



**P.S. 277
2008-09
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

SCHOOL: (22/ BROOKLYN/ P.S. 277)
ADDRESS: 2529 GERRITSEN AVENUE, BKLYN. NY 11229
TELEPHONE: 718-743-6689
FAX: 718-743-0920

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 277 Non-Title I School **SCHOOL NAME:** The Gerritsen Beach School

DISTRICT: 22 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** ICI LSO Team F

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 2529 Gerritsen Avenue

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-743-6689 **FAX:** 718-743-0902

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Jeanne M. Fish **EMAIL ADDRESS:** JFish 3@schools.Nyc.gov

<u>POSITION/TITLE</u>	<u>PRINT/TYPE NAME</u>
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON	<u>Madelon Wilson</u>
PRINCIPAL	<u>Jeanne M. Fish</u>
UFT CHAPTER LEADER	<u>Joyce Verderosa</u>
PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT	<u>Margaret Foti</u>
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE <i>(Required for high schools)</i>	<u>N/A</u>
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT	<u>Marianne T. Ferrara</u>

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position/Constituency Represented	Signature
Jeanne Fish	*Principal	
Joyce Verderosa	*UFT Chapter Chairperson	
Margaret Foti	*PA/PTA President	
N/A	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Arlene Boxer	DC 37 Representative	
N/A	Student Representative, if applicable	
Maureen Edwards	Parent	
Maria McAuliffe	Parent	
Kelly Scott	Parent	
Mary Podesta	Parent	
Lisa Winter	Parent	
Janet Kennedy	Assistant Principal	
Marguerite Burke	Teacher	
Madelon Wilson	Teacher/Chair	

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

The Gerritsen Beach School is located in the southern most end of Brooklyn. There are approximately 430 students in attendance from Grades Pre K through Five. The school is primarily a neighborhood school with the student population being found within a small radius. English is the spoken language in this working class community. The school consists of 20 classes including 5 EAGLE classes, 1 Kindergarten Enrichment class, 1 self-contained class and 2 half-day Pre K classes.

The unique location and charm of this coastal community, lends itself to a Marine Biology theme. During the years 1993-1998, we participated in a Federal Magnet Grant in Marine Biology. The program encouraged respect for the community and its natural environment. The residents of the community responded with appreciation and pride. As a result, parents became more involved in the school creating a partnership between the school and local community. This is evident by their continued donation of time and expertise to our school. The program continues to influence and enrich our instruction today.

Our goal is to provide strong instructional programs in all of the core curriculum areas. Language Arts is taught during the daily 90 minute Literacy Block. Our Language Arts Program consists of Reading and Writing instruction through the use of Balanced Literacy, Writers Workshop and a Basal Reading series with support from the Wilson Reading Program and Great Leaps. In addition, the early childhood grades utilize the Waterford Early Reading Program. Math is taught 60-90 minutes a day. Our students receive Mathematics instruction utilizing the Math Workshop Model. They also work independently in Mathematics Activity Centers. *Everyday Math* is the primary instructional tool for teaching mathematics in Grades K and One. Grades Two and Three utilize the *Scott Foresman enVisions* as their primary instructional tool. *The McGraw-Hill Mathematics Program* is the primary instructional tool for teaching mathematics in Grades Four and Five. Science and Social studies are taught three periods a week in Grades K through Two and four periods a week in Grades Three through Five. Every child in Grades K through Five participates in the hands-on science program, FOSS. Our computer specialist provides instruction to students and assistance to teachers throughout the year. Every classroom has four fully networked computers and a printer creating a classroom technology center.

During the 2007-2008 school year, 97.2% of all tested students in Grades Three through Five performed on Level 3 or 4 on the ELA. In Mathematics, 99% of all tested students performed on Level 3 or 4. All student subgroups made Adequate Yearly Progress in Math, ELA and Science.

P.S. 277 also participated in a Project ARTS grant which allowed all students to receive music instruction this school year. Children were afforded the opportunity to perform before an audience, contributing to their self-esteem. In conjunction, we offer a dance program in Pre-K through Second Grade in addition to our physical education program. Students showcased themselves during the Science Fair, Spelling Bees, Annual Dance Festival, Holiday Concerts and Drama Production performances. Through these enrichment programs, we offer our students alternative means to

achieve success in reaching the Standards. For students at risk of not meeting the Standards and those who have not met State Standards in Reading and Mathematics, the school has developed Academic Intervention Programs offered during and after school, Collaborative Team Teaching and small group reading and/or math instruction provided by a Reading/Math teacher. In addition, all cluster teachers are utilized to assist classroom teachers during the Literacy Block. This affords all children the opportunity for direct, small-group instruction.

The vision for P.S. 277 is one that is shared by the entire learning community. The teaching staff, parents and students alike, strive to participate in teaching and learning that engages all disaggregated groups within the community, resulting in success for all students. The demand for responsibility on the part of the students to take an active role in their education will be paralleled with opportunity for growth, in conjunction with support that will enable them to reach their goals.

The Mission Statement for P.S. 277 is as follows: Based on the needs of the total school population, we will provide a nurturing environment that instills confidence and self-esteem in our children as they develop intellectually, socially, emotionally and physically. Using the Standards as a guiding force, we will create a love of learning and an exchange of ideas. Together with parents, we will foster life long moral and ethical values, enable each child to achieve to his fullest potential and celebrate the uniqueness of the individual.

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:	P.S. 277 Gerritsen Beach				
District:	22	DBN #:	22k277	School BEDS Code #:	332200010277

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	x Pre-K	x K	x 1	x 2	x 3	x 4	x 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	36	36	36		93.6	93.1	93.1		
Kindergarten	66	73	64						
Grade 1	75	73	73						
Grade 2	46	71	68	Student Mobility: (% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	66	48	69		96.6	96.6	96.1		
Grade 4	64	65	48						
Grade 5	56	62	63						
Grade 6				Poverty Rate: (% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7					27.7	31.6	39.0		
Grade 8									
Grade 9									
Grade 10				Students in Temporary Housing: (Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11					0	1	2		
Grade 12									
Ungraded Elementary									
Ungraded Secondary				Recent Immigrants: (Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	409	428	421		0	1	0		
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	0	11	9						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	34	36	39	Principal Suspensions	1	0	0		
Number all others	17	11	18	Superintendent Suspensions	2	0	0		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
				Special High School Programs:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	11	5	10	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	0	0	1	(As of October 31; includes all full and part-time staff)	2006	2007	2008
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	28	30	31
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	8	4	7
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	5	TBD	4
	0	0	0				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender:				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100	100	100
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.0	0.5	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	78.6	83.3	80.6
Black or African American	5.9	8.4	5.5	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	60.7	66.7	74.2
Hispanic or Latino	5.6	4.0	7.1				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	1.7	2.3	4.3	Percent Masters Degree or higher	100	100	97
White	86.8	85.3	82.7	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	93.2	100	100
Multi-racial							
Male	51.1	49.8	51.1				
Female	48.9	50.2	48.9				

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:	
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____	

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	√	√	√			
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	4	4	3			

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	A	Overall Evaluation:	W
Overall Score	68.4	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	W
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	10.4	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	W
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	22.5	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	◇
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	35.5	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W
Additional Credit	0	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	W

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

P.S. 277 earned an "A" in all categories of the NYC Department of Education Progress Report 2007-2008 which in turn, resulted in an overall score of "A". We met 100% of our improvement targets from the previous year. We also made exemplary proficiency gains and, therefore, earned extra credit, in ELA and Mathematics for our Special Education Students. These were the only areas for which we had the 15 or more students required to measure such gains.

Per the Main Findings of the Quality Review Report dated October 2007, P.S. 277 made good progress in addressing the issues identified in the previous Quality Review Report. We met the New York City's evaluation criteria as follows: Quality Statement 1 – Gather Data: Well Developed, Quality Statement 2 – Plan and Set Goals: Well Developed, Quality Statement 3 – Align Instructional Strategy to Goals: Outstanding, Quality Statement 4 – Align Capacity Building to Goals: Well Developed, Quality Statement 5 – Monitor and Revise: Well Developed.

The results of the Inquiry Team action research indicates that all subgroups of students currently in our school in testing grades have made a years progress. In addition, 97.2% are on or above grade level in their ELA scores and 99% are on or above grade level in their Mathematics scores.

The most significant barrier to our school's continuous improvement is the lack of funding to finance proven programs to work with at risk students.

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.

- **By June 2009, 67.9 percent (127 students) of the 187 students in Grades Three, Four and Five will make one year or more progress in English Language Arts. This is a 5.3 percent (15 students) increase in the number of students who made progress in English Language Arts in 2008. Progress will be measured by a variety of assessments, including the New York State English Language Arts exam, Reading Indicators, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarks, Periodic Assessments, Predictive Exam, and teacher conference notes.**

- **By June 2009, 79 percent (148 students) of the 187 students in Grades Three, Four and Five will make one year or more of progress in Mathematics. This is a 5.2 percent (16 students) increase in the number of students who made progress in Mathematics in 2008. Progress will be measured by a variety of assessments including the New York State Mathematics exam, Chapter tests, Unit tests, Periodic Assessments, Predictive Exam, and teacher conference notes.**

- **By June 2009, 85 percent of classroom teachers (18 teachers) will have compiled, analyzed and utilized English Language Arts and Mathematics data for planning and implementation of instruction as demonstrated by data folios and teacher lesson plans. This is a 33 percent increase (7 teachers) from 2008, in the number of teachers using data to differentiate instruction.**

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools designated for improvement (SINI/SRAP/SURR or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): ELA

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By January 2009, students in Grades Three, Four, and Five will have demonstrated at least six months of progress as demonstrated by Reading Indicators, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarks, Periodic Assessments, and teacher conference notes. By April 2009, students in Grades Three, Four and Five will have demonstrated at least ten months of progress as demonstrated by Reading Indicators, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarks, Periodic Assessments, and teacher conference notes.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the use of a variety of approaches to Reading and Writing • Conduct Professional Development to interpret the data and trends of the school, grade, and class • Collect and examine student work at Faculty Conferences • Create study groups to support the variety of teaching strategies • Conduct Learning Walks • Conduct Formal and Informal Observations • Utilize the Renzulli Program • Develop student goals • Purchase more high-interest reading materials • Analyze student data from Periodic Assessments at Grade Conferences • Conduct Data Meetings to discuss planning and differentiation of instruction • Create skills analysis/action plan for ELA planning and instruction • Provide Professional Development for differentiation of instruction • Provide more consistent differentiation of instruction across curriculum areas • Target population: Students in Grades Three, Four and Five • Responsible staff members: classroom teachers and support staff • Implementation timelines: January 2009 – six months progress - April 2009 - 10 months progress

<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>Tax Levy Fair Student Funding</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal and Informal Observation Reports • Learning Walk notes • Lesson plans/Plan books • Classroom Libraries and Book Rooms • Invoices of newly purchased materials • Attendance sheets, minutes, notes, and agendas from Grade Conferences, Faculty Conferences, Academic Intervention Team Meetings, Inquiry Team Meetings, Professional Development sessions, Pupil Personnel Committee Meetings, Data Meetings • Skill Analysis Sheet and Action Plan for English Language Arts by class, student • Projects and student work generated by Renzulli Program

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target population: Students in Grades Three, Four and Five • Responsible staff members: classroom teachers and support staff • Implementation timelines: January 2009 – six month progress - April 2009 – 10 months progress
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics Staff Development funded by C4E allocation • Tax Levy 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal and Informal Observations • Learning Walk notes • Lesson Plans/Plan books • Student Projects and work generated by Renzulli Program • Individual student generated goals • Attendance sheets, minutes, notes and agendas from Grade Conferences, Faculty Conferences, Academic Intervention Team Meetings, Inquiry Team Meetings, Professional Development sessions, Pupil Personnel Committee meetings, Data Meetings, • Skills Analysis sheet and action plan for Mathematics by class, student

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools designated for improvement (SINI/SRAP/SURR or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Analyze Data

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By January 2009, 61 percent of teachers (11 teachers) in Grades One through Five will have compiled data folios for use in differentiated instruction. By June 2009, 100 percent of teachers (18 teachers) in Grades one through Five will have compiled data folios for use in differentiated instruction.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer a variety of formative and summative assessments for English Language Arts and Math, including Periodic Assessments, Predictive Assessments, Reading Indicators, Benchmarking, Math Chapter and Unit tests • Distribute data sheets to teachers • Conduct bi-annual conferences with individual teachers • Provide access to Predictive and Periodic Assessment data • Provide Professional Development on the use of data to plan and drive differentiated instruction • Monitor lesson plans/plan books • Provide Professional Development on goal setting for children • Conduct Learning Walks to observe evidence of differentiated instruction

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct Formal and Informal Observations to observe evidence of differentiated instruction • Examine student work resulting from differentiated instruction • Examination of student data by Inquiry Team • Target population: 85 percent of our classroom teachers (18 teachers) • Responsible staff members: Inquiry Team will be responsible for assisting teachers in implementing this goal • Implementation timeline: January 2009 - 61 percent of classroom teachers (11 teachers) in Grades One through Five - June 2009 – 100 percent of classroom teachers (18 teachers) in Grades One through Five
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax Levy Fair Student Funding • Tax Levy Data Specialist • Tax Levy Children First
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance sheets, minutes, notes and agendas from Grade Conferences, Faculty Conferences, Academic Intervention Team Meetings, Professional Development sessions, Individual Data meetings • Learning Walk notes • Formal and Informal Observation reports • Data from Acuity • Data from ARIS • Results of formative and summative assessments • Lesson Plans/Plan books • Samples of student work that has been differentiated according to strengths and needs

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			N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1
1	10	2	N/A	N/A				
2	4		N/A	N/A	1			5
3	5	5	N/A	N/A			5	4
4	13	8	5				5	1
5	17	11		5		1	2	
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	Students in Grades K-2 participate in small group instruction during the day and receive instruction in Foundations, Great Leaps and Waterford Early Reading Program. Students in Grades 2-5 participate in small group instruction both during the day and after school and receive instruction using Great Leaps, Wilson Reading System, Kaplan and Best Practices in Reading Program. Students are seen between 3 and 5 times per week.
Mathematics:	Students in Grades K-1 participate in small group instruction during the day using strategies from the Everyday Math Program. Students in Grades 2-5 participate in small group instruction during the day and after school using strategies from enVisions, McGraw Hill and Kaplan Program. Students are seen between 3 and 5 times per week.
Science:	Students in Grade 4 participate in small group instruction during school. Students are seen between 1 and 4 times per week.
Social Studies:	Grade 3-5 students participate in small group instruction in the classroom during the school year. They are seen two times a week. In Grade 5, AIS providers use old NYS constructed response questions as practice for the exam.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor: Carol Sweeney	Grade K-5 students participate in small group counseling once a week.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist: Rebecca Talbert	Grade K-5 students participate in one-to-one and small group counseling once a week, or as needed.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker: Jay Sosowsky	Grade K-5 students participate in one-to-one and small group counseling once a week, or as needed.
At-risk Health-related Services: Olivia Michaels	AIS students are seen daily, one-to-one for medication to relieve symptoms and as necessary.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) – Attach a copy of your school's current year (2008-2009) LAP narrative to this CEP.

Language Allocation Policy **School Year 2008-2009**

The Language Allocation Policy Team for P.S. 277 is comprised of our Principal – Mrs. J. Fish, Assistant Principal – Mrs. J. Kennedy, Parent Coordinator – Mrs. K. Salinas, ESL Teacher – Mrs. J. Vega, Speech Teacher – Ms. A. Geraci and Literacy Staff Developer – Mrs. M. Wilson.

Our current ELL Instructional Program is English as a Second Language (ESL).

The total number of ELL students in our school is 6. This accounts for 1% of our student population. We have 5 students in First Grade whose home language is Russian and 1 student in Fifth Grade whose home language is Haitian Creole.

After reviewing the *Parent Survey and Program Selection* forms for the past few years, we noted that all of the parents, who responded to the survey, requested their child be placed in an English as a second Language Program. Therefore, the program offered at our school is aligned with parent preference.

Analysis of the LAB-R results, to date, for the 2008-09 school year, show that only two of the students tested are eligible for services. One scored on the Beginner Level and the other scored at the Advanced Level.

Spring 2008 NYSESLAT results indicate that of the 10 students taking the exam, 6 scored out. The remaining 4 advanced one level of proficiency. After examining the students' results in the four modalities, (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing), the students showed growth in all four.

In order to meet the needs of our ELL students, we must focus on Academic Discourse through direct instruction on how to use language symbolically. Academic language must be formally taught and continuously practiced to describe the features and systems of the English language. The teacher will scaffold students' independent reading comprehension through modeling strategies during all components of the Readers and Writers Workshop.

We next reviewed the data for students' performance in the content areas of Math and English. During the 07-08 calendar year, all decertified ELLs who were in testing grades, performed on/above grade level in both content areas. This indicates that instruction was properly implemented. We then reviewed the ECLAS-2 Spring '08 data for our remaining four entitled

students who were then in Kindergarten. The one Intermediate Level student was on grade level in all the strands. The three Beginner Level students showed a weakness in Listening, Reading, Writing and Speaking. We will continue to work with the children on features and systems of the English language. This will be done in small group instruction in both the classroom and during ESL instruction and will be aligned with the Reading Standards.

Based on an analysis of the information provided above, P.S. 277 developed the following ESL Program Model for the 2008-2009 school year.

- ***Implication for Instruction:*** The ELL teacher will provide intensive language development activities for all students utilizing scientifically based research strategies.
- ***Implication for Professional Development:*** On-going professional development for all staff members in understanding and using specialized instructional strategies to meet the needs of the ELL population. This will include professional development that is provided at the school level, as well as professional development that is provided through our network.
- ***Program Implication:*** Services are provided through a pull-out program by a certified ELL teacher. Instruction time is driven by LAB-R and NYSESLAT scores. Instruction is small group with a focus on Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking. ELL strategies, techniques and methodologies are utilized with a goal of English Language Proficiency.
- ***Program Description:*** Our ELL Program has been successful with 60% of our population scoring out on the Spring 2008 NYSESLAT. The remaining 40% moved up one proficiency level. Our certified ELL teacher will use Leap Frog along with the Scott Foresman ESL Language Development Program. This will be supplemented by balanced literacy materials, and the Integrated Early Childhood Curriculum for English Language Learners.

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

Type of Program: ___ Bilingual ___X ESL ___ Both Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08: 10
(No more than 2 pages)

- I. Instructional Program for ELLs (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc). Program planning and management description to include identification and placement of ESL/Bilingual certified teachers, utilization of appropriate instructional materials (English and other languages) and technology, school-based supervisory support, use of external organizations, compliance with ELL-related mandates, and use of data to improve instruction:
 - A. Curricular: Briefly describe the school's literacy, mathematics and other content area programs and explain ELLs' participation in those programs. Briefly describe supplemental programs for ELLs (i.e., AIS, Saturday Academies).
 - B. Extracurricular: Briefly describe extracurricular activities available in your school, and the extent to which ELLs participate.

Our current ELL Instructional Program is English as a Second Language (ESL). The total number of ELL students served in 2007-08 is 10: 6 Advanced, 1 Intermediate and 3 Beginner Level. They account for 2% of our total student population. Advanced students received 4 periods of instruction weekly. Intermediate and Beginner students received 8 periods of instruction weekly. Services are provided through a pull-out program taught by a certified ESL teacher. Instruction, based on LAB-R and NYSESLAT results, is small group with an emphasis on Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking. We focus on Academic Discourse through direct instruction on how to use language symbolically. Academic Language is formally taught and continuously practiced. We scaffold Reading Comprehension by modeling strategies during Reading, Writing and Math Workshop Models. Students also receive personalized reading instruction on the computer both in the classroom and Computer Lab. ELL strategies techniques and methodologies are utilized with a goal of English Language Proficiency. Our students also receive small group AIS instruction during the school day in both Literacy and Mathematics utilizing ESL methodology. After school enrichment programs were available to all students in Grades 2-5. Three of our ELL students elected to attend an enrichment activity.
- II. Parent/community: Describe parent/community involvement activities planned to meaningfully involve parents in their children's education and to inform them about the state standards and assessments.

A workshop entitled *Getting to Know Your School* is conducted at the beginning of the year for parents of new ELL students. Parents watch an Orientation Video, receive parent guides in their native language and information about the *2001 No Child Left Behind Act*. ELL screening and assessment instruments are discussed along with program options. Throughout the year, parents are kept informed through one-to-one meetings, telephone calls and written correspondence in native language when requested/necessary. Parents are also kept informed by the Parent Coordinator and the Parents Association during monthly meetings and workshops.
- III. Project Jump Start: Describe the programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL/LEP students prior to the first day of school.

Newly enrolled ELL students did not register prior to the first day of school. We do, however have programs/activities in place to assist them upon arrival with their social/academic needs including: Waterford Early Reading Program, Leap Frog, Renzulli (all computer based programs). The children also receive AIS services in addition to their ESL instruction during the school day. Children are carefully monitored to ensure their social/emotional needs are met. If any child is having difficulties adjusting, parents are invited to speak with our Social Worker and classroom teacher. Together, we devise a plan to ensure the child makes a smooth transition.
- IV. Staff Development (2008-2009 activities—tentative dates and ELL-related topics): Describe how staff will participate in ongoing, long-term staff development with a strong emphasis on the State learning standards and high impact differentiated and academic language development strategies.

Professional Development for all staff members in understanding and using specialized instructional strategies to meet the needs of the ELL population will be on-going throughout the school year. This will include professional development provided by the school and network when available. In addition, our ESL Teacher meets with classroom teachers and out of classroom teachers who provide instruction to our ELL students to provide strategies in implementing differentiated instruction with ELL methodologies.

V. Support services provided to LEP students: Describe other support structures that are in place in your school which are available to ELLs. Our school has a S.A.P.I.S counselor who works with small groups of students to help develop their self esteem and social interaction skills. Similar services are also provided to students determined to be in need by our Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist and Social Worker.

VI. Name/type of native language assessments administered (bilingual programs only): Describe how you assess the level of native language development and proficiency of the ELLs who are in a bilingual program. **NOT APPLICABLE**

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

School Building: _____ PS 277 _____ 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 (1) Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program			
						1

* The number of teachers reported must represent the number of teachers holding an appropriate license for the subject area being taught (i.e., language arts and content area.) Note: The Office of Bilingual Education and Foreign Language Studies will conduct a random review of the 2006-2007 teacher reported data. Districts randomly selected will be asked to electronically submit to the Department, the name of the teacher(s), social security number and type of license or certificate issued by the NYSED.

** Examples of this may include: teachers without an appropriate New York State teaching certificate or New York City license for the subject area(s) being taught or without a valid NYS teaching certificate or NYC license.

*** Teaching Assistants and Paraprofessionals must be working under the direct supervision of a licensed teacher. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules

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

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 22

School Building: P.S. 277

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From:8:15 To:9:00	ELA skills	Independent Reading	Independent Reading	Independent Reading	Math Workshop
2	From:9:00 To:9:45	Guided Reading	Guided Reading	Guided Reading	Guided Reading	Math Workshop
3	From:9:45 To:10:30	Shared Reading	Shared Reading	Shared Reading	Shared Reading	ESL
4	From:10:30 To:11:15	Math	Math	Math	Math	Music
5	From:11:15 To:12:05	ESL	ESL	ESL	ESL	Science
6	From:12:05 To:12:55	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
7	From:12:55 To:1:40	Social Studies	Writing	Writing	Writing	Writing
8	From:1:40 To:2:25	Writing	Computer	Social Studies	P.E./Handwriting	Health/Learning Centers
9	From:2:25 To:3:25		ESL	ESL	ESL	
10	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 22

School Building: P.S. 277

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From:8:15 To:9:00	Morning Routines, Word Study/Phonics	Morning Routines, Word Study/Phonics	Morning Routines, Word Study/Phonics	Morning Routines, Word Study/Phonics	Morning Routines, Word Study/Phonics
2	From:9:00 To:9:45	Guided Reading	Math Workshop	Guided Reading	Guided Reading	Guided Reading
3	From:9:45 To:10:30	Shared Reading	Math Workshop	Shared Reading	Shared Reading	ESL
4	From:10:30 To:11:15	Math	Shared Reading	Social Studies	Music	Shared Reading
5	From:11:15 To:12:05	ESL	ESL	ESL	ESL	Math
6	From:12:05 To:12:55	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
7	From:12:55 To:1:40	Writing	Computer	Fundation Phonics	Math	Health
8	From:1:40 To:2:25	Social Studies/PE	Science/PE	Art/PE	Writing/PE	Dance
9	From:2:25 To:3:25		ESL	ESL	ESL	
10	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 22

School Building: P.S. 277

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From:8:15 To:9:00	Morning Routines, Shared Reading	Morning Routines, Shared Reading	Morning Routines, Shared Reading	Morning Routines, Shared Reading	Morning Routines, Shared Reading
2	From:9:00 To:9:45	Guided Reading	Math Workshop	Guided Reading	Guided Reading	Guided Reading
3	From:9:45 To:10:30	Writing	Guided Reading	Math	Social Studies/Writing	Writing
4	From:10:30 To:11:15	Math	Social Studies	Computer	Music	Dance
5	From:11:15 To:12:05	ESL	Science/PE	Writing/PE	Phonics/PE	Math/PE
6	From:12:05 To:12:55	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
7	From:12:55 To:1:40	Science	Writing	Phonics	Math/PE	Phonics/Word Study
8	From:1:40 To:2:25	Social Studies	Phonics	Science	Health	Learning Centers
9	From:2:25 To:3:25		ESL	ESL	ESL	
10	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)

Not Applicable SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (Bilingual)

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

School District: _____ School Building: _____

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
2	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
3	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
4	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
5	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
6	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
7	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
8	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
9	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					
10	From:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To:					

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a) NOT APPLICABLE

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) NOT APPLICABLE

**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.

We ascertain the primary language spoken in the home through the Home Language Survey that is completed by the parent during the enrollment process. We cross reference this with information provided on the Blue Home Emergency Card kept in the office. Through interviews conducted with the parents at the time of registration, along with outreach to new parents by the Parent Coordinator, it is determined if parents need/request written and/or verbal translations of correspondence, report cards, etc.

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.

Currently, we have six students in need of ESL services. All of the households have at least one adult member able to read/write/speak in both English and their native language. This information was disseminated to our school community through our ELL Committee, School Leadership Team, Parent Coordinator and Parent Association

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.

Oral interpretation services are to be provided by paraprofessionals, parent volunteers and our Parent Coordinator. We will also network with neighboring schools to procure personnel that will assist with written translation services. Before correspondence is sent home to parents, documents in need of translation are given to our Translation Team for processing. When necessary, we will avail ourselves of services provided by the DOE Translation and Interpretation Unit. In this way, all correspondence is sent home at the same time. English and foreign language report cards are also sent home simultaneously.

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 are to be provided by paraprofessionals, parent volunteers and our Parent Coordinator. If a parent does not have, or cannot bring another member of their household to school for conferences, meetings, etc. and interpretation services are

necessary for parents to communicate, arrangements will be made to have a member of our Translation Team available. When necessary, we will also make arrangements for oral interpretation services (phone conference calls) offered by the Translation and Interpretation Unit of the DOE.

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>.

One percent of the 2008-09 student population is ELL. We maintain a current record of the primary language of each parent/household. Although every household has an adult member who can speak, read and write in English, documents identified by the Translation and Interpretation Unit as containing critical information regarding their children's education, are obtained in relevant, covered languages. Members of our Translation Team are also available to clarify and answer questions.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

NOT APPLICABLE

Directions:

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

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

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

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

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

NOT APPLICABLE

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

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

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

1. For each area of school improvement identification (indicated on your pre-populated School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot, downloadable from your school's NYCDOE webpage under "Statistics"), describe the school's findings of the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified.
2. Describe the focused intervention(s) the school will implement to support improved achievement in the grade and subject areas for which the school was identified. Be sure to include strategies to address the needs of all disaggregated groups that failed to meet the AMO, Safe Harbor, and/or 95% participation rate requirement. Note: If this question was already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

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

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

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

NOT APPLICABLE

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

Directions: 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) data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.
- **English Language Learners**
Multiple data sources indicate that there is a great deal of variation in the curriculum and instruction that ELL students receive, by grade level, by type of ELL program or general education program, and by district. For example, some of the best instruction observed by site visitors was found in ELL program classrooms at the elementary level, which contrasted sharply with the generally lower quality of ELL program instruction at the secondary level. The auditors found that planning for ELL education at the city and even district levels did not percolate down to the school and teacher levels. Consequently, planning for ELL education in the audited schools generally occurred at

the level of individual teachers or ELL program staff, contributing to the variations in curriculum and instruction observed across ELL and general education programs. Further, there is a general lack of awareness of the New York State Learning Standards for ESL.

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

1A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. The administration, staff developers, IEP teachers and ELL service provider meet to analyze student performance and evaluate the instructional alignment to NYS ELA standards. We address the ELA curriculum through the Balanced Literacy Approach. 97.2% of our students scored level 3 or 4 on the 2007-2008 NYS ELA exam. Upon examination of this data, we conclude that the findings of this study are not applicable to our school.

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

Applicable X Not Applicable

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

Gaps in Written Curriculum:

- English Language Arts standards are displayed on bulletin boards next to student work, are listed in plan books and are displayed in every classroom.
- Test preparation and Academic Intervention materials are aligned with the standards and are research based.
- All lessons are aligned with standards based on the NYS Standards and Performance Indicators which are distributed to teacher each year.
- All staff involved in instruction are provided with the PS 277 Circulars which are revised each year.

Curriculum Maps

- PS 277 circulars provide detailed instructional expectations for Balanced Literacy.
- Pacing Calendars, Reading Indicators, Rubrics Guided Reading benchmarks, Periodic Assessments and ECLAS insure that the curriculum is aligned to the standards.
- NY State Standards are referenced when writing IEPs to reflect specific skills and outcomes.
- Teacher created ELA Curriculum Maps are standard based and act as a guide for teaching staff.
- Science and Social Studies curriculum is integrated in the Literacy Block. Content area specialists provide Scope and Sequence and grade specific curriculum to support classroom teachers.

Taught Curriculum

- The Writers Workshop (Lucy Calkins) is utilized in every classroom to teach writing. Teachers keep conference notes which are the result of meetings with individual students which in turn drive instruction.
- Writing Standards and rubrics are posted in lesson planning and implementation.
- Writing portfolios are maintained to reflect the progression of the writing process and reflect the standards.
- Teachers encourage students to identify goals for reading and writing.

- Students assess their writing both independently or with a peer using grade specific writing rubrics.
- Students are provided with focused instruction on comprehension skills through the use of Skill of the Week plan.
- Principles of Learning and Blooms Taxonomy are addressed at P.D. Evidence of application is observed in lesson plans, plan books and during the instructional process.
- The Readers Workshop which consists of Guided Reading, Shared Reading, Read Aloud and Independent Reading is utilized daily.
- Foundations, Wilson and Sadlier phonics program are used to address word study.
- Conference notes are maintained for every student which in turn drives instruction.
- Our students with special needs, our ELLs and all students participate in activities that advance reading, listening, speaking and writing.
- 97.2% of our students performed at or above grade level on the NYS ELA exam for 2007-2008 school year indicating that NYC curriculum is aligned to the NY State standards.

ELA Materials

- A needs assessment of books and other teacher aids is distributed annually to teachers.
- PS 277 has two extensive book rooms in addition to a school library which supports the Balanced Literacy program for Reading and Writing.
- Our teacher resource center contains professional books for teachers to study various aspects of Reading and Writing.
- Foundations program, Wilson program, Great Leaps, Bumpy Books and Leap Frog are resources which are utilized for our at-risk, special ed and ELL students.
- The following materials are used for our ELL students: Leap Frog, Bilingual dictionaries, Scott Foresman, ESL Language Development Program.
- Scantron, ARIS and Acuity are utilized by teachers in Grades 3-5 to identify needs through skills analysis. An instructional plan is formulated based on findings.
- Our Literacy Staff Developer created an item skills analysis for Grades K through 2 which draws results from ECLAS testing to drive instruction.
- Literacy centers in all classrooms offer a variety of activities that allow students to work independently or with partners. Such activities address many learning styles and materials.
- Two computer programs, Waterford and Renzulli enhance and integrate Literacy instruction. Waterford Early Reading Program is utilized in all classrooms in Kindergarten through Grade 2. Renzulli is utilized in the computer lab and at home by students in Grade 1 through 5.

English Language Learners

- Our ESL teacher uses the Balanced Literacy approach to reading and writing.
- Our ESL teacher attends training and workshops both on site and those given by the network.
- Our ESL teacher uses both formal and informal assessments to drive instruction.
- An item skills analysis is created by the Literacy Staff Developer based on the results of the NYSESLAT to drive instruction.

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

1B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. The administration met with Staff Developers, IEP teachers and ELL service provider to analyze student performance and evaluate the instructional alignment to the NYS Standards for each of the three Math programs in use at PS 277. We found that our Math curricula is aligned to both the process strand and the content strand of the NYS Mathematics Standards. 98.9% of our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

performed at Levels 3 and 4 on the NYS Math exam in 2007-2008 school year. Upon examination of our testing data, we conclude that the findings of the study are not applicable to our school.

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

Applicable X Not Applicable

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

- When the NYS Math Standards changed in 2005, we provided extensive PD on the new Math Standards. All teachers keep a copy of the NYS Math Standards on their desk and display the grade-level standards in each classroom. Teachers reference the standards in their plan books.
- Students in Pre-K through Grade 1 use Everyday Mathematics. Students in Grades 2 and 3 use Envision Mathematics. Both programs are aligned to NYS Standards and are research-based programs.
- In Grades 4 and 5 students use McGraw Hill Mathematics. In 2005, the Math Staff Developer, along with the teachers created a pacing calendar to align the series to the NYS Standards.
- Cooperative instruction is utilized by the teachers to foster mathematical communication and problem-solving skills. Accountable Talk stems are posted to cultivate mathematical discussions.
- Teachers on each grade level meet weekly to develop Balanced Math Workshop lessons. Teachers discuss ways to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each class. During these lessons, teachers model new concepts in a mini-lesson and students then practice the concepts with Math partners.
- Students write entries in a Math journal on a regular basis and are encouraged to reflect upon their learning. In these journals, students also write about Mathematical processes.
- Our Math resource room contains an extensive collection of manipulative, Math literature and Math teacher resource books which the teachers borrow to make abstract Mathematical concepts more concrete. Teachers also have collections of manipulatives in their classroom for the children to use as needed.
- Everyday Math and Envision have extended response questions embedded into their assessments. Teachers have created original extended response questions to supplement the McGraw Hill program in Grades 4 and 5. When appropriate, teachers use standards based rubrics to grade extended response questions.
- After each chapter assessment, teachers use standards-based item analyses to plan for differentiated instruction.
- NYS Math Standards are reviewed with staff members at the beginning of each school year.
- Pacing calendars aligned to the standards are disseminated before school begins. On-going Professional Development for Mathematics takes place during grade conferences and common preps.

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

2A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. The administration, staff developers, IEP teachers and ELL service provider met to analyze student performance and evaluate the instructional alignment to NYS ELA Standards. We address the ELA curriculum through the Balanced Literacy Approach. 97.2% of our students scored level 3 or 4 on the 2007-2008 NYS ELA exam. Upon examination of this data, we conclude that the findings of this study are not applicable to our school.

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

Applicable X Not Applicable

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

- The Workshop Model approach for ELA instruction that we use at PS 277 cultivates student engagement. The Model begins with a 10-15 minute mini-lesson in which the teacher activates prior knowledge. The teacher clearly demonstrates the strategies and skills that good readers use by Think Aloud. Students then apply what they have learned to their reading and they are encouraged to verbalize their thought process. Independent practice follows in which the students apply what they have learned during the mini-

lesson. A sharing session ends the lesson and the children discuss ways they were able to apply the strategy during independent reading.

Balanced Literacy is comprised of four major components:

Guided Reading takes place in a small group with one teacher and no more than six students. The students are flexibly grouped according to Fountas and Pinnell reading level. The close proximity of the teacher allows her to deeply understand a child's reading strengths and weaknesses and provides a venue for individualized instruction.

Shared Reading and Book Clubs give the students an opportunity to discuss literature and make connections.

During Read Alouds the teacher involves all students in a discussion of story elements, genre characteristics, word study, grammar and phonemic patterns.

Teachers individually conference with students during Independent Reading. Children choose a book of interest on their "just right" level from a well-stocked, leveled classroom library.

- Students are expected to share their writing pieces with their classmates.
- Teachers have received P.D. on Bloom's Taxonomy and the art of developing critical thinking strategies through thoughtful, open-ended questioning techniques.
- At faculty conferences, the Inquiry Team shares their findings. At monthly grade conferences, teachers share one "best practice" with their colleagues.
- Content area reading materials are modified to meet the needs of our ELL and Special Education students.
- Computer based programs such as Renzulli and Waterford, engage students in a customized program.
- Item Analysis on assessments help teachers to monitor progress and differentiate instruction.

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

The administration met with staff developers, IEP teacher and ELL service provider to analyze student performance and evaluate the instructional alignment to the NYS Standards for each of the three Math programs in use at PS 277. We found that our Math curricula is aligned to both the process strand and the content strand of the NYS Mathematics Standards. 98.9% of our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students performed at Levels 3 and 4 on the NYS Math exam in 2007-2008 school year. Upon examination of our testing data, we conclude that the findings of the study are not applicable to our school.

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

Applicable X Not Applicable

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

- At PS 277, we use a Balanced Math Workshop Approach as the instructional framework for all Math lessons. Each lesson starts with a 10 minute mini-lesson in which the teacher models concepts for students using a “think-aloud” strategy or manipulative. Students then work in a small group or with a Math partner to practice application of the new concept. The class then reconvenes to verbally share what they have learned. Students then reflect upon their learning and write about their experiences in their Math journals.
- Teachers regularly utilize collaborative learning approaches to stimulate and develop Accountable Talk and Listening in Mathematics.
- Teachers differentiate instructional methods to accommodate the learning styles of the students. Instruction is offered in a variety of modalities including manipulatives, use of overhead projectors and Smartboards.
- Our Math Staff Developer turn keyed P.D. on current Mathematical research. She shares her expertise with the staff on a daily basis. The Math Staff Developer has also compiled a list of Math literature and Math Websites to supplement concepts being taught.
- Related services provider specialists regularly meet with teachers to discuss alternative approaches to curriculum instruction in Mathematics. Teachers use this information to further differentiate instruction to our special needs students.
- The Math Staff Developer and the Science content teacher provide P.D. to staff integrating the two disciplines. The teaching staff in turn applies these instructional practices in the classroom making certain that the standards are being addressed.

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

The administration met with support teachers to assess whether this finding is relevant to our school's educational program. We examined school organization sheets over the past three years. We also reviewed data found in the Annual School Report Card and the Learning Environment Survey. We conclude that this find is not applicable to our school.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

- Over the past three years, our data on the Annual School Report Card indicates that 80% of our teachers have remained teaching at PS 277 for two years or more.
- In the past three years, our data shows that 100% of our teachers are fully licensed and permanently assigned to our school.
- Teacher turnover rate over the pasta three years is 4%. For the most part, Teacher Turnover has occurred because of relocation or transportation issues
- New teachers receive support from a variety of sources including: on-site mentor, off-site new teacher workshops, on-site differentiated P.D., inter visitation with master teachers, individual conferences with administrators and staff developers as needed.
- Continuing teachers also have the opportunity to participate in on-site and off-site differentiated P.D. and inter visitations.
- All teachers are encouraged to share best practices at grade conferences. In addition, support is given for teachers on the grade to enable them to function as a team.

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

The administration met with the ESL teacher and support personnel to assess if the finding is relevant to our educational program. We met to discuss effective instructional practices, interventions and materials. We also examined the P.D. opportunities available for our ESL teacher.

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

Applicable X Not Applicable

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

- Our ESL teacher attends off-site P.D. for instruction and testing of ELL students
- A network ELL specialist met with the ESL teacher and classroom teachers to present ELL instructional practices including Academic English and Language Acquisition
- The ESL teacher communicates with the classroom teacher to monitor student progress
- Individual instruction is provided during the extended day for students with high need
- On city-wide Professional Development days, our special education support staff offers workshops that address alternative strategies and approaches to support the ELL student

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

The administration met with our ESL teacher and support personnel to assess whether this finding is relevant to our school's educational program. The ELL testing coordinator met on separate occasions with the ESL teacher to discuss the findings of the LAB-R and NYSESLAT testing. The ESL teacher then disseminates the information to the classroom teacher. Based on this data we determine that the findings are not applicable to our school.

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

Applicable X 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?

- The ELL testing coordinator shares the LAB-R scores with classroom teachers and the ESL teacher when results are available.
- NYSESLAT scores from previous years are analyzed to differentiate instruction.
- When there are ELL students in the testing grades, the ELL periodic assessments are administered.
- ELL instruction is determined by proficiency levels - appropriate programs are formulated.
- Students who test out of the ESL program, according to NYSESLAT score, are targeted for Academic Intervention Services.
- Our ESL instruction is offered as a pull-out program by a certified ESL teacher.
- ELL student data is carefully examined for progress and proficiency in all four content areas: Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking.

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

While the DOE and individual schools have made a substantial investment in professional development for special and general education teachers, classroom observations, IEP reviews, and interviews indicate that many general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators do not yet have sufficient understanding of or capacity to fully implement the range and types of instructional approaches that will help to increase access to the general education curriculum and improve student performance. Further, many general education teachers remain unfamiliar with the content of the IEPs of their students with disabilities, have a lack of familiarity with accommodations and modifications that would help support the students with disabilities in their classrooms, and are not knowledgeable regarding behavioral support plans for these students.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

6.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. School Administrators, Staff Developers, the IEP teacher and the School Psychologist meet on a regular basis to assess student performance and instructional alignment to the NYS Standards. This group regularly discusses alternative approaches that will help improve the performance of our Special Education students. This group of individuals also assesses materials and interventions and their appropriateness for individual students. These professionals also augment their own professional knowledge regarding current educational research through attendance at workshops and special education forums. They disseminate best practices to our staff. Upon examination of our Progress Report and Quality Review, we found that Key Findings 6 is not relevant to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable X Not Applicable

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

- Every teacher/service provider that services a special needs child has a current copy of each child's IEP (as per Chapter 408).
- Teachers and Special Education Paraprofessionals work collaboratively to address specific needs and provide differentiated instruction to their students.
- Special Education support staff collaborate with teachers, model strategies in the classroom, and provide ongoing P.D.
- Special Educators offer ideas to modify curriculum and develop plans and approaches to meet the needs of each child.
- Behavioral plans are routinely formulated when necessary and are reviewed with parent, child and teacher.
- Based on the child's IEP, a testing modification chart is generated and testing modifications are made for all assessments.
- Our AIS Teachers/Staff Developers demonstrate model lessons in Literacy and Math.
- Special Educators analyze data to monitor growth and drive instruction for individual students.
- We regularly conference with parents to inform them of learning strategies to be reinforced at home that will lead to academic success.
- Our CTT and other Special Educators, attend citywide and D.75 Professional Development Workshops.
- Our IEP Coordinator conducts training on using IEP Pro to produce quality IEPs that are aligned to the NYS Standards. She also monitors mandates and ensures that they are being followed as per the IEP.
- For the 2005-2006 school year, PS 277 was recognized by NY State as a high performing/gap closing school in student achievement.

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

7.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. The Administration met with the School Assessment Team, Special Education Service Providers, CTT teachers and the ESL teacher to assess student performance and instructional alignments to the NYS Standards. This group met to discuss effective instructional practices,

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

intervention and materials. They reviewed student work and testing data. They reviewed Special Education protocols that are in use at PS 277. Additionally, they reviewed the Progress Report and the Quality Review Results. They concluded that the findings of the study are partially applicable to our school. We find the following statement is applicable to our school: There appears to be a lack of alignment between goals, objectives and modified promotion criteria that are included in student's IEPs and the content on which these students are assessed on grade-level State tests. Our staff creates IEPs that are a result of examination of student performance, academic strengths and weaknesses and teacher observations. According to some of our IEPs, several students are functioning one year or more below grade level. However, NYS requires that each child be tested according to their assigned grade level rather than their cognitive functioning grade level.

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?

Parts of the key findings above are not applicable to our school as follows:

- Our IEPs do specify appropriate testing accommodations for each child and they are implemented in the classroom as well as on City/State Exams.
- Our IEPs do regularly include behavioral plans such as a Functional Behavioral Plan and a Behavior Intervention Plan. These plans are created collaboratively by the teacher, IEP Coordinator and the Guidance Support Staff.
- Classroom teachers use the Performance Indicator checklist as a guide to set/meet their modified promotional criteria.
- Our IEP Coordinator weekly reviews SEC Report to monitor compliance and implementation of mandates. She ensures that providers have registered first attend dates.
- All service providers generate a schedule according to student's mandates and a copy is kept in the Main Office. This schedule was conscientiously created to best serve the student's needs.
- Classroom and cluster teachers adapt lessons and modify content area materials to student's instructional level.
- Classroom and cluster teachers differentiate instruction within the classroom.
- Related service providers maintain progress reports for each of their students. This progress is regularly shared with the classroom teacher, IEP teacher and parent.
- All classroom teachers, cluster teachers and related service providers are given up-to-date copies of each child's IEP as per Chapter 408.
- 96% of our special ed students made one year progress in ELA and 86% of our special ed students made one year progress in Math.

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.

Our school will continue to address the needs of our students by adapting grade level curriculum to individual student's instructional levels. The PS 277 staff will continue to collaboratively plan to maximize each individual student's performance.

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: **Jun 18, 2008** Email address: **jf3@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	22K277
School Name	P.S. 277 The Gerritsen Beach School
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 37,167
Principal Name	Jeanne M. Fish
Principal Email	JFish3@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7187436689

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

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

Before- and After-School Programs	\$ 0
Summer School Programs	\$ 0
Dedicated Instructional Time	\$ 37,167
Individualized Tutoring	\$ 0

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

Contracts for Excellence funds will be utilized to increase student time on task. Specifically, instructional time will be dedicated to providing intervention to our students who recently passed the NYSESLAT in 2008. In addition, any students newly admitted to non-entry grades will be included in this initiative.

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 efforts to offer individualized tutoring (provided by qualified staff as a supplement to general curriculum instruction and targeted to students not meeting State standards)?

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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