



P.S. 245

2008-09

**SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

SCHOOL: 22K245

ADDRESS: 249 EAST 17TH STREET, BROOKLYN, NY 11226

TELEPHONE: 718 284-2330

FAX: 718 284-2333

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: PS 245 **SCHOOL NAME:** Public School 245

DISTRICT: 22 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** Empowerment #21

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 249 East 17th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11226

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718 284-2330 **FAX:** 718 284-2333

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Ama Willock **EMAIL ADDRESS:** awilloc@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON Valerie Shoenfeld

PRINCIPAL Patricia A. Kannengieser

UFT CHAPTER LEADER Valerie Shoenfeld

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT** Evelyn Fergus

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools) _____

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT** Marianne Ferrara

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 Salts; 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
Patricia A. Kannengieser	*Principal or Designee	
Valerie Shoenfeld	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee (Teacher)	
Evlyn Fergus	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President (Parent)	
Nilsa Grandel	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
Melissa Stiegelbauer	Teacher	
Ama Willock	Teacher	
Michelle White	Parent	
Elizabeth Colonette	Parent	
Sandra Armstrong	Parent	
Chela Hill	Parent	

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

PS 245 is a small, innovative Pre-K through grade 5 elementary school located in the heart of Flatbush. The school was established 14 years ago by parents who worked diligently with a community-based organization to create a local neighborhood school for their children. Today the school has a total of 188 students in grades Pre-K through 5, and it serves both general education and special needs children. All of the students receive free breakfast and lunch through the Universal Meals Program.

PS 245 families hail primarily from the Caribbean and other Latin countries, and they place a high value on education. Together they work hard alongside the staff to create an exceptional learning environment and to meet the academic and social needs of all of our children. The school's mission is to educate children to become responsible citizens in a diverse world. Toward this end it incorporates character education, and involvement in the arts, into a strong curriculum of reading, math, social studies, and science.

The school's small size dictates a small staff-- 14 teachers, 1 secretary, 2 school aides, a parent coordinator and a principal. Hence, two out-of classroom teachers wear many hats and serve in many capacities. Students and staff are very close and there is a connectedness that is hard to find in any other school. PS 245 operates like a family, with a strong sense of purpose and camaraderie.

The school uses its limited resources wisely, and is creative and 'smart' in scheduling and spending. A common planning block and sustained professional development allow teachers to collaborate and share information on and across grades. Two out-of classroom teachers provide AIS to children on Grades K-5, identified as high risk. A SAPIS Counselor, Mr. Regnier, provides counseling and intervention services to children on all grades, while the Parent Coordinator maintains open lines of communication between home and school.

An active Parent Association provides significant support for day-to-day operations in the school and attracts parent volunteers who assist in the office and lunchroom on a regular basis. Special events—movies, dances, etc. offer parents, staff and children opportunities to come together in a social context. Additionally, PA fundraising efforts have helped with so many of the "little extras" that make school fun—pizza parties, prom night, bus trips.

The school has affiliations with a number of outside organizations, which sustain and support its performance and growth. A *Principal for a Day* (PENCIL) relationship with John Reinhardt of Fillmore Realty provides financial as well as community support. A variety of arts organizations—*Lincoln Center* 'Opera is Elementary', *Revels-Bey Music Company*, and *Midori and Friends*, provide extensive opportunities for children in all grades to participate in art, dance, music and theater presentations. *Prospect Park* and *The Environmental Center* (District 22) allow children in grades 3, 4, and 5 to visit nature preserves and obtain first hand knowledge of science topics covered in class. *Farms for City Kids* in Vermont provides children in 4th/5th grade with a unique opportunity to experience 'life on a farm'. The *Dental Clinic at P.S. 269* offers free dental services (with parent permission) to all children.

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 1b - November 2008)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT										
School Name:	P.S. 245									
District:	22	DBN:	22K245	School BEDS Code:	332200010245					
DEMOGRAPHICS										
Grades Served:	Pre-K	√	3	√	7		11			
	K	√	4	√	8		12			
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded	√		
	2	√	6		10					
Enrollment					Attendance - % of days students attended:					
(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of June 30)	2005-06	2006-07*	2007-08*			
Pre-K	19	18	17		94.3	92.8	93.7			
Kindergarten	21	32	38							
Grade 1	22	20	34	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:						
Grade 2	27	22	19	(As of June 30)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08			
Grade 3	25	22	21		97.1	91.9	94.3			
Grade 4	23	26	25							
Grade 5	22	26	26	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:						
Grade 6	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08			
Grade 7	0	0	0		55.3	55.3	55.3			
Grade 8	0	0	0							
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:						
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08			
Grade 11	0	0	0		3	2	0			
Grade 12	0	0	0							
Ungraded	0	0	3	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:						
Total	159	166	183	(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08			
					1	1	0			
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:						
(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of June 30)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08			
# in Self-Contained Classes	0	10	10	Principal Suspensions	2	5	0			
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	2	2	0	Superintendent Suspensions	0	4	0			
Number all others	2	1	4							
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				Special High School Programs - Total Number:						
				(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08			
				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0			
				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:						
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08			
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0							
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0							
# receiving ESL services only	5	11	18	Number of Teachers	11	10	14			

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 1b - November 2008)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	1	2	0	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	2	2	5
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	3	N/A	1
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
(As of October 31)	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	63.6	80.0	64.3
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	54.5	70.0	64.3
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher	91.0	80.0	86.0
(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	88.9	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Black or African American	93.7	89.2	81.4				
Hispanic or Latino	5.0	7.2	14.8				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.6	1.2	1.6				
White	0.6	2.4	2.2				
Male	42.1	48.2	45.4				
Female	57.9	51.8	54.6				
2008-09 TITLE I STATUS							
	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
√	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)	No	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:					
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08) Based on 2006-07 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 1b - November 2008)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:	IGS			ELA:			
Math:	IGS			Math:			
Science:	Pending			Graduation Rate:			

This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
Student Groups		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							
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities		-	-	-			
Limited English Proficient		-	-				
Economically Disadvantaged		√	√	-			
Student groups making AYP in each subject		3	3				

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
Progress Report Results – 2007-08				Quality Review Results – 2007-08			
Overall Letter Grade:	B			Overall Evaluation:	√		
Overall Score:	59.1			Quality Statement Scores:			
Category Scores:				Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	√		
School Environment:	9.7			Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	√		
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	√		
School Performance:	14.2			Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W		
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	√		
Student Progress:	35.2						
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	0						

KEY: AYP STATUS				KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE			
√ = Made AYP				Δ = Underdeveloped			
√ ^{SH} = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target				▶ = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features			
X = Did Not Make AYP				√ = Proficient			
– = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status				W = Well Developed			
				◇ = Outstanding			

* = For 2006-07 & 2007-08, the PAR Attendance Rate is listed for District 75 schools; and the Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) is listed for all other schools. If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.

Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools; NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.

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:				
District:		DBN #:		School BEDS Code #:

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec.		
Enrollment:				Attendance:					
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)	2006	2007	2008		
Pre-K									
Kindergarten									
Grade 1				Student Mobility:					
Grade 2				(% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3									
Grade 4									
Grade 5				Eligible for Free Lunch:					
Grade 6				(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7									
Grade 8									
Grade 9				Students in Temporary Housing:					
Grade 10				(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11									
Grade 12									
Ungraded Elementary				Recent Immigrants:					
Ungraded Secondary				(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total									
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									
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes				Principal Suspensions					
Number all others				Superintendent Suspensions					
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS									
				Special High School Programs:					
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008		
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants					
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes				Early College HS Participants					
# in Dual Lang. Programs									
# receiving ESL services only				Number of Staff:					
# ELLs with IEPs				(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					
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals					
Overage Students:									
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals					
				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					
American Indian or Alaska Native				Percent more than two years teaching in this school					
Black or African American				Percent more than five years teaching anywhere					
Hispanic or Latino				Percent Masters Degree or higher					
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.				Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)					
White									
Multi-racial									
Male									
Female									

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

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students						
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Black or African American						
Hispanic or Latino						
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander						
White						
Multiracial						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities						
Limited English Proficient						
Economically Disadvantaged						
Student groups making AYP in each subject						

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		

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

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Performance Trends 2007-2008 Progress Report

Student Performance in English Language Arts shows:

Percentage of Students at Proficiency (Level 3 or 4): 60.9% of our students performed at proficiency levels of 3 or 4, which is 51% of the way from the lowest (38.8%) to the highest (82.1%) score relative to our Peer Horizon, and 51.2% of the way relative to the City Horizon.

Median Student Proficiency (1.00 – 4.50): 3.11 is our median student proficiency for this assessment, which is 53.7% of the way from the lowest (2.82) to the highest (3.36) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 51.5% of the way relative to the City Horizon.

The overall score for student progress was 14.2 out of 25. In 2006-2007 the overall score was 16.5 out of 30. This represents only a negligible increase. And the change from 63% of students performing at proficiency levels of 3 or 4 to 60.9 % of students performing at these levels in 2007-2008 represents a decrease of more than 2%.

At the same time **Student Progress for English Language Arts** indicates the following:

Percentage of Students Making 1 Year of Progress: 51.3% of our students made at least 1 year of progress, which is 34.1% of the way from the lowest (39.7%) to the highest (73.7%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 23.5% of the way relative to the City Horizon.

Percentage of Students in School's Lowest 1/3 Students Making at Least 1 Year of Progress: 82.4% of these students made at least 1 year of progress, which is 64.1% of the way from the lowest (55.6%) to the highest (97.4%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 63.5% of the way relative to the City Horizon.

Average Change in Student Proficiency for Level 1 and Level 2 Students: 0.27 is our average change in student proficiency for Level 1 and Level 2 Students, which is 35.3% of the way from the lowest (0.15) to the highest (0.49) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 32.4% of the way relative to the City Horizon.

Average Change in Student Proficiency for Level 3 and Level 4 Students: (-0.09) is our average change in student proficiency for Level 3 and Level 4 Students, which is 46.7% of the way from the lowest (-0.23) to the highest (0.07) score, relative to our Peer Horizon and 43.3% of the way relative to the City Horizon.

The school did not receive any additional credit for closing the achievement gap for Special Ed or ELL students because the cohort for these children is too small (under 15).

The overall score for student progress was 35.2 out of 60. In 2006-2007 the overall score was 12.3 out of 55. This represents a significant increase. But while the change from 38.2% of students making progress in 2006-2007 to 51.3% of our students making progress in 2007-2008 is to be applauded, the school is committed to continued growth in this area. Ultimately, and ideally, all students should make 1 year of progress.

The New York State Report Card indicates the school has met and exceeded it's **AYP** in all subject areas for all subgroups, and the school is a **School In Good Standing** on this report.

With only one class on grades 3, 4, and 5, it was a rather simple matter to see where the greatest lack of progress and performance occurred, as well as where the greatest increase in progress and performance was evident.

5th grade students (85%) outperformed both 3rd grade students (45%) and 4th grade students (50%) students in English Language Arts; 5th grade students (60%) made greater progress than 4th grade students (45.8%) in English Language Arts. Additionally, 3rd Grade showed a significant decrease (45%) in students performing at proficiency levels of 3 or 4 as compared to 3rd graders from the year before (2006-2007).

The Inquiry Team's careful analysis of some of the ELA practice tests and Interim Assessments the children were taking showed some of the issues to be centered around vocabulary sophistication, use and understanding of idiomatic expressions, and acquisition of higher order thinking skills to support deeper and more insightful comprehension and analysis of text. The school is working continuously on improving instruction in these areas.

The increase in progress in English Language Arts was attributed to the school's increased focus on literacy in the school's action plan for 2007-2008. The addition of a Literacy Coach to the staff and the hiring of an outside AUSSIE literacy consultant were an important part of that plan. Additionally, bi-weekly grade level planning sessions built into the school day permitted classroom teachers to meet and plan together, and to look at school data and discuss its implications for literacy instruction. Finally, the schedule for the day was changed to include a zero block from 9:15 a.m. to 9:55 a.m., when Guided Reading would take place for the whole school. During this time all available personnel pushed into all classrooms to support reading instruction.

The decrease in performance was attributed, to a large extent to the inexperience of the new (to the school and DOE) 3rd grade teacher, who then resigned from the staff in the middle of the year to follow a different career path. The staff also identified a significant number of 'at risk' children in the class who have since been receiving academic intervention services or who have been referred for special education services.

Greatest Accomplishments

As indicated in the 2007-2008 Quality Review, PS 245 has made some progress in addressing the issues identified for improvement in the Quality Review. This year's review states that the school demonstrates good teamwork and collaboration in setting goals for student achievement and planning a curriculum. A wide range of professional development opportunities is available to support the staff and to enable them to improve their instruction. There is also a strong environment of trust and respect, which supports students' personal and academic success.

Some of our greatest accomplishments over the last two years include, but are not limited to:

1. The scheduling of bi-weekly grade level planning sessions for teachers on and across grade levels. During this time teachers have the opportunity to collaborate and plan for instruction.
2. Running records in reading conducted 3-4 times a year to track reading progress toward Rigby benchmark goals. Analysis of these assessment to determine next of steps for children Above-At-Below benchmarks.
3. The establishment of a common instructional block for Guided Reading each day, when all staff push-in to classrooms to provide direct instruction to four groups each day.
4. Goal setting, for grades, classes and individual students, in the subject areas of Reading, Writing, and Mathematics. These goals are articulated to children, as well as shared with parents via the school's progress reports (sent home 3xs a year), report cards, and Parent/Teacher conferences.
5. Continued efforts to differentiate instruction during Reading, Writing, and Mathematics teaching through the use of centers, projects, and other group activities. The instruction is driven by the available data on each child in these subject areas. This data is provided through running records, interim assessments, school practice tests, baseline writing assignments, as well as through analysis of Everyday Math Unit tests.
6. The AIS program where initial formative assessments in ELA/Math identify students in grades K-5 who are 'at risk' and in need of academic intervention. Two out-of classroom teachers provide services to these children, using a variety of programs, including, this year, the research-based RTI Foundations' program in grades K-2.
7. The establishment and refinement of a curriculum map to align and integrate curriculum across grades and subjects. The initial focus was on Reading; the focus for 2008-2009 includes Writing.
8. The acquisition of a SAPIS counselor, Mr. Regnier, who is able to provide counseling as well involve children in constructive activities aimed at building self-esteem and confidence.
9. The affiliation with PENCIL and the establishment of a relationship with John Reinhardt, our Principal for a Day. Mr. Reinhardt provides the school with financial assistance, leadership expertise, and this year, greater support for parent involvement

The school received a 'D' in its 2006-2007 Progress Report and was determined to change that letter grade. Consequently, the school received a high 'B' in the 2007-2008 Progress Report. This two-letter-grade increase was the result of the school implementing the changes outlined above and working collaboratively as a learning community—students, staff, parents, and administration, to ensure that a greater number of students were having a greater number of their needs met.

Aids to Continuous Improvement

A significant aid to our continuous school improvement is the caring and nurturing atmosphere that exists throughout the school building. Teachers and staff work side by side to help create a safe and inviting learning environment, where children feel supported. The small size affords the principal and staff an opportunity to know all of the students and their families, and there is a connectedness that is hard to find in other schools.

Professional development provided by an AUSSIE literacy consultant has also played a significant part in the direction the school has taken in addressing the issues presented in the Quality Review and verified in the recent Progress Report. This consultant has worked in classrooms, modeling lessons in reading and writing, and sharing effective reading principles and strategies. She has also conducted extensive planning sessions with classroom/out-of-classroom teachers to support them in developing effective lessons, improving their teaching practices, and enhancing learning outcomes for the children in their class. Through her efforts the school has developed an assessment driven, school-wide literacy program, and is in the process of completing a new school-based curriculum using state outcomes and syllabus documents.

The ongoing work of the Academic Intervention Team has helped the school's lowest 1/3 of students make significant progress (82.4%) toward achieving their goals. The two out-of-classroom teachers continue to do a superb job of addressing the literacy and math needs of the children identified as high risk. They use a variety of programs, keep extensive documentation on the children, and communicate regularly with classroom teachers to assess progress and make changes in programs (exit opportunities). Twice a year, January and April, they ask teachers to complete a survey on the progress of AIS students in the classroom

Finally, the work of the Inquiry Team in analyzing student work, identifying areas of student weakness, providing/suggesting strategies to address these skill areas, and sharing findings with the larger school community has proven invaluable. The work of the team has created a school-wide initiative where all classroom teachers are taking a closer look at the data that is constantly being generated. They are now using this information to determine interim steps/goals for their students in the academic areas of reading, writing and math. They are also using this information to inform their instruction in an effort to better meet the needs of all students in their classroom.

Barriers to School Improvement

The single greatest barrier to school improvement for our school is funding.

Under a prior administration the school lost Title 1 monies (lunch forms demonstrated a 55% rate of poverty, when a 60% rate was required for funding in Brooklyn). Additionally, the school chose to grandfather in Universal Meals, with the result that it was unable to collect lunch forms for the past 4 years. This resulted in a tremendous loss of monies which could have contributed to additional school personnel, enrichment programs, and parent involvement opportunities.

Though the number of children in our building is very small, the initiatives and directives coming out of the DOE necessitate a larger staff, for accomplishment. Committees overlap of necessity and any initiative—Inquiry Team process, AIS intervention, Special Ed compliance, and Crisis, Child Abuse, Safety Plan development, are being handled by the same few people. There are just not enough hands to go around.

Developing and sustaining professional development opportunities in a variety of academics areas, offering enrichment through art, music, and/or dance, as well as providing after school activities for children whose parents both work take greater funding than ever before. Without Title 1 monies and with the imminent budget reductions that have been rolled out in the last 9 months, the challenges are great for a small under-funded school such as PS 245.

In our efforts to sustain and improve on the educational opportunities we can offer our children we have needed to be extremely creative, and very frugal. We have often found it necessary to call upon the generosity and support of a number of people—PENCIL and our Principal for a Day, *Farms for City Kids*, and City/State Legislators such as Councilman Mathieu Eugene, Congresswoman Yvette Clarke, and Assemblywoman Rhoda Jacobs, as well as a number of DOE agencies.

Another significant barrier to school improvement includes the restrictions imposed on the school as a result of a licensing rather than a leasing arrangement with the landlord, Holy Innocents Church.

1. Evening and weekend activities are curtailed because the church resumes occupancy each evening after 7:00 p.m. and on Saturday and Sunday.
2. Issues related to the envelope of the building—particularly the heating and electrical systems and the roof that leaks incessantly, are serious in nature.
 - In spite of a brand new boiler, because all radiator valves are locked in the “on” position, the heat in the building is never equitably distributed. Temperatures reach 80° on the first floor, while children sit on the 2nd floor in coats.
 - Electrical capacity is insufficient for the school’s activities and the number of classrooms that are in use on a regular basis. Circuit breakers trip regularly and a new scanner, slated for installation this month, was rendered inoperable by this electrical issue.
 - Additionally, and of great concern to everyone is how these building issues impact on the use of ‘Resolution A’ monies. The school has \$650,000 in previously awarded monies that is currently slated for a *state of the art* science lab, a library with new lighting and books, and an upgraded sound system in the auditorium. Additional funding to the tune of \$2 million dollars was earmarked for a working kitchen for the school. Finally, \$100,000 in new technology monies was to help us purchase new technology equipment.

Unfortunately, most of these improvements will not happen if the electrical system in the school is not upgraded, and the roof is not repaired to the satisfaction of the SCA contractors overseeing the intended work.

Like any other NYC school we strive to provide an optimum learning environment for our children. We seek to offer them the very best education and afford them the same opportunities afforded other NYC school children. This building places significant limitations on the school and staff's ability to do that.

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.

PS 245 School Goals 2008-2009

At P.S. 245 we use data to:

- *Inform/ improve classroom instruction*
- *Support differentiated learning*
- *Better meet the needs of all children, low performing as well as high performing*
- *Enable all children to make adequate yearly progress*

Goals:

1. **Set small, attainable and measurable student goals in reading and writing, that are aligned with NYS performance standards in those subjects, and will improve individual student learning outcomes as follows:**
 - A. **20% (15) of students in grades K and 1 (73) exceed reading comprehension and accuracy benchmarks for their respective grades in the Spring 2009 ECLAS assessments.**
 - B. **60% (26) of students in grades 3 and 5 (43) will make 1 year of progress in the Winter 2009 ELA**
2. **Develop curricula approaches in reading and writing for grades K-5 that are aligned to New York State standards, promote student engagement, and include:**
 - A. **Participation of all teachers in bi-weekly curriculum mapping during the 2008-2009 school year.**
 - B. **A curriculum binder in place by June 2009 that includes monthly and weekly plans in reading and writing for grades K-5.**
 - C. **Observable classroom teaching throughout 2008-2009 that is matched to this curriculum for reading and writing.**
3. **Increase the number of teachers in grades K-5 who use data to plan differentiated instruction in reading and math through professional development provided by the AUSSIE literacy consultant, two out-of classroom teachers, and the**

principal, so that:

- A. All (9) K-5 classrooms show evidence of differentiation of instruction in guided reading through management of reading groups and center activities by June 2009.**
 - B. 25% (3) of K-5 classrooms show evidence of differentiation of instruction in mathematics at least 3 days a week, through grouping, centers, and menu activities by June 2009.**
- 4. Improve reading comprehension for all students, but particularly for students in grades 4-5, while at the same time developing the writing skills of these same students so as to:**
- A. Move at least 25% (6) of level 2 students in grades 4 and 5 to level 3 as measured in the 2009 New York State ELA**

	<p>November 08</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals communicated to parents in school-designed progress report sent home on 10/17/08. • Class goals for November established during Election Day PD. • Students' first goals for reading and writing reviewed and revised, and new goals selected where appropriate. • Goals communicated to parents during Parent Teacher Conferences. <p>December - June 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers review student goals with AUSSIE literacy consultant during bi-weekly common planning time to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check for alignment with teacher instruction and the use of child friendly language. 2. Tracked student growth and performance against these goals using available assessment data—running records, conference notes, ECLAS, and Acuity (Predictive and ITA). 3. Revised goals to reflect next steps needed for improved student learning. 4. Communicate goals regularly to parents (Progress reports and Parent/ Teacher conferences) • Children are able to articulate their goals in reading. • Goals are recorded on reading folders and/or notebooks and are communicated to parents via school-designed progress reports in October, January and May.
--	---

<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>Target Population: K-5 Responsible Staff: classroom teachers, cabinet and principal and AUSSIE literacy consultant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUSSIE literacy consultant conducts Next Steps meetings with teachers to decide on goals for students in reading and writing based on Rigby benchmark reading levels. TL Fair Student Funding • Revised prep schedule allows bi-weekly common planning time for each grade; F-Status teacher provides additional coverage once a week. TL Fair Student Funding • Election Day PD agenda includes time for review of students goals • Bi-weekly planning during extended days on Tuesdays and Thursdays supports goal-setting. • Purchase of labels and folders facilitates dissemination of goals to students. • Purchase of The Continuum of Literacy Learning by Fountas & Pinnell assists teachers in choosing reading goals. • Inclusion of reading and writing goals in school-designed progress report informs parents of small goals children must meet in order to achieve success.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Interval of Measure: November, January, May</p> <p>Instrument of Measure: Running records that are tracked to Rigby benchmarks in reading and baseline/ midline/end-line writing assessments marked against grade specific rubrics.</p> <p>Projected Gains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60% of students are reading and writing at or above benchmark levels for the grade in November; • 75% of students are reading and writing at or above benchmark levels for the grade in January; • 80% of students are reading and writing at or above benchmark levels for the grade in May.

	<p>November 08</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> September, October, and November curriculum maps completed and reviewed during Election Day PD Curriculum writing process begun in Science and Art. <p>December – June 2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor to ensure that performance indicators are addressed in reading and writing, using checklist. Collect exemplary pieces of writing for each genre. Analyze student portfolio and work samples. Continue to revise, edit and update reading and writing curriculum maps for December – June. Continue the curriculum writing process in Science and Art.
<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>Target Population: K-5 Responsible Staff: classroom teachers, cabinet, principal and AUSSIE literacy consultant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AUSSIE literacy consultant continues professional development in curriculum mapping, provides templates, and shares NYS performance indicators checklist. Facilitates process during bi-weekly common planning time with teachers on grades K-5. TL Fair Student Funding, TL FSF General Hold Harmless, TL Children First Funding Revised prep schedule allows bi-weekly planning time for curriculum writing on each grade; F status teacher provides additional coverage once a week. TL Fair Student Funding Election Day PD by out-of-classroom teachers includes time for curriculum writing. Contract for Excellence Purchase of binders provides storage for curriculum maps in reading and writing. TL Fair Student Funding
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Interval of Review: Monthly</p> <p>Instrument of Measure: Review of curriculum maps by Cabinet and AUSSIE literacy consultant <u>using NYS ELA standards performance indicators checklist.</u> Formal and informal observations by the principal and visits to</p>

classrooms by AUSSIE literacy consultant.

Projected Gains:

- Curriculum binders (K-2 and 3-5) show 10% increase toward completion. Revisions continue to be made to monthly plans, and weekly plans are added.
- PS 245 Curriculum binder contains curricula, aligned to NYS standards in reading and writing, from September through June.
- Observable classroom instruction on grades K-5 is matched to school curriculum in reading and writing and demonstrates increased student engagement as defined by the Santa Cruz Professional Teaching Standards.
- Student work on display in the classroom and hallways reflects teachers' use of the school curriculum.

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 NCLB/SED improvement (SURR, SINI, and SRAP) must identify a goal and complete an action plan for each subject/area of identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): READING AND MATHEMATICS

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase the number of teachers in grades K-5 who use data to plan differentiated instruction in reading and math, to meet students’ needs.</p> <p>C. All (9) K-5 classrooms show evidence of differentiation of instruction in guided reading through management of reading groups and center activities by June 2009.</p> <p>D. 25% (3) of K-5 classrooms show evidence of differentiation of instruction in mathematics, at least 3 days a week, through grouping, centers, and menu activities by June 2009.</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>January-June 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop curriculum maps for ELA and have conversation around differentiation. • PD on Math differentiation by provided by AUSSIE math consultant <p>Summer 2008</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers attended full-day Foundations workshops to support program rollout in September. <p>September-October</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administered baseline writing and math assessments on each grade. • Revised guided reading schedule, assigning two teachers to every classroom. . • AUSSIE literacy consultant and early childhood out-of-classroom teacher provided PD around differentiated, engaging, rigorous center activities for literacy during bi-weekly common planning time.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduced new word works program—Foundations, in grades K-2 to provide Tier 1 and Tier 2 intervention based on children’s demonstrated ECLAS needs from Spring 2008 assessment. <p>November 08</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy and math centers that support differentiated instruction developed during Election Day PD. • Response to Intervention (RTI) grant allowed teachers to begin addressing the needs of lowest performing students (based on spring 2008 ECLAS assessment) using <i>Foundations</i> program. • <u>Network</u> AUSSIE consultant provides monthly all-day professional development for principal and AIS out-of classroom teacher. <p>December- June 2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom/Out-of-Classroom teachers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze end of unit tests in Everyday Math to group for individualized instruction using math centers and guided math groups. 2. Provide Double Dose <i>Foundations</i> intervention at least three times a week to children in grades K-2. 3. Use Acuity Predictive and ITA assessment reports to obtain valuable information that supports differentiation and grouping.
<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>Target Population: K-5 Responsible Staff: classroom teachers, cabinet, principal, and AUSSIE literacy consultant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Network</u> AUSSIE consultant provides professional development for principal and AIS out-of-classroom teacher. School’s AUSSIE literacy consultant supplements this professional development and provides additional training for teachers. TL Fair Student Funding, TL FSF General Hold Harmless, TL Children First Funding • Revised prep schedule allows bi-weekly planning time for curriculum writing on each grade; F status teacher provides additional coverage once a week. TL Fair Student Funding • Response to Intervention grant provides professional development through a consultant who visits the school on a monthly basis • Election Day PD provided by out-of-classroom teachers includes time for creation of differentiated center activities in literacy. Contracts for Excellence

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bi-weekly planning during extended days on Tuesdays and Thursdays provides an opportunity for teachers to learn more about the strategies that support differentiated instruction. • Purchase of Foundations' books and materials supports the introduction and maintenance of the Foundations' intervention program in grades K-2. • Purchase of Fountas and Pinnell word works materials to support the creation of center activities in literacy.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Interval of Review: Monthly</p> <p>Instruments of Measure: Formal and informal observations by principal, and visits to classrooms by AUSSIE literacy consultant.</p> <p>Projected gains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All</u> teachers differentiate literacy instruction during guided reading, through grouping and literacy centers so as to better meet the individual learning needs of all students. • An <u>increasing number</u> (3) of teachers differentiate math instruction, again through grouping, menu activities and math centers, so as to better meet the needs of all students.

	October 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reading. • Baseline writing assessment administered in grades K-5. Baseline assessment is analyzed using the rubric to establish student writing goals and next steps for teaching. • In response to 2007-2008 Progress Report results and the examination of the 2008 ELA results the Inquiry Team expanded the ELA focus to include writing. Included in this was an emphasis on vocabulary enrichment, sentence expansion, and effective use of graphic organizers. The initial rollout included grades 4 and 5. Resources were provided to teachers in grades 3,4 and 5 to allow for differentiation of homework based on the student's instructional reading level.
	November 08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction on the use of sentence expansion strategies was provided to teachers in grades 3, 4, and 5 during Professional Development on Election Day. Teachers were also an opportunity to create literacy centers using Fountas and Pinnell word work resources to enhance guided reading instruction. • Initial introduction of sequenced steps in vocabulary enrichment provided to grade 4 & 5 teachers and out-of-classroom teachers. • Three ELA practice tests administered in grades 3, 4, and 5. Results compared and scrutinized for progress in reading comprehension and writing development.
	November-January 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA enrichment classes held after school to develop reading and writing strategies and build reading stamina.
	January – June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administer midline and end-line reading and writing

	<p>assessments and analyze the results to track progress of students against benchmarks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Continue Next Steps meetings with Aussie literacy consultant following benchmark assessments with the goal of deepening ownership and understanding of each child's individual learning needs and the strategies needed to meet those needs. 3. Analyze end of the month reading and writing samples to determine revisions and changes to curriculum maps in these areas. 4. Use bi-weekly common planning sessions to revise curriculum maps and align with state reading and writing performance standards. Adherence to this curriculum map translates into a consistent and rigorous K-5 reading and writing curriculum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry Team's focus will be introduced in stages over the course of the school year to all grades.
<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>Target Population: Grades 4 and 5 Responsible Staff: Inquiry Team, Grades 4 and 5 teachers and AUSSIE literacy consultant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUSSIE literacy consultant supports Reciprocal Teaching in the classroom and Here Hidden Hid questioning techniques to strengthen children's higher order thinking skills with the goal of improving their comprehension of familiar and unfamiliar texts. TL Fair Student Funding, TL FSF General Hold Harmless, TL Children First Funding • AUSSIE literacy consultant introduces sentence expansion strategies to improve writing mechanics in grades 4 and 5 with additional support from AIS out-of-classroom teacher. • Classroom teachers on grades 4 and 5 use the Scantron Ed Performance Series used to assess and support reading comprehension language arts. • Inquiry Team efforts shift to focus on vocabulary acquisition and writing (with emphasis on mechanics). TL Children First Inquiry Teams • Purchase of Bringing Words to Life by Isabel Beck provides 4th and 5th grade teachers with ideas and strategies to increase and expand students' vocabulary. TL Fair Student Funding

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains

Interval of Review:

Periodic Assessment Intervals—approximately every 2-3 months.
November, Jan, May

Instruments of Measure:

Acuity ELA assessments
Running Records analyses

Projected Gains:

- 70% of 4th and 5th graders show progress on Acuity Diagnostic in November as compared to Acuity Predictive in October.
- 85% of 4th and 5th graders score at Tier 3 or higher on the April Acuity Diagnostic Assessment.

- 75% of 4th and 5th grade students will be at or above benchmark reading levels as measured by the DRA reading assessment in January.
- 85% of 4th and 5th grade students will be at or above benchmark reading levels as measured by the DRA reading assessment in May/June.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN
REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K	8	8	N/A	N/A				
1	12	12	N/A	N/A				
2	5	5	N/A	N/A			2	2
3	4	2	N/A	N/A			2	3
4	8	4	5	5			1	3
5	7	4	5	5				2
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Appendix 1 – Part B: AIS PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

<p><i>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</i></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, peer tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p><u>ELA:</u></p> <p>ELA Extended Day</p> <p>Literacy Push-In</p> <p>Wilson</p> <p>New Heights</p> <p>McCall Crabs</p> <p>Lexia Phonics</p> <p>Soar To Success</p> <p>Rewards</p>	<p>This program meets for seven weeks prior to the NYS assessment given in grades 3, 4, and 5. Students in grades 3, 4, and 5 receive instruction in reading, listening, and the writing process. This program takes place 2 days a week (Monday 3:00-5:00, Wednesday, 3:00-5:00) for two hours each day.</p> <p>Out of classroom personnel push-in during the literacy block to provide small group instruction for ‘at-risk’ or enrichment students.</p> <p>During the school day, identified students will receive small group instruction in decoding and spelling skills as prescribed by this program.</p> <p>During the school day and after school, identified students will receive small group instruction in fluency and comprehension.</p> <p>During after school, on a 1-1 basis or in small groups, this instructional tool will be used to address recall of information.</p> <p>During the school day, students work independently on this computerized phonics program to strengthen their phonemic awareness and their use of phonics to decode.</p> <p>During the school day in a small group setting, comprehension and strategy-use will be emphasized using this literacy program.</p> <p>During the school day with small groups, REWARDS Intermediate, a specialized program, will be used with intermediate students (grades 4, 5 and 6) to develop a flexible strategy for decoding long words as well as to increase their oral and silent reading fluency.</p>

Headsprout	This independent phonics/comprehension program, which is accessed via the internet, is utilized during the school day and at home.
<u>Mathematics:</u>	
Math Push-In	AIS teachers push into identified classrooms at least 2 times a week to provide small group instruction using the balanced math workshop model (Everyday Math). Articulation between AIS teachers and classroom teachers is held bi-weekly to improve effectiveness of instruction. This model provides staff development in the area of mathematics.
Math Extended Day	This program meets for seven weeks prior to the NYS assessments given in Mathematics in grades 3, 4, and 5. Students in grades 3, 4, and 5 receive additional instruction in problem solving, and math concepts. This program takes place 2 days a week (Monday 3:00-5:00, Wednesday, 3:00-5:00) for 2 hours each day.
Science:	This program was implemented to improve the analytical skills of our 4 th grade students in the area of Science. Students in grade 4 receive additional instruction in Science for seven weeks prior to the NYS assessments given in this subject. This program takes place 2 days a week (Monday 3:00-5:00, Wednesday, 3:00-5:00) for 2 hours each day.
Social Studies:	This program was implemented to improve the analytical skills of our 5 th grade students in the area of Social Studies. Students in grade 5 received additional instruction in Social Studies—analyzing historic documents and understanding sophisticated concepts, for seven weeks prior to the NYS assessments given in this subject. This program takes place 2 days a week (Monday 3:00-5:00, Wednesday, 3:00-5:00) for 2 hours each day.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	The SAPIS worker will provide peer leadership, one-on-one counseling, and peer mediation intervention during the school day.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	NONE at this time.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	Mr. Kenneth Bedell provides student support services as needed on Fridays.
At-risk Health–related Services:	The SAPIS worker provides substance abuse intervention during the school day if needed. Ms. Alexis Connell-Cox, our Public Health Advisor, is here daily, and conducts asthma workshops, as well as disseminates other health related information.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) – Language Allocation Policy Narrative 2008-2009

Team Members

Principal:	Patricia Kannengieser	EGCSR Teacher:	Ama Willock
ESL Teachers:	Susan Slome, Harriet Lubowitz	Special Education:	Ama Willock
Parent Coordinator:	Nirva Moise	Spanish Para:	A. Fernandez

Public School 245 is a small, innovative, and creative Pre-K through grade 5 elementary school established approximately 14 years ago. We are located in Flatbush, Brooklyn. Our student population is approximately 188 students. We have one class per grade with the exception of kindergarten, 1st grade, and 2nd grade, where there are 2 classes. The ethnic composition of the school is 84.5% Black; 1.93% White; 10.96% Hispanic; 2.58% Asian and others, with 48% male and 52% female students. There are 26 identified English Language Learners for the 2008-2009 school year. We have 11 ELLs in kindergarten (8 speak Spanish, 1 speaks Afrikaans, 2 speak Haitian Creole), 5 ELLs in 1st grade (3 speak Spanish, 1 speaks Haitian Creole), 4 ELLs in 2nd grade (1 speaks Haitian Creole, 2 speak Spanish, 1 speaks Afrikaans), 5 ELLs in 3rd grade (Home Language- 1 Haitian Creole, 2 Spanish, 1 Tagalog, and 1 Fulani) and 1 ELL in 4th grade (Home Language -Fulani). Total LEP population represents 13.8% of students in P.S. 245. Mainstream classes are heterogeneously grouped and ESL instruction is delivered through a combination pull-out, push-in model. Freestanding ESL students are taught English with native language support, where necessary.

Pullout ELL students spend the majority of their day in an English-speaking classroom supplemented by English-focused instruction in a small group. The ESL teachers plan with the mainstream teachers to ensure content alignment. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, the trend in program choices for P.S. 245 has been *English as a Second Language*. This year 10 out of 10 parents selected ESL after viewing the video during the orientation workshop. Based on this survey, we have a pullout ESL program to serve the needs of the ELL children. Our ESL pullout program is aligned with the parents' requests.

P.S. 245 will use data to design instruction for ELLs so that they will achieve proficiency in listening, reading, speaking, and writing in English as well as achieve proficiency in content areas. All instruction is aligned with ESL NYS standards.

ELL Data Results

Fall '08 LABR: 3 kindergarten students are at the beginner level, and 8 are at the intermediate level.

Spring '08 NYSESLAT: **Grade 1** – 1 Beginning, 3 Advanced, **Grade 2** – 1 Beginning, 3 Advanced, **Grade 3** – 1 Beginning, 1 Intermediate, 3 Advanced, **Grade 4** – 1 Intermediate.

October 2008 ECLAS: **Grade 1** – 1 Level II, 3 Level III, 1 Level V, **Grade 2** – 1 Level III, 1 Level V, 1 Level VI, **Grade 3** – 4 Level VI, **Special Education Grade 2** – Level II, **Grade 3** – Level III.

This data is analyzed by the mainstream teacher in conjunction with the ESL teacher to design instruction for the ELL students.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

P.S. 245 Staff (2008-2009): The school has one Tax-Levy funded certified ESL teacher and one F-Status certified ESL teacher to service the school's ELL students through a pull-out ESL program. It also has a Spanish-speaking paraprofessional for Grade 2 special needs ELL students. The ESL teachers provide small group instruction to promote listening, speaking, reading and writing skills through ESL methodologies and strategies. Prior to September 2007 the Intervention Team and the Early Grade Class Size Reduction Teacher identified the academic, social, and cognitive issues that all ELL students were experiencing and brainstormed ways to address these needs. They also incorporated the ELLs into their groups as of September 2007. During the extended day, the ELLs were tutored in language arts activities based on their weaknesses and needs. We will continue to provide these services for all ELL students. *Foundations* and *Headspout* are two programs that are used in the extended day to focus on phonics, and letter/word recognition. The LEA (Language Experience Approach) uses oral language to develop comprehension.

Three ELL students have been identified as having special needs. 1 is currently in Kindergarten, 1 in the Grade 2 (12:1:1) special education class, and 1 in the Grade 3 (12:1:1) special education class. These students receive the mandated ELL instruction, but there is also a bilingual Spanish-speaking paraprofessional in the classroom. For at-risk ELL students, high quality instruction includes authentic purposes for listening, speaking, reading, and writing across the curriculum, as well as a variety of reading and writing experiences to reinforce essential English and literary skills. Students reaching proficiency are serviced by the AIS team and are included in the extended day program.

As mandated, all beginning and intermediate ELLs receive 360 minutes per week of ESL instruction by a certified ESL teacher in a pull-out program. All advance ELLs receive 180 minutes per week of ESL instruction by a certified ESL teacher in a pull-out program and an addition 180 minutes per week of ELA via the AIS Team. The ESL instruction is delivered through small group instruction with a focus on English language objectives and concentration on reading and writing strategies.

Instructional Materials:

Instructional materials that support the learning of ELLs are those materials that are rich in visuals, include content from a multicultural world, and focus on English language development. Language acquisition instruction is linked to content instruction in Social Studies, Science, and Math and includes the use of illustrated word walls. The Science and Art teacher use illustrated word walls to emphasize content vocabulary. Teachers will use the *Illustrated Science and Technology Dictionary* and the *Illustrated Math Dictionary* to emphasize content vocabulary. Native speakers literate in their home language will use bilingual dictionaries.

Technology: The BBC English website School House Rock videos illustrate grammar and usage in an engaging manner. *One More Story* is a children's literature website with audio and book illustrations that ELLs find very exciting and useful.

Staff have identified a category of students we call ESL2 children. These are students who are usually first generation Americans and speak fluent English but hear a second language at home. Programs have been developed to improve their understanding of idiomatic phrases and other English expressions, which may not come naturally to them. This is also developed through content area instruction and via articulation with mainstream teachers.

All personnel in the school receive professional development during grade and faculty conferences. These workshops offer strategies and techniques teachers may use to help meet the needs of ELL students in their classroom. The ESL teachers meet each month with classroom

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

teachers to plan collaboratively to provide additional assistance. Topics include: *Using Data for Planning and Instruction*, and *Connecting ELL Data to Achievement*. In addition, future workshops will provide specific reading comprehension strategies and scaffolding techniques that promote content knowledge and academic language acquisition in Science and Social Studies. Two teachers are registered to attend citywide ELL PD in January that is provided by the Department of Education.

Seven students scored at the advanced level on the Spring 2008 NYSESLAT. These students will receive additional instruction in writing and comprehension skills to enable them to score at the proficient level in Spring 2009. Using the results of Interim Assessments and the Spring 2008 NYSESLAT scores ELL students' skills will be evaluated and analyzed and to provide specific instruction designed to address their deficiencies/needs.

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

Type of Program: ___ Bilingual ESL ___ Both **Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2008-09:** 26
(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).

A. Curricular:

P.S. 245 currently has an ESL pull-out program that serves 26 students in grades K, 1, 2, and 5. The students receive instruction in English. The pull-out program has proven to be successful for our population because students are grouped according to ability and are given intense instruction that meets their needs by a state licensed ESL teacher. Content instruction is focused through articulation with mainstream teachers. English, speaking, reading, and writing skills are developed by utilizing the Social Studies, Science, Math, and Literacy standards.

Students in the ESL program receive small group instruction in English that stimulates their oral and written development. Students are consistently engaged in lessons where they have the opportunity to practice listening, speaking, reading, and writing—the four crucial skills needed for language acquisition. TPR and modeling are a few of the strategies that are used. Language instruction is linked to content instruction in Social Studies, Science, Math, and Literacy through articulation with mainstream teachers.

B. Extracurricular:

Students are invited to participate in all the programs offered at the school. These include morning tutorials, after school enrichment, as well as the homework/recreation after-school program.

- II. Parent/community:

Research has indicated that parent and community involvement is an important component in a child's academic success. Our parents participate in Family Literacy and Math workshops, attend trips with the classes, are involved in extracurricular programs, and volunteer to assist with special events. Most of them have a vested interest in the total school population. The Parent Coordinator and a Supervising School Aide, who speak French-Creole and Spanish respectively, have assisted in keeping the lines of

communication open between the home and school. The Parent Coordinator was instrumental in getting many of the parents trained as Learning Leaders; the Supervising School Aide has been responsible for getting parents into the school as volunteers. These volunteers assist individual students, as well as provide much-needed clerical help throughout the school day.

To maintain the partnership between the parents and the school, there will be parent meetings staggered throughout the school year. In September there was an orientation meeting for all parents, including ELL parents, to introduce them to the school, the curriculum, and the various ESL programs available. In November, there was a parent meeting to acquaint all parents, including ELL parents, with the assessments taking place during the school year. In April, there will be a meeting for the parents of ELL students to acquaint them with the NYSESLAT. In May, there will be a parent meeting for all parents, including ELL parents, to acquaint them with promotional policies. The Parent Coordinator has bilingual dictionaries (Spanish/English, Haitian Creole/English) available. All ELL parent workshops promote the development of English language literacy at home. Translators are available as needed.

II. **Project Jump Start:**

Newly enrolled LEP students and their parents are given a school tour and an orientation of the programs in the school. The ELL teacher, the Parent Coordinator, and the Supervising School Aide involve parents who speak a native language other than English. They translate when necessary and help transition the new LEP students and their parents to our school.

III. **Staff Development** (2008-2009 activities—tentative dates and ELL-related topics):

During professional development days there will be ELL workshops to meet the 7.5 hours of ESL training for mainstream teachers and 10.5 hours for special education teachers. In addition, teachers will be encouraged to take part in workshops sponsored by ELL organizations such as QTEL (Quality Teaching for English Language Learners). One topic will be *Developing English Language Skills through Content Instruction*. The ESL teachers will present at grade conferences and faculty meetings to stress language acquisition techniques and strategies.

IV. **Support services provided to LEP students:**

Other supplemental programs for ELLs include Academic Intervention Services. During AIT meetings, ELL data, which outlines the individual progress of ELL students, is discussed and used to determine the next steps for these students.

V. **Name/type of native language assessments administered** (bilingual programs only):

NA

School Building: PS 245 District 22

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

Number of Teachers 2007-2008				Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals***		Total
Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**				
Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
	2					2

* 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.

Number of LEP Students Identified and Served in Each School Building by Type of Program in 2008-2009

School District: 22 Type of Program: ESL Bilingual Both School Building 245

(Complete this form for each school building with LEP students in grades K-6 during 2008-09)

Do not include long-term ELLs

Language	K			Grade 1			Grade 2			Grade 3			Grade 4			Grade 5			Grade 6		
	Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served		Identified	Served	
		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL		Bil	ESL
Arabic (ARB)																					
Bengali (BEN)																					
Bosnian (BOS)																					
Chinese (CMN)																					
French (FRA)																					
H. Creole (HAT)	2		2				1		1	1		1									
Hindi (HIN)																					
Japanese (JPN)																					
Korean (KOR)																					
Polish (POL)																					
Portuguese (POR)																					
Russian (RUS)																					
Spanish (SPA)	8		8	3		3	2		2	2		2									
Vietnamese (VIE)																					
Tagalog										1		1									
Afrikaans	(AFR) ¹		1	2		2			1												
Fulani										1		1	1		1						
SUB TOTALS →	11		11	5		5	4		4	5		5			1			0			

Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Total Number of LEP students in grades K-6 Identified in the Building in 2008-09 (Do not long-term LEPs)
 UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

26

Total Number of LEP students in grades K-6 Served in the Building in 2008-09 (Do not include long-term LEPs)

26

ADDITIONAL LANGUAGES

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

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL

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

School District: 22

School Building: 245

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:30 To: 9:15	Subject (Specify) MORNING MEETING	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) MORNING MEETING	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) ESL
0	From: 9:15 To: 9:55	Subject (Specify) GUIDED READING	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) GUIDED READING	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) ESL
2	From: 9:55 To: 10:40	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) P.E.	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) ESL
3	From: 10:45 To: 11:30	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
4	From: 11:35 To: 12:20	Subject (Specify) L	Subject (Specify) U	Subject (Specify) N	Subject (Specify) C	Subject (Specify) H
5	From: 12:25 To: 1:10	Subject (Specify) Fundations/ Phonics	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Fundations/ Phonics	Subject (Specify) Fundations/ Phonics	Subject (Specify) Fundations/ Phonics
6	From: 1:15 To: 2:00	Subject (Specify) Writing	Subject (Specify) Literacy/Writing	Subject (Specify) Literacy/Writing	Subject (Specify) Literacy/Writing	Subject (Specify) P.E.
7	From: 2:05 To: 2:50	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Social Studies
8	From: 2:50 TO:	Subject (Specify) DISMISSAL	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify) DISMISSAL	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify) 2:50 DISMISSAL

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

ESL Program Type: ___ TBE ___ Dual Language X Pull Out
 Indicate Proficiency Level: ___ Beginning ___ Intermediate X Advanced

School District: 22

School Building: 245

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:30 To: 9:15	Subject (Specify) Guided Reading	Subject (Specify) Literacy	Subject (Specify) Guided Reading	Subject (Specify) Literacy	Subject (Specify) Guided Reading
0	From: 9:15 To: 9:55	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) Guided Reading Content Area Science	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) Science
2	From: 9:55 To: 10:40	Subject (Specify) P.E.	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) ESL
3	From: 10:45 To: 11:30	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
4	From: 11:35 To: 12:20	Subject (Specify) Music	Subject (Specify) Geography	Subject (Specify) Literature Circles	Subject (Specify) Literature Circles	Subject (Specify) Art
5	From: 12:25 To: 1:10	Subject (Specify) L	Subject (Specify) U	Subject (Specify) N	Subject (Specify) C	Subject (Specify) H
6	From: 1:15 To: 2:00	Subject (Specify) Writing	Subject (Specify) P.E.	Subject (Specify) Writing	Subject (Specify) Writing	Subject (Specify) Writing
7	From: 2:05 To: 2:50	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Social Studies
8	From: 2:55 To:	Subject (Specify) DISMISSAL	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify) DISMISSAL	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify) 2:50 DISMISSAL
9	From: 2:55 To: 4:05	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY (Reading & Math)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY (Reading & Math)	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) _____ **Number of Students to be Served:** _____ **LEP** _____ **Non-LEP**

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

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

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.

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)		
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts		
Supplies and materials		
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL		

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

The Home Language survey was utilized to determine parents' primary language at home.

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.

Three primary languages have been identified within the school community—English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole. All literature sent home, when necessary or requested, is translated into these languages. In addition, and most importantly, we have translators on the premises who serve as interpreters with parents who speak/understand Spanish and/or Haitian Creole. These persons, the Parent Coordinator, and a Supervising School Aide translate for teachers/parents and when necessary, make phone calls. The Department of Education Translation Service is utilized for low incidence languages.

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.

Written documents and information are translated in-house for immediate use. Department of Education translation services are utilized for written translations of documents when time permits.

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.

Oral interpretation services in both Haitian Creole and Spanish are provided in-house by staff on a need basis. Two staff members translate for parents and teachers at Parent Teacher Conferences, Parent Workshops, and other school functions.

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>.

Parents will be notified in their home language. The translation unit will be utilized to translate surveys, notices, and other forms of communication. In the event that a notice is presented with a short turnaround, a staff member will provide the translation for the notice. Parents will be given the opportunity to advise us in advance if they need translation services in the form of an interpreter for meetings or events. In that case, we will fill the need with school staff. In the event that a staff member is not available, we will use a parent or request the services of the Department of Education for this purpose.

**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)*¹ 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.

¹ To examine whether instruction was aligned to the New York state standards and assessments, teachers in the district completed the *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)*. Based on two decades of research funded by the National Science Foundation, the SEC are designed to facilitate the comparison of enacted (taught) curriculum to standards (intended) and assessed curriculum (state tests), using teachers' self-assessments. The data for each teacher consist of more than 500 responses. The disciplinary topic by cognitive-level matrix is presented in graphic form, which creates a common language for comparison and a common metric to maintain comparison objectivity.

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

A school committee comprised of the principal, cabinet, a parent and consultant met several times to assess this finding and we determined that the finding was relevant to our school, in the areas of curriculum maps and taught curriculum.

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

X Applicable Not Applicable

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

Curriculum Maps: previously the school followed the New York City CAB for ELA. This document mapped out a pacing calendar and topics for teaching in each grade K-5. Last year the school began the process of creating its own ELA Curriculum based on the NY State standards. By the end of the 2007-2008 school year this curriculum map was in draft form.

Taught Curriculum: The school reviewed the taught curriculum in ELA to determine if it was aligned to the NYS standards and to evaluate what place writing had in this curriculum. While writing was evident in classrooms, it lacked rigor and did not incorporate all aspects of the writing process.

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.

Work is continuing throughout the 2008-2009 school year to refine the school curriculum maps by aligning them to NY State ELA standards, assessing them for academic rigor, and identifying the mini lessons needed to achieve the expected learning outcomes. As work continues on the curriculum maps we are including performance indicators for writing and all aspects of the writing workshop. Greater emphasis is being placed on the development of lessons that consistently address these points.

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.

A school committee comprised of the principal, cabinet, a parent and consultant met several times to assess this finding and we determined that the finding was relevant to our school, in the area of problem solving.

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

X Applicable Not Applicable

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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?

Though the Everyday Math K-5 instructional materials are closely aligned with the NY State Mathematics content and process standards they provide few opportunities for children to engage in problem solving activities that reflect achievement of NY State performance standards.

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.

Teachers are making a conscious effort to create and find problem solving activities aligned with each math standard and are including these in their lessons and in homework assignments.

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.

A school committee comprised of the principal, cabinet, a parent and consultant met several times to assess this finding and we determined that there is some evidence that direct instruction is still the comfort zone for teachers in ELA instruction.

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

X 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?

Though educationally relevant activities are evident in most classrooms, the ability to regularly differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students is a work in progress.

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.

Professional development by an AUSSIE literacy consultant, in conjunction with work by school's two out-of-classroom teachers, has begun to address teachers' use of best instructional practices as well as provide support and modeling for teachers in their efforts to differentiate instruction.

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* (SOM²) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

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

2B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. A school committee comprised of the principal, cabinet, a parent and consultant met several times to assess this finding and we determined that there is some evidence direct instruction is still the comfort zone for teachers in Math instruction.

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?

Teachers still require assistance in the planning of lessons that incorporate hands on /relevant activities that use prescribed manipulatives.

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.

Professional development by an AUSSIE mathematics consultant, in conjunction with additional work by the principal, has begun to address these issues and encourage teachers to experiment with hands-on activities that help students to construct their own knowledge.

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.

A school committee comprised of the principal, cabinet, a parent and consultant met several times to assess this finding and we determined that the finding was not relevant to our school.

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

Applicable X Not Applicable

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

This is a very small school with 14 teachers. From year to year one teacher may leave for personal or other reasons, but the School Demographic and Accountability snapshot for 2007-2008 shows that 65% of the staff have been in the building for at least 5+ years.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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.

N/A

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.

Meetings were held with the principal, cabinet, classroom teachers of ELLs and the ESL teachers to discuss this finding. This school has never had a significant ELL population. However we can see that the trend is for the school's ELL population to increase.

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

X Applicable Not Applicable

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

Limited opportunities to attend citywide Professional Development provided by the Department of Education OELL for techniques and instructional strategies to use with ELLs. (Courses are often filled and registration is restricted.) Limited opportunities for in-school professional development as a result of limited personnel and limited funding.

In 2007-2008 —6.9% of students were ELLs.

In 2008-2009—13.8% of students are ELLs.

As stated above, this finding has minimal relevance, but we can see it quickly becoming a bigger issue as the ELL population increases.

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

The school has allocated monies to provide additional ESL support beyond the mandated 2+ days already required. Teachers are being sent to city and district professional development and are receiving in-house professional development from the additional ESL teacher.

In -school workshops will address the use of data to determine which ELL students require additional support and which ELL students need different support. Additional workshops will address building skills with scaffolds or temporary instructional supports such as: modeling, bridging, using background knowledge, and giving clear examples. The professional development will be designed to give teachers the tools they require to address the needs of the ELL students in their class and as well as the support to develop a strong repertoire of techniques to increase proficiency in reading (comprehension), writing, and speaking (especially as demonstrated on tests of academic content).

Central can support the schools by making the registration process for citywide workshops more user-friendly and understandable. In this economic climate, the cost of the workshops severely limits the school's ability to support teachers' attendance for this outside professional development.

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.

Through LAP Committee meetings the issue of monitoring ELLs' academic progress was discussed and it was found that ELL data/information was not being disseminated to mainstream teachers. In some cases the data distributed was not well-understood.

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

X Applicable Not Applicable

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

Mainstream teachers were not fully aware of LABR or NYSESLAT results for their ELL students. In addition these teachers did not realize the implications of these assessment results.

There is only a minimal amount of data based on the current number of ELL students in the building. As this population grows, we see there is the potential for this to become a relevant concern.

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.

In 2008-2009, when teachers complete their *Next Step Sheets* following benchmark assessments, they will have the data at hand and use it for planning and instruction for ELLs. Workshops will be conducted to provide materials, as well as to share techniques and strategies for English Language acquisition, with the intent of moving students towards proficiency.

Central would be helpful in planning and delivering workshops for the mainstream teacher in analyzing and using ELL data to inform instruction.

Teachers are being asked to track progress of ELL students in reading (three times a year). In 2008-2009 we will begin to track in writing and math using baseline, midline, and end-line progress assessments.

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.

A school committee comprised of the principal, cabinet, a parent and consultant met several times to assess this finding and we determined that there was some evidence that general education teachers in the building do not have the background information needed to effectively meet the emotional, social and academic needs of the children in their classrooms with IEPs.

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?

In general teachers do not fully understand the range and types of instructional approaches that will assist all students in accessing the curriculum, and thereby improve instruction. 50% of the classroom teachers in our school do not have special education backgrounds. Most early childhood classes (K-1) do not have students in their classrooms that have IEPs. As a result these teachers are only exposed to this type of instruction on a need basis or as part of collaborative conversations with colleagues.

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.

Outside professional development opportunities and support will be provided by the Staten Island Integrated Service Center on both understanding and writing IEPs, as well as on how to implement them using effective strategies like task management analysis, and/or specific instructional approaches, like reciprocal teaching.

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.

A school committee comprised of the principal, cabinet, a parent and consultant met several times to assess this finding and we determined that there is some evidence that existing IEPs do not address modifications to the classroom environment, including instruction.

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?

When IEPs are written it is assumed that the teacher who will implement them will also put the necessary accommodations in place. Since differentiation is not fully understood by most teachers, the approach that is taken is somewhat limited. However, we do use grade specific performance indicators to determine modified promotional criteria. Our school selects realistic goals and objectives in academic areas that will build upon goals already achieved.

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

We will continue to support classroom teachers, especially those with SETSS students in their rooms, via professional development on differentiation. In addition to the services students receive via SETSS, we will continue to service them via AIS programs that have monitoring systems embedded in them. This allows us to determine skill levels, and assess the attainment of goals. When needed, we will develop and utilize behavior management plans guided by Dr. Mel Levine's *Collaboration Worksheet*. Upon completion, it provides us with strategies and accommodations that can be used in school and at home. Professional development will be provided on the use of this tool in developing behavior management plans. Such plans would be useful in the development of behavioral goals and objectives.

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

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

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

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

Submit date: **Jul 15, 2008** Email address: **pkannen3@schools.nyc.gov**

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

School DBN	22K245
School Name	PS 245
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 16,887
Principal Name	Pat Kannengeiser
Principal Email	pkannen3@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7182842330

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

\$ 16,879

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 and/or principals (consistent with SED mentor-teacher certification requirements and limited to 1st and 2nd years teacher/principal assignment)?

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

Utilization of staff developer to turnkey innovative instructional techniques to teachers, introduce differentiated instruction techniques, and teachers in an effort to further student achievement for low academic performers.

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

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

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

- New implementation
- Program Expansion

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

- Yes
- No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No