ELL students.

The above numbers include all ESL Special Education students and students from Family College.

NUMBER OF ELLS BY GRADE IN EACH LANGUAGE GROUP
 FREESTANDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Spanish	14	25	20	12	10	9	9	9	6
Chinese	0	1	2	2	1	3	1	0	0
Russian	17	29	22	20	12	20	21	11	11
Arabic	2	1	3	2	2	1	5	2	0
Urdu	7	8	6	6	6	7	4	4	6
French	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
Polish	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Albanian	1	2	3	3	4	4	2	2	1
Total	42	67	57	48	35	45	43	29	25

Grand Total: 391

IV. Parent Program Choice

Initial contact with parents of newly enrolled targeted ELL students occur via the Parent Orientation meeting which is held in the fall and periodically thereafter. Information and requirements, in each native language, is provided regarding the ELL mandated program. The parents will view a video describing the three different program choices in their native language as well as speak to the ESL teacher with any questions they may have. A translator is always provided. In the past few years, the trend seems to be that parents have been selecting a Free Standing ESL program after receiving materials and viewing the programs selection video/DVD at their initial Parent Orientation Meeting. The program that P.S. 225 offers ELL students is a push-In ESL program, which satisfies the wants of the parents.

Our parent coordinator Ms. Mezhibovsky is located in room 202A. She is here to assist and welcome parents. It is her responsibility to see that all of the ELL parents understand relevant events in the school community.

V. Assessment Analysis**P.S. 225 and Annex ESL NYSESLAT Breakdown 07-08**

Grade	Total Students	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced
1 st	39	23	12	4
2 nd	51	17	20	17
3 rd	52	13	22	17
4 th	34	2	9	23
5 th	29	3	3	23
6 th	26	4	5	17
7 th	50	20	13	17
8 th	33	6	13	14
Totals	314	85	97	132

Assessment Analysis: Long Term ELL students, who have been in the program for more than three years are eligible. Some of these students also receive Reading Intervention Services. Within the demographics of P.S. 225's ELL population lays a very specific and distinct English Language Learner; Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE). According to the BESIS Report 2007-2008, there are 25 SIFE students in total. The breakdown of SIFE students is as follows: 3 in 5th grade, 3 in 6th grade, 9 in 7th grade, and 10 in 8th grade. The services provided for SIFE students, apart from mandated time, as per Part 154, are extended hours on two days of the week for two hours, during which students receive Language Arts instruction. After analyzing the patterns from the 2008 NYSESLAT results for grades K-8, we discovered that in grades kindergarten and first grade reading is the weakest of the four modalities in both grades. The average score was 9. The second lowest scoring modality was writing, with an average score of 15. The average score for listening was 20 and the highest modality was speaking, which scored an average of 22. Ten percent of P.S. 225 K-1 students achieved proficiency, 53% scored at beginner level, and 28% scored at intermediate, and 9% scored at an advanced level.

In grades 2-4, the weakest modality was reading, with an average score of 13. The second lowest scoring modality was writing, which held an average score of 15. Listening had an average score of 18 and the highest scoring modality was speaking, with an average score of 25. Thirteen percent of P.S. 225's 2-4 students achieved proficiency, 20% scored at beginner level, 32% scored at intermediate, and 26% scored at advanced.

In grades 5-6, the lowest scoring modality was writing, with an average score of 18. Listening and reading both scored an average of 20 and the highest scoring modality was speaking, which held an average score of 26. Fifteen percent of P.S. 225 5-6 grade students achieved proficiency, 11% scored at beginner level, 5% scored at intermediate, and 25% scored at advanced.

In grades 7-8 the lowest scoring modality was writing with an average score of 16. Reading was the second lowest modality with an average score of 17. Listening had an average score of 18 and the highest scoring modality was speaking with an average score of 23. Eight percent of P.S. 225 English Language Learners in the 7th and 8th achieved proficiency, 30% scored at beginner level, 30% scored intermediate and 35% scored at advanced. It is apparent that after analyzing the 2008 NYSESLAT results, reading was the lowest scoring modality across all of the grades and speaking being the highest scoring modality.

Based on the results from the City and State Assessment Data, in the content area of mathematics, the 2007-2008 results 95% of the 41 3rd grade ELLs' are on a level 3 or above. 91% of the 32 4th graders are on a level 3 or above. In the 5th grade, 79% of 38 of the ELLs' on level 3 or above. 68% of 41 ELLs' are on a level 3 or above. Of the 36 ELLs' in the 6th grade, 31% are on a level 3 or above. 41% of the 34 ELLs' in the 8th grade are on a level 3 or above. Based on the results from the City and State Assessment Data, in the content area of English Language Arts, the 2007-2008 results 58% of the 38 ELLs' are level 3 or above. In the 4th grade, of the 30 ELLs' 43% are on a level 3 or above. In the 5th grade, of the 33 ELLs' 64% are on a level 3 or above. In the 6th grade, of the 31 ELLs' 23% are on a level 3 or above. In the 7th grade, of the 25 ELLs', 16 % are on a level 3 or above. Of the 19 ELLs' in the 8th grade, 26% are level 3 or above. Based on the results from the New York State 4th grade Science exam, 3 students scored level II, 17 scored level III and 10 scored level IV. Based on the results from the New York State 5th grade Social Studies Exam, 8 students scored level I, 5 scored level II, and 12 scored level III.

Other Assessments

ECLAS

	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	Level V	Level VI
K	26	44	0	1	0	0
1	7	9	14	4	6	29
2	0	0	1	13	1	49
3	0	2	1	15	15	72
<hr/>						
Total	33	55	16	33	22	150

After analyzing the above assessments from all grade levels, we realized that the main focus of teaching and learning continues to be integrating reading and writing into all subject areas.

VI. Planning for ELLS

Current ELL Instructional/Program Model Description

To provide a sound evaluation and an accurate picture of our ELL population, the number of years of schooling in their native language, or lack thereof, is an important factor when planning for academic language development (CALP) or instruction in general.

ELL teachers will continue to use various programs such as SIOP, Rigby Language Development Program, and an array of leveled readers to develop appropriate instruction incorporating skills and strategies that will lead to better achievement on formal and informal assessments. ELL teachers also use scaffolding, supplemental textbooks and school supplies which include student made bingo games, the Oxford picture dictionary, flash cards, crosswords, and books on tape.

Based on a school wide initiative to align collection and use of data to drive instruction, ESL providers will set monthly goals for all students being serviced. These goals will work towards having students meet New York State Standards while using language acquisition strategies appropriate for English Language Learners.

Instructional Program Component

Taking into account the above percentages of ELL's participating in City and State examinations, the ELL teachers will work closely with homeroom teachers to coordinate activities and develop student's math and literacy skill in accordance to New York State Standards. ELL teachers are implementing the Department of Education's Children First Curriculum, which includes the Balance Literacy Approach as well as the Everyday Mathematics Program. Those students that have scored a 1 or 2 on performance levels are eligible for Academic Intervention Services (A.I.S.) to help them meet the standards. ELL teachers incorporate grade appropriate integrate thematic units through content areas using balanced literacy components and scaffolding strategies such as guided reading. The ELL teachers working with ELL students during the 37 ½ minutes are using small group instruction in the English Language Arts content areas.

All of P.S. 225's staff will participate in workshops provided by school based and Citywide professional development that focuses on ESL issues throughout the 2008-2009 year. These workshops will concentrate on integrating ESL strategies and techniques with core curriculum in the mainstream classroom. Some workshops attended during the 2007-2008 academic school year were:

Process of Guided Reading Throughout the Curriculum

Reading: Improving Student Individual Progress

School Enrichment Model Program Training

Differentiated Instruction Strategies

(PDA) Improving Teaching and Learning

Independent Investigation Method

ESL staff will meet weekly with administration and main stream staff to articulate program goals and objectives. They will provide modeling, coaching and demonstrating activities with our mainstream personnel to ensure our Limited English Proficient (LEP) population is receiving ESL services throughout the day.

Classroom teachers and ELL teachers create a buddy system with newcomers and mainstream students to help adapt to their new school environment. Centers include leveled readers, picture cards and books, audio tapes, books on tape, wordless books, Leap Pads and visual materials.

Newly arrived English Language Learners are especially welcomed in to P.S. 225's freestanding ESL Program. Each classroom has been designed to accommodate newcomers with ESL centers. The primary goal is to improve the listening, reading, speaking and writing skills of ELL students. The ELL teachers do not solely rely on the NYSESLAT to determine how well ELL students are performing but also take into account careful consideration of the information provided by the parent or guardian of the student's Home Language Survey.

Last year was the first year we created a seventh grade newcomer's class. Due to its success, we have continued with this class again this year. Of the 14 students that were on register, eight students improved from beginner to intermediate or advanced levels. The classroom teacher used all the senses and incorporated art and music in all content areas. The primary goal is to improve the listening, reading, speaking and writing skills of ELL students.

The Language Allocation Policy will act as a framework and reference for ELL teachers. The ELL teachers, in collaboration with classroom teachers will implement the various approaches mentioned in the said document, in order to help students meet academic standards.

This year we will introduce a new ESL program called Imagine Learning English. Imagine Learning English, is a computer-based instructional program, teaches children English and helps develop literacy skills. Students receive one-on-one instruction through hundreds of engaging activities specifically designed to meet their individual needs, so they progress quickly. We are presently involved in the grant writing process to fund this initiative.

Individual prescriptive and diagnostic plans are designed to facilitate differentiated instruction to address special needs of ELLs, SIFE and long term ELLs. They will also be given the opportunity to develop English literacy skills together with their families through the TASC program. This program will also sharpen their language/literacy skills and foster child/parent, school/family collaboration. TASC also provides an ESL after school program. The students in this program will receive small group instruction in all language modalities and in the content areas of ELA, math, social studies and science

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.

In order to accurately assess the written translation needs for P.S. 225, the ESL staff first reviewed the Home Language Surveys in order to accurately identify the languages currently spoken by parents of the ESL population. The required documentation for communicating with the parents for its availability both in-house and online was then reviewed by the ESL Staff.

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.

The 7 certified teachers comprising the P.S. 225 ESL team, met to discuss the interpretation needs of the parents of our targeted population. After reviewing the active caseloads for each of the caseloads, as well as the Home Language Survey, the team decided that the following interpretation needs exist;

1. Oral translation for in house events like Parent Teacher Conferences or PTA meetings or Open School
2. Interpretation for IEP or referral meetings
3. Translation services for admissions
4. Translations for major content area exams

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.

At this time the Department of Education provides translated copies of key documents such as Entitlement Letters, Placement Letters, Survey/Selection Forms, Title III Supplementary form. We will also be submitting report cards and promotion in doubt letters for translation into our seven primary languages. It is the opinion of the ESL team, that once the requested forms are translated, the parents of our ESL population will be able to receive and understand their children's status reports.

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.

The proposed oral interpretation services which P.S. 225 will consist of the following; obtaining the services of a bilingual family assistant or school aide to assist in translation or interpretation on Fall and Spring Open School nights. The extension of the hours for the Spanish speaking Family Assistant in order to better serve the daily needs of the families. Using the services of on the bilingual Parent Coordinator as well as the staff for oral translation purposes.

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>.

In anticipation of the implementation of VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services, the staff of P.S.225 has conducted a needs analysis via personal interview with parents and students in order to determine where the shortage of translated materials exist for parents. At this time the following interventions are in place;

- a. Bilingual staff in the three primary languages (Russian, Urdu and Spanish) spoken by the families of our students are available throughout the school day.
- b. All documents leaving the building are either translated or contain a translated message in seven languages that directs parents to contact the school regarding the notices for the purpose of being informed of the contents of each notice.
- c. The school will utilize the services of the Translation and Interpretation Unit in order to expand the number of school documents that currently exist.

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 **769,698.00**
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program **7697.00**
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified **38,485.00**
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year 99.3%
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.

The 5% Title I set-aside money is available to encourage teachers to complete their Masters Degree and apply for Permanent Certification in their core subject area.

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.

School-Parent Involvement Policy

- I. P.S. 225, in compliance with the Title I/PCEN mandates, has implemented a parent involvement policy strengthening the link between the school and the community. P.S. 225’s policy is designed to keep parents informed by actively involving them in planning and decision-making. Parents are encouraged to participate on the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, and Parent Advisory Councils, as trained volunteers and as members of the school professional development advisory council. Educational research has shown a positive correlation between parental involvement and student achievement. The overall aim of the policy is to develop a parent involvement program that will build a home-school partnership that assists parents in acquiring effective parenting skills, provide parents with the information and training needed to effectively become involved in planning and decision making, increase their understanding of the role of the home in enriching education and improving student achievement, and the development of positive attitudes toward the school community as whole.
- II. The policy encompasses all parents including parents of English Language Learners and special needs students.
- III. The policy is designed based upon a careful assessment of parents’ needs and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Title I/PCEN Parent Involvement Program.
In developing the P.S. 225 Parent Involvement Policy, the P.S. 225 PTA and parent members of the School Leadership Team were consulted on the proposed Parent Involvement Policy and asked to survey its members for additional input. To increase parent involvement, P.S. 225 will:
 - Actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and improving the funded programs and parental involvement policy of the school.
 - Support level committees that include parents such as the School Leadership Team and the Parents Teacher’s Association. Provide technical support when needed.
 - Maintain parent coordinators Title I funds to serve as liaisons between the school and parent communities. The parent coordinator will provide parent workshops based on the assessed needs of the parents in the school site.
 - These workshops may include the parenting skills, GED, ESL and curriculum based workshops to build parents’ capacity to help their children at home.
 - Provide a school informational meeting on all funding programs in the school.
 - Provide written translations.
 - Provide an Annual Parent Fair where all parents are invited to attend formal presentations and workshops that address their parenting needs.

P.S. 225 will encourage more school-level parental involvement by:

- Holding annual Parent Curriculum Conference
- Maintaining parent participation in school leadership teams
- Encouraging parents to become trained volunteers through Learning Leaders
- Having written and verbal progress reports that are periodically given to keep parents informed of their children's progress and goal setting.
- Providing school planners for daily written communication between school/teacher and the home.

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

**SCHOOL - PARENT COMPACT
P.S. 225**

The school and parents working cooperatively to provide for the successful education of the children agree:

The School Agrees

- To convene an annual meeting for Title I parents to inform them of the Title I program and their right to be involved.
- To offer a flexible number of meetings at various times, and if necessary, and if funds are available, to provide transportation, child care or home visits for those parents who cannot attend a regular school meeting.
- To actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and improving the Title I programs and the parental involvement policy.
- To provide parents with timely information about all programs.
- To provide performance profiles and individual student assessment results for each child and other pertinent individual and school district education information.
- To provide high quality curriculum and instruction.
- To deal with communication issues between teachers and parents through:
 1. Parent-teacher conferences at least annually
 2. Frequent reports to parents on their children's progress
 3. Reasonable access to staff
 4. Opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class
 5. Observation of classroom activities

To assure that parents may participate in professional development activities if the school determines that it is appropriate, i.e., literacy classes, workshops on reading strategies.

The Parent/Guardian Agrees

To become involved in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the school-parent involvement policy.

To participate in or request technical assistance training that the local education authority or school offers on child rearing practices and teaching and learning strategies.

To work with his/her child/children on school work; and read to them for 15 to 30 minutes per day.

To monitor his/her child's/children's:

1. Attendance at school
2. Homework
3. Television watching

To share the responsibility for improved student achievement.

To communicate with his/her child's/children's teachers about their educational needs.

To ask parents and parent groups to provide information to the school on the type of training for assistance they would like and/or need to help them be more effective in assisting their child/children in the educational process.

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS Not Applicable

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:

- a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
 - o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.
3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
 4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
 5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
 6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
 7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.
 8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
 9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.
 10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

In order to help participating students meet the State standards, we use highly qualified teachers who perform academic intervention for our at risk students, those students performing at Level 1 or Level 2 in either Reading or Mathematics. We have 6 AIS providers, servicing students in grades 3 through 8, aligning instruction to classroom curriculum and State Standards. See goal two Action and Aligning Resources.

2. Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning.

Our classroom teachers and our AIS teachers meet on a weekly basis to articulate students goals, and strategies to help students reach those goals. See Part B, Description of Academic Intervention Services.

3. Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that:

- a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;
- b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
- c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

Students receiving intervention services are addressed during the 37.5 minutes extended day in a 10:1 setting, allowing for more individualized instruction in areas of deficiency. Many of these students also attend an afterschool tutorial program where strategies are employed to improve comprehension skills, as well as develop mathematical thinking.

Students are seldom removed from classroom instruction, as we follow a push-in model for intervention as much as possible. Our AIS teachers work in the classroom, with a small group of targeted students, following the classroom teacher’s curriculum, but with instructional strategies and techniques that address the specific needs of the students being serviced. Students are invited to attend afterschool and Saturday tutorial programs.

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

Our teachers have at least one common preparation period per week, allowing teachers and AIS providers to setting common goals for their mutual students. This articulation ensures teachers to scaffold support for the benefit of their students.

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

The Administration has gone to great lengths to ensure that all of our Middle School teachers, and our AIS teachers have been certified in their areas of instruction. Title I set-aside money is available for this endeavor.

6. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff;

By June 2009, teachers and other staff will have experienced at least 7 professional development opportunities to support differentiated instruction, the implementation of new learning strategies into instructional practices, research methods, school enrichment models, and ELL training. Much of the development occurs during faculty conferences, grade conferences, and individual conferences with supervisors and coaches. Coaches are offering lunch and learn opportunities for interested teachers. We plan to host annual Parent Curriculum Conferences, encourage continued parent participation in the School Leadership Team. Our Parent Coordinator will provide parent workshops based on the assessed needs of the parents. These workshops may include parenting skills, GED, ESL and curriculum based workshops to build parents' capacity to help their children at home.

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and

P.S. 225's policy is designed to keep parents actively involved in their school community. We encourage our parents to participate on The School Leadership Team, the Parents Association and Parent Advisory Council. We invite our parents to attend parent teas, student assemblies, concerts, and school field trips, in the hope of developing positive attitudes toward the school community as a whole.

8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

NCLB programs, Title I School Quality Review funding, SED Improvement grants, ESDSVPP, C4E, TASC Shorefront Y, and Family Literacy services are coordinated by the administration for the seamless integration of Federal, State and Local services and programs.

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

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

NCLB/SED Status: Year 1 **SURR¹ Phase/Group (If applicable):** _____

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

1. For each area of school improvement identification (indicated on your pre-populated School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot, downloadable from your school’s NYCDOE webpage under “Statistics”), describe the school’s findings of the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified.

Because we did not meet the participation rate of 95% for the school year 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, we were designated as a School in Need of Improvement. Our participation rate for 2006-2007 was 93% and for 2007-2008 94%.

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

The School Quality Review Grant in the amount of \$30,000.00 was used to provide additional ELA and Math instruction to Middle School Students during afterschool hours, based upon data analysis of 2008 NYS Assessment in Language Arts and Mathematics. The \$65,000 Title I SED School Improvement Grant was utilized to provide attendance incentives for special education students. Two licensed F Status teachers were hired to perform ELA enrichment, academic intervention, attendance improvement and assist with state testing to promote academic improvement and increased participation rates. Parent/child involvement activities as well as attendance importance workshops are held for parents to improve their awareness of good attendance habits follow through.

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified.

(a) Provide the following information: 2008-09 anticipated Title I allocation = **\$769,698.00** 10% of Title I allocation = **\$77,052.00**

(b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement.

There are many factors that impact on student attendance. One aspect that we are addressing through professional development is student engagement. A series of sessions presented by the NYC SEM Network (The Schoolwide Enrichment Model) encourages teachers to enrich standard based curriculum with meaningful and enjoyable activities. Resources were purchased to encourage daily and afterschool by providing engaging enrichment activities and developing students' talent potentials.

Professional development has also been provided for the use of Smart Boards and Mimio Boards in daily classroom instruction. This technology encourages engagement and makes learning more enjoyable, thus encouraging attendance.

2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school's strategy for providing high-quality professional development.

Our preliminary focus for professional development, based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, has been to support all teachers in their growth as professionals through reflective practices. The elements of this standard have been supported by the mentoring work of our Literacy and Math coaches, both for new teachers as well as for veteran teachers. Additional support comes from grade conferences, faculty conferences and feedback from observations. Classroom inter-visitations are encouraged. Teachers share ideas on classroom management, various strategies that have proven to be successful, and afford themselves opportunities to observe best practices. In addition to our in-house professional development, teachers are encouraged to attend citywide workshops in subject areas that would improve their overall instruction.

3. ***Describe how the school will notify parents about the school's identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.***

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 is a federal law to improve education for all children. It holds schools responsible for results, gives parents greater choices, and promotes teaching methods that work. When P.S.225 was identified as a School in Need of improvement, a letter was sent to all parents advising them of this status, as well as their option to transfer their children to another public school that is not identified as needing improvement. The letter specifically stated that parents could obtain a copy of the School's Report Card either from the office of our Parent Coordinator, or on the Department of Education's website.

In a further effort to inform parents, a meeting was held to answer question parents might have had about school improvement, interventions and afterschool programs, as well as information about the Public School Choice transfer process. A letter went out in many of the spoken languages of the parents that make up our school community, as well as in English, with a statement requesting parents to see a staff member for a full translation.

Information regarding school policies on attendance and lateness is distributed to students and parents in September through the student handbook and highlighted during Parent/Teacher conferences, Funded Program conferences, and parent meetings with School Assessment Team, particularly for students with special needs. All AIS providers' document attendance for students serviced and reaches out to parents if attendance drops. Special attention is given to make sure parents understand the importance of taking standardized tests and every effort is made to ensure that all students who miss any test date receives a make-up test. School assistants and staff provide language translation as needed, reaching out to parents in school, by telephone, or at home.

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____ **N/A** _____

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

Directions: 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)² data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.

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

– **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: (We will form a committee to discuss this finding.)

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

The five key findings relating to ELA alignment issues were discussed initially at a school Cabinet meeting consisting of the Principal, elementary and middle school Assistant Principals and Literacy and Math Coaches. We attempted to establish a clear focus of how these five findings relate to Standard Based teaching and learning in our school, keeping in mind our established bottom line goals reflection of needs articulated in our Progress Report and Quality Review. We discussed how the underpinnings of intended and assessed curriculum presently align with implementation of School Quality Criteria. We realized that the taught curriculum often needs to be differentiated to address the needs of our large ELL population, making it more difficult to go into greater depth in addressing alignment of teaching and learning to state standards, both in planning and implementation. Additional meetings of our Cabinet and Inquiry Team will analyze school data and evaluate the impact on student achievement through the lens of these key findings. Our SAF and Network Leader will be asked to assist us in this endeavor. We will address these findings at grade and faculty meetings as well as SLT meetings, and will encourage input from parents and self-assessment from staff.

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

Applicable Not Applicable *Not yet determined*

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?

Our school has not yet completed the process.

Curriculum Maps

We have developed a Curriculum Map for elementary and middle school grades aligned with State mandated writing pieces. This acts as a pacing calendar for teachings rather than a definitive outline of student outcomes in writing. Standard based rubrics are used that are reflective of required student outcomes. However, skills to be mastered and strategies to be utilized have not been fully delineated.

Taught Curriculum

Although most New York State Standards are being addressed at all grade levels, there are some gaps of in-depth instruction. Efforts to improve test results and less instructional time due to additional test dates make it difficult for teachers to address all literacy competencies. There is less emphasis on spelling and handwriting, as these competencies are minimally relevant in State ELA exams. Teachers emphasize speaking and listening, as part of the workshop model and as a key element for ELLS, but enrichment activities in this area also may be limited due to time constraints. In addition there may be a lag in taught curriculum of grade-specific student competencies when teachers struggle to find time to differentiate instruction for low performing students and ELL's.

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.

The Cabinet will revisit all aspects of State mandated curriculum with teachers during grade conferences and during Title I and ESL staff meetings. Effort will be made to develop more in-depth curriculum maps for writing. We will look at ways to address vertical alignment across grade levels. Many students enter below Standard from the previous grade level. The proposal for the School Wide Project option would be one way to help us address this issue, by allowing us to focus on smaller classrooms and groups of students with similar needs. We will continue to look at the Collaborative Team Teaching model (part of our Inquiry Team research) as another possible solution.

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.

Opportunities arise during professional development, and especially at grade conferences to determine the dissatisfaction of teachers with the choice of materials used for Math instruction. Some teachers feel the program is on a higher instructional level than the majority of students can rise to, and the corresponding work is difficult to complete independently. This is true for our ELL and our Special Education students, as well as our lower performing students. Therefore, teachers will teach the content and in many cases the process will be individually interpreted by the teachers.

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

X Applicable Not Applicable

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

In both *Everyday Mathematics* and *Impact Mathematics* there has been an outcry from educators of mathematics to align the text curriculum to the NYS Standard 3. While there is not an exact alignment, good attempts have been made by the publishers to show the correlation between content and standards.

The process strands have been somewhat better addressed in *Impact Mathematics*, if and only if the Workshop Model is encouraged by Teachers of Mathematics and followed by students in the exploration portion of the lesson, using appropriate models for the Representation strands. Communication can usually be addressed in the share out or in small group work, where idea exchange is encouraged. However, this does not always transfer to the writing of adequate explanations, a task that students must master for the State exam. The Problem Solving strand is somewhat wanting, because the texts don't always use realistic situations and therefore connections between what we teach in math class don't naturally translate to real life situations.

When *Everyday Mathematics* published their 3rd Edition, they also published and distributed to NYC Schools a pacing guide with each lesson aligned to a process and a content strand, where applicable. It is not always a good marriage between text and standard. The text itself does not address process strands, they are usually teacher directed activities, where the process is embedded through teaching the content, and will vary from classroom to classroom.

Looking at the NYS Standard, The State Exams, and the material covered in either EDM or Impact, there are very noticeable differences between City curriculum and State Testing. The level of instruction from the texts is on a much more difficult level than what is tested by the

State, and has material that students will not be tested on in that grade. The scope and sequence far exceeds what a student should know by the end of a particular grade, so, teachers usually teach to the standards, which could account for the lack of depth in what is being taught in the mathematics classroom.

One of the more obvious disadvantages, and possibly the reason for the “gaps”, is the transition from EDM to Impact. Teachers feel there is no connection between the current grade, and the previous grade’s instruction. This is especially true moving from Impact Course 1 to Course 2, to Course 3. Teachers describe the Course 3 text as anything but user friendly.

We assume that most schools supplement instruction from other books, such as test preparation materials, former NYS exams, and books that use a direct instructional approach, as opposed to investigative approach found in Impact, and to some extent in EDM. Teachers must use supplemental materials to address the needs of their special education population, as well as the ELLs.

Through questioning and discussions held at grade conferences, most of our middle school teachers find that teaching the content, away from the text, and then plugging in applicable material from Impact works better than using the text to initiate instruction. The other concern is that there is not enough practice provided in either Impact or EDM and options for reteaching are inadequate. Again, neither series seems to address the needs of our ELL students nor our Special Education population sufficiently.

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.

We have already been looking at other texts that are more suited for our student population, that will address the process and content strands incorporated in NYS Standard 3, and provide teachers with more direction to go deeper into concepts, and yet be able to remain on pace with the NYC calendar. It would be in the best interests of student’s and teachers of mathematics to have central develop a program that addresses all Mathematical Strands and establishes a calendar that allows more in depth study of the subject.

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.

Formal and informal observations by administrators and Coaches show evidence of best practices classroom instructional strategies across all grades and subject areas.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

School based observations, as well as results of our Quality Review, supports our schools use of best practices and differentiated instruction. Coaches support implementation of the workshop model and special attention is being given to the implementation of the California Teaching Standards.

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* (SOM³) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics

³ To examine instruction in the classrooms, the School Observation Measure (SOM) was used to capture classroom observation data for the district audit. The SOM was developed by the Center for Research in Educational Policy at the University of Memphis. The SOM groups 24 research based classroom strategies into six categories: (1)

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.

As determined through random classroom observations and most formal observations, direct instruction in mathematics classes was frequently noted. Differentiated practice of the skill is common during workshop model lessons.

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

X 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?

It has been noted that teachers will deliver a mini-lesson, work through a guided practice with the students, and then have students work in small groups or partners to complete a series of exercises related to the instruction. A share out will follow, where any misconceptions will be addressed. Some exercises will involve small group investigations, others lessons will be lesson-related seat work. If computers are available in the classroom, early finishers can be assigned to work on a task that might or might not be related to the lesson. Technology use can therefore be determined as low, at least until there are enough computers in each classroom for student use. Teachers' use of computers combined with Smart Boards or Mimioboards, is another way of relating information to students using interactive means. Students are also learning how to use Smart Boards to display and share their work.

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.

As more computers become available in the classrooms, through purchase, or through grants, more students will be able use interactive websites based on standards. As Teachers explore various websites, assisted by our Media Specialists, more and more use of technology will occur.

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.

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

School staff data will be analyzed across the last several years to determine retention rate.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

3.3: Based on your response to Question 3.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Based on school staff data (BEDS, School Report Cards) our teachers' turn over rate is low. Data will continue to be analyzed to determine future retention rates.

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.

We will discuss additional professional development opportunities relevant to ELL learners with classroom teachers during grade conferences and with ELL support staff during our monthly meeting.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Teachers are informed about professional development opportunities through our school's "Intercom", where workshop titles and dates are posted. The D.O.E. Teachers' Weekly is forwarded to Teachers e-mails, applicable workshops from the Principal's Weekly are shared with the staff as well as specific invitations to attend various Workshops offered through PROTRAX.

Unfortunately, many workshops are held during class time, and when teachers are pulled from the school, students miss vital instructional time. When workshops are offered on weekends or afterschool, few teachers are able to attend due to travel time constraints or parenting responsibilities.

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.

We are looking for support from NYCDOE to provide opportunities during Chancellor's Professional Development Days. We are planning to continue providing professional development on language acquisition strategies during grade conferences and monthly ELL support staff meetings. Coaches offer additional professional resources and instructional materials in our Lending Library. *Lunch and Learn* meetings are being offered to teachers as alternative to professional development during the school day.

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

We will meet with teachers during weekly grade conferences and monthly meetings of ELL support staff to determine monitoring of ELLs academic progress and English language development, particularly through use of NYSESLAT testing data to determine frequency and duration of instruction for this large group of students.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Although we have made great strides in using data for goal setting and next steps for all our students, we need to continue to develop articulation between ELL academic intervention staff and classroom teachers. Classroom teachers need more training in disaggregating NYSESLAT scores and data implication need to be explained and made available to all teachers to inform instruction.

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.

Suggestion: Presentations at grade conferences or faculty meetings on analyzing LAB/NYSESLAT Test, distribution of NYSESLAT to teachers in September.

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 Cabinet will meet with members of the School Assessment Team, School Based Support Team, Special Education teachers and classroom teachers to determine their belief as to whether staff has sufficient understanding of or capacity to fully implement the range and types of approaches needed to increase access the general education curriculum and improve student performance. Disaggregated data for special education students as a group as well as individual student progress will be examined more closely.

UPDATED – MARCH 26, 2009

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

X Applicable Not Applicable

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

Although we have taken steps to ensure classroom teachers not only have and are familiar with students' I.E.Ps, particularly accommodations and modifications that would help support students with disabilities, teachers, as well as paraprofessionals, need more professional development regarding accommodations and behavioral support plans for these students, as well as goal setting aligned to individual students I.E.P's

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.

Although we have made great strides in using data for goal setting and next steps for all our students, and are focusing on the Collaborative Team Teaching model to create more supportive classrooms for students with disabilities, students in least restrictive environments are often less likely to get regular classroom teacher support, often depending in large part on their paraprofessional for instructional guidance. Not only is greater citywide professional development needed for teachers, but paraprofessionals as well. Much of this work was previously done at the district level and is now the responsibility of the schools. We are striving to fill the need.

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

The Cabinet will meet with the School Assessment Team, special education and classroom teachers to evaluate whether the classroom environment, including classroom instruction, is specified in the I.E.P's of students with disabilities, whether there is an alignment between the goals, objectives, and modified promotional criteria included in the I.E.P and grade level state tests, and whether behavioral plans are included.

UPDATED – MARCH 26, 2009

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?

Classroom teachers need more experience in developing goals based on Individual Student's I.E.P.'s as they relate to student's objectives. Goal setting for these students has just started to become a collaborative process between classroom teachers and A.I.S. providers.

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

The relevant issues will be addressed by close teamwork of teachers, the I.E.P. team and the Math and Literacy coaches. To improve the alignment between the goals, objectives and modified promotional criteria included in the I.E.P. and grade level State Assessments, it is imperative that all those involved, teachers, related service providers, and paraprofessionals, receive in-depth professional development in all areas of instruction, as well as the methods that measure a student's progress.

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 Excellence 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 SED requirements.

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

Submit date: **Jul 10, 2008** Email address: **jmonteb@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	21k225
School Name	The Eileen E. Zaglin Public School
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 363,323
Principal Name	Joseph Montebello
Principal Email	jmonteb@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7187439793

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

- Yes
 No

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

Creation of additional classrooms	
Reducing teacher-student ratio through team teaching strategies	\$ 159,603

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

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

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14
 C4E Target #2: 8 - Math - Students with Disabilities - 18 - 1 - 17

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

For example:

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

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

For example:

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

	Targeted Grade	Targeted Subject	Targeted Population	Students per Teacher 2007-08	# Classrooms / Sections Targeted	Projected Students per Teacher 2008-09
C4E Target #1	4	All (ES only)	English Language Learners	28	1	15
C4E Target #2	3	All (ES only)	English Language Learners	28	1	15
C4E Target #3						
C4E Target #4						
C4E Target #5						
C4E Target #6						

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

- Yes
- No

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

Before- and After-School Programs **\$ 85,579**
 Summer School Programs
 Dedicated Instructional Time
 Individualized Tutoring

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to support new or expanded before- or after-school programs?

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

We plan to use the Schoolwide Enrichment Model to help incorporate the philosophy and pedagogy of enrichment to improve performance in core academic subjects, enhance motivation and enjoyment in learning, and provide challenging instruction for all students. Our students will be trained in research skills, independent learning and thinking skills, communication skills as well as methodology skills.

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

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

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

- New implementation

- Program Expansion

Please indicate how the program/strategy will be expanded for school year 2008-09 (e.g., increase in the number of after-school program hours, increase in the number of students served, etc.)

The beginning implementation of this program took place in 2007-08 school year. During this time, information was disseminated and communicated to the rest of the school. Several selected SEM components were introduced in the middle school grades. Using C4E funds will allow us to move towards a full, phased-in implementation of SEM components throughout the school and expand the program in the elementary grades.

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for new or expanded summer school programs?

- Yes
 No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for new or expanded efforts to increase dedicated instructional time (e.g., instructional blocks for core academic subjects, additional instructional periods for areas of greatest student need, Response to Intervention (RTI) and/or intensive individual intervention, etc.)?

- Yes
 No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for new or expanded efforts to offer individualized tutoring (provided by highly qualified staff as a supplement to general curriculum instruction and targeted to students not meeting State standards)?

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

Programs to recruit/retain Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)

Professional mentoring for beginning teachers and principals

Instructional coaches for teachers **\$ 18,812**

School leadership coaches for principals

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

Please describe the program.

To hire an F status coach to provide support in content areas needed to attain learning standards for low performing students.

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

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

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

- New implementation
- Program Expansion

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to implement a new full-day pre-kindergarten program, or to expand an existing 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 Language Learners (ELLs)?

- Yes
- No

How much do you plan to allocate for this program?

Model Programs for ELLs \$ 99,324

Please describe the program.

Middle School English Language Learner class.

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

- New implementation
- Program Expansion

Please indicate how the program/strategy will be expanded for school year 2008-09.

We currently have a 7th grade ELL newcomers' class. We plan to modify this class for the next school year. Registration will determine grade assignment with consideration given for a multi-grade class. Priority placement in this class will be given to students who are in this country for less than one year.

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence