



**P138M**



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

**SCHOOL: (D75/MANHATTAN/75M138)**  
**ADDRESS: 144 EAST 128<sup>TH</sup> STREET**  
**TELEPHONE: 212 369-2227**  
**FAX: 212 427-6608**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

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

**SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE**

**Part A. Narrative Description**

**Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot**

**SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS**

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009**

**APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM**

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

**APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION**

**APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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

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

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

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

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

SCHOOL NUMBER: P138M SCHOOL NAME: N/A

DISTRICT: 75 SSO NAME/NETWORK #: 2

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 144 East 128<sup>th</sup> Street, NY, NY 10035

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 212 369-2227 FAX: 212 427-6608

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Jacqueline Keane EMAIL ADDRESS: [Jkeane@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:Jkeane@schools.nyc.gov)

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON**

Audra Vanderland

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jacqueline Keane

**PRINCIPAL**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michelle Arellano

**UFT CHAPTER LEADER**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Patricia Jewett

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION  
PRESIDENT**

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bonnie Brown

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SUPERINTENDENT**

## SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position/Constituency Represented	Signature
Jacqueline Keane	*Principal or Designee	
Michelle Arellano	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Patricia Jewett	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
N/A	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
N/A	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
N/A	Student Representative, if applicable	
Fatima Espaillat Wagner	Parent, P48	
Lillie Smith	Parent, P33	
Sarah Chavis	Parent, Park West HS	
Elyse Jaeger	Teacher, Park West HS	
Audra Vanderland	Teacher, J47; Chairperson	
Kimberly Ramones	Teacher, I90	
Victoria Walden	Teacher, P33	
Teaque Smith	Paraprofessional, P30	
Lindsay Friedman	Speech teacher, P48	
Andrea Weiner	Operations Liason, P138	

\* 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**

P138M is a Special Education cluster school with seven sites and five special education programs. Our main site is located in P30, an East Harlem elementary school. Our community school offsites, two elementary, two middle schools, one middle/high school and one high school, are located in neighborhoods spanning the borough of Manhattan - from Washington Heights to Harlem to Midtown to Gramercy Park to Chelsea – and include a wide diversity of communities and cultures.

With the support of our home, general education, and community partners, and through focused instructional planning, we are continually expanding student options for participation in learning experiences in school, at work, and in the larger community. The entire school community, with the support of professional consultants, is committed to creating and expanding programs with clear expectations to support greater student independence, build self-esteem and instill a commitment to personal excellence.

All P138M students have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and receive the full continuum of services including Special Education Teacher Support Services, integrated inclusion classes, instruction in self-contained classes, and related services including speech, hearing, vision, counseling, occupational and physical therapy. Nurses provide the specialized medical services required by a number of our students. Additionally, English language learners (ELLs) are served in two bilingual classes, a push-in English as a Second Language (ESL) program, and/or by alternate placement classroom paraprofessionals proficient in the student's native language.

It is our mission to build highly specialized instructional programs to best serve our students. Our broad strategy of person centered planning, and the educational implications of functional, alternate and standard assessments, drive the development of meaningful and appropriate goals, objectives and instructional strategies for each student.

Students performing in the moderate to profound range of developmental disabilities, many who are additionally challenged by physical and sensory disabilities, participate in communication rich programs focused on integrating experiential learning in naturally occurring, "real world" settings that are essential to expanding their capacity to achieve high standards of independence in school, at home, at work, and in the community. For many, technology is the key to providing effective individual communication systems.

In classes implementing TEACCH and sensory integration strategies, students with autism are taught skills through numerous and structured functional learning opportunities and challenging behaviors are addressed through systematic reinforcement of appropriate alternatives.

Students challenged with severe emotional disabilities receive guidance and behavioral supports, as well as instruction in all academic areas. Strategies for turning student crises into opportunities for learning and that teach students effective choice making and self-regulation skills are implemented.

Three 12:1:1 ratio classes serve students who are deaf or hard of hearing and use cochlear implants or hearing aids. This Auditory-Oral program is committed to maximizing auditory skills for learning spoken language and intelligible speech.

Students in the seven inclusion classes and one Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) class attend early childhood, elementary or middle school classes with their non-disabled peers in our community school sites.

The majority of our students in classes for children with emotional challenges, and all students in the Auditory-Oral classes participate in the same standardized assessments as their general education peers. All other students participate in alternate assessments such as the Brigance Inventories, Assessment of Basic Language Learning Skills (ABLLS), and the NYS Alternate Assessment (NYSSA). Academic Intervention Services (AIS) provide additional targeted assistance, needed by students at risk, to achieve high learning standards.

## **SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

---

The Administrative Cabinet, School Leadership Team and SCEP committee reviewed the 2007-08 SCEP goals, action plans and indicators of success, the Quality Review, and NYS assessment results including the NYSAA results for students in alternate assessment classes. Additional sources of data pertinent to our school and students were the Periodic Assessments, the results of the Inquiry Team action plan, Brigance Inventories data, teacher made assessments and ongoing surveys of instructional and professional strengths and needs.

---

### **PERFORMANCE TRENDS**

- Based on a comprehensive review of all summative and formative data available to the SCEP committee, we have observed an ongoing, gradual increase in the number of students in standard assessment grades three through six performing at levels 2 and 3 on NYS ELA, math, social studies and science exams. Students in the auditory/oral classes, due to the nature of their disability, experience difficulties with processing language which significantly impact their performance as reflected in their ELA level 1 scores; however, their math scores are in the level 2 to 3 range.
- We have seen continued growth of our students in alternate assessment classes, particularly in the areas of communication for socialization and self-regulation as measured by Brigance Inventories, Inquiry checklists and video documentation; and independence as demonstrated by self-generated questions and independent completion of work, and documented in workstation skills data collection tools. While growth is apparent, communication deficits impact opportunities for fulfilling social interactions and successful learning experiences, and continued work in these areas is a priority.
- Behavioral data clearly indicates the escalation of physical confrontations among our students with emotional challenges (one 12:1:1 and three 8:1:1 classes), the majority of whom are now fifth and sixth graders. While most students remain on task during literacy and math blocks with their homeroom teachers, aggressive behaviors significantly increase during afternoon instruction with some coverage teachers. It is critical that we strengthen our positive behavior support systems and implement them programmatically to decrease incidents.
- Despite ongoing outreach efforts, we have seen only sporadic, slight increases in the level of parental/family involvement in PTA meetings, workshops, and other school activities. A close review of the subgroups of parents/families most involved appears to indicate parents/families of students in our early grades and in elementary inclusion programs. It is crucial that we increase parental/family involvement in order to expand and sustain positive outcomes for our students.

**OUR FOCUS** Based on data reviewed, P138M will make a concerted effort to address achievement of all students, with a focus on the following priorities for improving student performance:

### **ELA**

A comprehensive review of all core academic areas and deficit areas, in particular, for all students in standardized instruction, indicates that poor listening, specifically the inability to take notes while focusing on material read, negatively impacts ELA exams performance and general student achievement. We will improve our data review system and item/skill analysis to increase staff skills for planning effective targeted interventions.

### **COMMUNICATION SKILLS**

A comprehensive review of Brigance data, video documentation and Inquiry checklists (including CARS, EASIC, and D75 Communication Profile segments) indicates that alternate assessment students are demonstrating increasingly positive choice and decision making skills, as well as strategies for requesting of and/or directing of others; student communication for socialization has also expanded. Students with autism were selected as our Inquiry target group because they demonstrated severe communication deficits, persistently impeding their ability to self regulate behavior. Forty-five percent of the group met goals; thirty percent approached mastery; twenty-five percent made limited progress. We will continue to build teacher capacity for implementing strategies for improvement and will increase use of technology and improved formats for identifying patterns, trends and comparisons of progress and performance data.

### **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Our June 2008 staff survey reflected the ongoing requests by staff to participate in intermediate and advanced TEACCH training; to continue intervisitations to model classrooms; and to meet with cohorts for instructional planning and sharing of effective strategies. Additionally, there were a number of requests for professional development addressing positive behavior support strategies. We will continue to strategically link professional development to school priorities.

### **TECHNOLOGY**

As part of the D75 TANGO pilot program, students and staff in one 12:1:4 class receive hands-on support for integrating this high tech device, a SmartBoard and digital cameras. A review of anecdotal data and video documentation indicates an increase in communication to answer questions and for socialization using technology. Going forward, a quantitative tool for classroom data collection will be designed and implemented, increasing staff accountability for instructional actions and outcomes.

### **POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORTS**

A review of anecdotal behavior data indicates a significant increase in the number of incidents of aggressive behavior among students in 12:1:1 and 8:1:1 classes. The need for a more effective, consistent, programmatic positive behavior support program is clear. This process had begun, as documented in minutes of PBIS meetings. Clearly defined expectations, a refined points system, and the use of student checkbooks are among the improvements made and about to be rolled out.

### **PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT**

The results of a P138M parent survey revealed a strong preference for changing the time, and in many cases, the day of PTA meetings/workshops. A significant number of parents requested workshops addressing behavior strategies. This indicates the need for P138M to reschedule future meetings and to develop a series of positive behavior workshops to increase parental participation.

### **DATA ANALYSIS**

The Quality Review report noted our ongoing collection of extensive data, but also our need to: Increase use of technology and improve formats for identifying progress/performance patterns/trends; analyze and use data more effectively to plan instructional interventions; and expand comparison of data to that of similar groups of students. Needs will be addressed in context of the above focus areas

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

## **GREATEST ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- P138M's greatest accomplishments over the past few years include the following:
- An increasing number of teachers are attending intermediate and advanced levels of UNC/Chapel Hill TEACCH training. Two teachers, now qualified trainers, are participating in the D75/UNC TEACCH model classroom project.
- Staff continues to make great strides in implementing exemplary TEACCH and sensory integration strategies and structured classroom design; students are making educationally significant progress.
- Sensory integration, yoga, therapeutic listening and Handwriting W/O Tears best practices continue to be successfully integrated, providing positive behavior supports throughout the instructional day.
- Park West HS students, supported by a Hewlett Packard grant, are creating a weather station. Students are using technology to design communication symbols and a weather tracking data base, accessible to all sites via EChalk.
- Park West HS students will be participating in a Sensory and Social Awareness pilot program designed by Dr. Valerie Paradiz to foster self advocacy skills in students with autism spectrum disorders who are capable of functioning at or near grade level.
- A 12:1:4 class at the main site is in its second year of the D75 TANGO/AAC pilot program.
- Park West HS students are participating in the new D75 Get Ready to Learn pilot project. This daily movement/yoga program is designed to focus students for learning.
- Thirty-two classes are participating, for the second year, in the D75 Brigrance Online pilot program.
- The UFT Teacher Resource Room is entering its third year at J47. The teacher trainer continues to provide hands-on tech support throughout our sites during school hours, and after school professional development.
- The number of high school students working in community based jobs has increased; the number of community based job sites has increased as well.
- Supported by a RESO grant, the integration of SmartBoards, Intellitools and middle/high school Attainment software has significantly expanded interactive student participation in instructional activities throughout our sites.
- Five students travel to/from school independently; nine students are participating in the D75 Independent Travel Training program.
- Seventy-five percent of students participating in NYSAA achieved Level 3 or 4 scores.
- The number of students moving to Less Restrictive Environments (LRE) increased, including one student to the Transition Center and one student to the CTT class.
- P138M received a Well Developed rating for both '06-'07 and '07-'08 Quality Reviews

## **SIGNIFICANT AIDS OR BARRIERS TO IMPROVEMENT**

Aids or Barriers include, but are not limited to, the following:

- > Highly motivated classroom staff and service providers who electively expand their skills by participating in advanced workshops on their own time, at their own expense.
  - > Related service teams working closely with classroom staff to deliver unified services.
  - > Highly successful collaborations with several host community school administrators; need for increased/improved collaborations with others.
  - > Scantron and Acuity data and item/skill analyses and resources supporting targeted instruction and intervention for students in standard assessment classes.
  - > Redesigned Brigance Online pilot program.
  - > Lack of meaningful/useful reports reflecting NYSAA performance data recorded in ATS.
  - > Parent participation in meetings and workshops offered throughout the year continues to be a disappointingly low average of 3%.
  - > Instructional budget reductions negatively impacting programs.
  - > Time and budget constraints limiting professional development opportunities.
  - > Ongoing inability to fully serve students OT, PT, Speech and ESL needs.
  - > Ongoing need for adequate and appropriate space in community school buildings.
  - > Ongoing need for equitable use of host community school facilities.
  - > Insufficient availability of special education substitute teachers appropriately trained to work with our diverse student population.
  - > Absence of an efficient, DOE driven, IEP administrative structure that includes sufficient training and necessary supports.
  - > Contractual restrictions preventing Principal from moving paraprofessionals from site-to-site, Inhibiting staff assignments that would best benefit instructional programs.
-

## **SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS**

- By June 2009, standard assessment classroom staff will participate in ongoing professional activities to improve data analysis and targeted instruction skills; as a result, 20% of students scoring at Level 2 (2008 ELA results) will achieve Level 3 on 2009 ELA assessment.
- By June 2009, students in two elementary 12:1:4 classes will demonstrate a 10% increase in the frequency of communication for academic participation and socialization as evidenced by TANGO Pilot Program assessment data. One class will use TANGO AAC devices exclusively; the second class will use a variety of other AAC devices.
- By June 2009, students in elementary 6:1:1 classes at two sites, and identified as the Inquiry target group, will demonstrate a 10% increase in communication skills resulting in an increase of self-regulatory behaviors as evidenced by Inquiry assessment data.
- By June 2009, students in elementary 12:1:1 and 8:1:1 classes will demonstrate a decrease in the number of physical confrontations as evidenced by a 12% decrease in the number of students requiring level two behavior supports.
- By June 2009, parent participation will increase at rescheduled meetings and requested workshops as evidenced by 15% increase in attendance.

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #1**

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> <i>Goals should be SMART</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By June 2009, standard assessment classroom staff will participate in ongoing professional activities to improve data analysis and targeted instruction skills; as a result, 20% of students scoring at Level 2 ('08 ELA results) will achieve Level 3 on '09 ELA assessment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coach will facilitate August 28<sup>th</sup> PD - "From Assessment to Instruction"</li> <li>AP and coach will facilitate monthly standard assessment cohort meetings/PD; data, skill deficits and instructional strategies will be addressed (emphasis on listening skills)</li> <li>Students will be identified for Academic Intervention Services (AIS) and parents notified</li> <li>Calendars of monthly AIS meetings and AIS student services will be created</li> <li>AP and coach will conduct monthly AIS meetings; AIS plan will be developed</li> <li>Academic cabinet will review/analyze Sept/Oct Scantron reports</li> <li>AIS team will write individual intervention plans: instructional resources will be identified</li> <li>As needed, coach will visit class(es) to observe targeted instruction; will model lessons</li> <li>Coach will provide ongoing follow-up w/teacher(s) to support instructional strategies.</li> <li>Staff will register for D75 professional development workshops, as scheduled</li> <li>Coach will facilitate Nov 4<sup>th</sup> PD - ELA: Prep, Test, Score! (emphasis on listening skills)</li> <li>Academic cabinet will review/analyze Nov/Dec Acuity and Scantron reports</li> <li>Coach/teachers will collaborate for ongoing test prep; additional supports for Aud/Oral w</li> <li>Parent workshops will be scheduled: in December to review score reports, plan home intervention strategies; and in June to discuss ELA/Math test results and plan next steps</li> <li>Coach will meet w/Principal/AP to review NYS data, comparing students/classes/sites</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b></p>	<p>Tax Levy and NYSTL money allocated for: core curriculum and test prep materials Scheduling Implications: common meeting time for standard assessment cohorts and AIS team</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly minutes of cohort and AIS meetings; monthly AIS tracking form.</li> <li>Sept/Oct 2008 Scantron assessments</li> <li>November 2008 Acuity ELA assessment</li> <li>December 2008 Scantron follow-up assessments</li> <li>January 2009 NYS ELA assessment</li> <li>Parent workshop minutes and attendance.</li> <li>20% of students scoring at Level 2 (2008 ELA results) will achieve Level 3 on 2009 ELA assessment, as evident in 2009 score data.</li> </ul>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #2**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** ELA/Communication  
(for Participation/Socialization)

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By June 2009, students in two elementary 12:1:4 classes will demonstrate a 10% increase in the frequency of communication for academic participation and socialization as evidenced by TANGO Pilot Program assessment data. One class will use TANGO AAC devices exclusively; the second class will use a variety of AAC devices.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent surveys for baseline at-home performance will be distributed</li> <li>• OT, teacher, staff developer will design quantitative tool for classroom data collection</li> <li>• Classroom staff will collect baseline data; weekly data will then be collected</li> <li>• Weekly staff meetings will be conducted to plan weekly projects, review progress and discuss instructional intervention strategies</li> <li>• D75 tech team will collect video documentation, quarterly</li> <li>• Ongoing: OT and teacher will customize devices for student responses to Meville to Weville curriculum specific questions; OT will consult w/cluster teachers and make relevant customizations</li> <li>• Daily, students will use TANGO devices to: participate in morning meetings; answer academic questions during instruction; comment during literacy activities.</li> <li>• November 4<sup>th</sup> PD will be conducted</li> <li>• OT and teacher will design: Wh question class activities; spelling activities for identified students; class categorization skill activities</li> <li>• OT and teacher will model integration of new activities.</li> <li>• Parent training will be scheduled/conducted; follow-up will include homework activities</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b></p>	<p>D75 '08 Tech Solutions budget provided: devices, and curriculum materials D75 '09 Tech Solutions budget will provide: device repair services Tax Levy money is allocated for: carrying cases</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed parent surveys of at-home performance</li> <li>• October/November 2008 TANGO and Brigance assessments</li> <li>• Parent attendance at training workshop(s)</li> <li>• February 2009 TANGO assessment.</li> <li>• May 2009 TANGO and Brigance assessments</li> <li>• 10% increase in the frequency of communication for academic participation and socialization as evidenced by TANGO Pilot Program assessment data.</li> </ul>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #3**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** ELA/Communication (for Self-Regulation)

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By June 2009, students in elementary 6:1:1 classes at two sites, and identified as the Inquiry target group, will demonstrate a 10% increase in communication skills resulting in an increase of self-regulatory behaviors as evidenced by Inquiry assessment data.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal will post availability/description of Inquiry Team positions; will select members</li> <li>• Team will meet to review student data, previous assessments</li> <li>• Team will meet to define focus, target population, goals and learning targets</li> <li>• Team will use technology to design a customized assessment system to facilitate identification of patterns/trends of student performance; define benchmarks</li> <li>• Team/classroom staff will collect baseline data</li> <li>• Team will meet to review/analyze conditions of learning</li> <li>• Team will collaborate with teachers re: instructional strategies; share suggestions</li> <li>• Team will disseminate plan to all participants</li> <li>• Team/classroom staff will complete weekly assessment</li> <li>• Team will meet monthly to review data; revise instructional strategies as needed</li> <li>• Classroom staff will participate in PD, intervisitations, cohort collaborations, and professional consultations to support improved instruction</li> <li>• Team will meet to summarize/compare student performance (class to class, site-to-site)</li> <li>• Team and classroom staff will meet to share outcomes; outline “the next step”</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Inquiry Plan money allocated for: materials; per session for Inquiry Team meetings and for staff attending after school/weekend professional development; teacher/para daily substitutes to provide coverage during cohort collaborations and intervisitations to exemplary classrooms; consultant fees</p> <p>Scheduling Implications: common meeting time for participating classroom staff.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications submitted in response to posting</li> <li>• Calendar of Inquiry Team meetings; calendar of PD activities for participating staff</li> <li>• Dissemination of Inquiry plan and assessment tool</li> <li>• Oct/Nov 2008 Brigance assessment and Inquiry checklist</li> <li>• Weekly Inquiry assessment data</li> <li>• February 2009 Inquiry checklist</li> <li>• May 2009 Brigance assessment and Inquiry checklist</li> <li>• 10% increase in communication skills as evidenced by Inquiry assessment data</li> </ul>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #4**

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By June 2009, students in elementary 12:1:1 and 8:1:1 classes will demonstrate a decrease in the number of physical confrontations as evidenced by a 12% decrease in the number of students requiring level two behavior supports.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AP, CIT and guidance counselor will facilitate weekly PBIS meetings</li> <li>PBIS team (AP, coach, guidance counselor and classroom teachers) will define program and examine school culture to customize positive behavior program</li> <li>PBIS team will restructure program (clearly define expectations, refine points system, introduce student checkbooks, etc.)</li> <li>Two assembly programs (one for students; one for parents) will be conducted in November to “kick off” new behavior program</li> <li>New protocol will be rolled out with support of CIT, guidance counselor and AP</li> <li>AP and CIT will turnkey w/ cluster teachers</li> <li>Baseline data will be collected and analyzed for protocol reduction</li> <li>Points competition results for each class will be posted weekly</li> <li>PBIS team will collect/review/analyze ongoing data</li> <li>PBIS team will revisit structure/protocols of program as needed</li> <li>Points competition winning class will receive prize of a field trip (projected for March)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Tax Levy money allocated for: field trip</p> <p>Scheduling Implications: common meeting time for participating classroom staff.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PBIS minutes of monthly meetings</li> <li>Completed PBIS Plan and behavior program protocols</li> <li>Posted display of points earned</li> <li>Monthly behavior data</li> <li>February/June 2009 review of incident report summary</li> <li>12% decrease in the number of students requiring level two behavior supports</li> <li>10% decrease in ORRS reporting</li> </ul>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #5.**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Parent Engagement

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By June 2009, parent participation will increase at rescheduled meetings and requested workshops as evidenced by 15% increase in attendance.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators, SLT and Parent Coordinator will review the revised parent surveys completed by parents, charting parent preferences and interests.</li> <li>• Administrators, SLT and Parent Coordinator will review parent attendance at 2007-08 activities, and identify patterns of attendance.</li> <li>• Principal and SLT will share survey and review information with PTA executive board.</li> <li>• Activities will be scheduled/re-scheduled in response to parent preferences.</li> <li>• A revised calendar will be distributed.</li> <li>• Monthly PC newsletters will highlight upcoming activities.</li> <li>• Arrangements will be made for guest speakers.</li> <li>• Requested workshop presentations will be prepared; some topics will be presented as a series to encourage ongoing participation by parents.</li> <li>• Two announcement/reminder flyers will be sent home prior to each scheduled activity; outreach will also be made by phone.</li> <li>• A school administrator will attend each activity.</li> <li>• Attendance will be documented.</li> <li>• PC will highlight each activity in upcoming newsletter.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Tax Levy money allocated for: materials, transportation, refreshments and para per session to provide after school childcare as needed.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed annual Parent Surveys</li> <li>• Monthly review of parent attendance charts by principal, PC and SLT</li> <li>• Completed parent workshop reviews</li> <li>• 15% increase in parent participation will be evident in attendance data</li> </ul>

## **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	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
4	7	4	4	N/A	0	0	0	0
5	2	3	N/A	5	0	0	0	0
6	9	7	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A
7	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

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

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	<b>Description:</b> Provide a brief description of <b>each</b> of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
<b>ELA:</b>	<p>Acuity and Scantron web-based assessment and intervention programs are used. These programs identify students' present level of academic preparedness, and provide web-based resources to address identified target deficits. In addition, we utilize the NYS ELA Coach test preparation workbooks and the Aim Higher ELA intervention workbooks for additional support. These series of workbooks, along with the teacher guides, provide excellent resources for remediation.</p> <p><i>Services:</i> 1:1 and 2:1 small group tutoring services provided during the school day; 3-4 periods per week (during literacy block and teacher professional option periods)</p> <p><i>Strategies:</i> NYS ELA Coach, Aim Higher</p>
<b>Mathematics:</b>	<p>Acuity and Scantron web-based intervention programs are used as our primary resource for assessment and intervention. In addition, NYS Math Coach, Aim Higher Math Intervention, Everyday Math Games, and the Understanding Math software program are used as additional remediation resources. The Understanding Math software program is excellent for below-grade-level remediation.</p> <p><i>Services:</i> 1:1 and 2:1 small group tutoring services provided during the school day; 3-4 periods per week (during math block and teacher professional option periods)</p> <p><i>Strategies:</i> NYS Coach Math, Aim Higher, Everyday Math Games, Understanding Math software program</p>
<b>Science:</b>	<p>The 4<sup>th</sup> Grade NYS Science Coach is used and provides science content in a very easy-to-understand (user-friendly) format, numerous multiple-choice practice opportunities, and extended response questions typical of those on the actual state exam. Below-grade-level intervention is also provided.</p> <p><i>Services:</i> 1:1 and 2:1 small group tutoring services provided during the school day; 2-3 periods per week (science period and teacher professional option periods)</p> <p><i>Strategies:</i> NYS Science Coach (4<sup>th</sup> grade)</p>
<b>Social Studies:</b>	<p>The 5<sup>th</sup> Grade NYS Coach is used. This material is similar to the Science Coach in that content is very easy to understand and is presented in small, manageable chunks. There are also opportunities to practice exam-type questions and to differentiate for below-grade-level intervention.</p> <p><i>Services:</i> 1:1 and 2:1 small group tutoring services provided during the school day; 2-3 periods per week (social studies period and teacher professional option periods)</p> <p><i>Strategies:</i> NYS Social Studies Coach</p>

<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b>	N/A
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	N/A
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	N/A
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>	N/A

# **P138M 2008-09**

## **Language Allocation Policy (LAP)**

### **APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLS)**

#### **Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) 2008-2009.**

---

District 75                      School: 75M138M                      Principal: Jacqueline Keane

Four hundred-twenty students are enrolled in the 12:1:1, 12:1:4, 8:1:1 and 6:1:1 classes at P138M. According to recent ethnic data, 36% of our student population is Black; 51% is Hispanic; 4.5% is Asian; 8.3% is White and .4% is Native American. Seventy-seven students (18.3% of total register) are identified as ELL students and participate in P138's Bilingual and ESL programs: 14 kindergartners; 6 first graders; 5 second graders; 3 third graders; 16 fourth graders; 7 fifth graders; 5 sixth graders; 5 seventh graders; 14 eighth graders; and 2 tenth graders. Seventy-four students are identified as Spanish speaking, and Cantonese is the identified language of the remaining three students. Of the seventy-seven students, ninety-four percent participate in alternate assessment classes; only five ELL students participate in standardized assessment. Eight alternate assessment ELL students are in Inclusion classes.

Two Spanish bilingual classes provide services to 17 ELL students. Both bilingual class teachers have NYC bilingual licenses; one has NYS bilingual certification as well. Both bilingual classes are elementary alternate assessment classes; one provides services for students with multiple disabilities, the second provides services for students with autism. Expressive and receptive native language development and proficiency of these students is assessed through observation, instructional activities directly eliciting language, and alternate assessment strategies designed by their classroom teachers. Assisted communication strategies including communication devices, picture symbols and modified curriculum materials are implemented for both assessment and instruction.

Forty-six bilingual students participate in alternate assessment monolingual classes with the support of assigned paraprofessionals who speak the students' native languages. The remaining fourteen students are designated as ESL only. Two certified ESL teachers implement the push-in model to provide ESL instruction to forty-four alternate placement and the fourteen ESL Only students.

As indicated above, fourteen students are identified for ESL Only services; forty-six bilingual students are in alternate placement classes. The ESL teachers work collaboratively with classroom teachers and alternate placement paraprofessionals across content areas to ensure that ELLs are receiving appropriate language instruction with an emphasis on ESL and ELA learning standards, NYS alternate grade level indicators and alternate performance indicators. ESL and classroom teachers are able to plan aligned instruction during common preparation periods. ESL services are provided to students identified as ESL Only and to bilingual students in alternate placements. CR Part 154 mandates that these students (58 K-8 students at the Beginner level and two HS students at the Intermediate level) receive 360 minutes (2 units) of weekly ESL instruction, incorporating ESL strategies and materials. Our two NYC licensed ESL teachers utilize the push-in model, but do implement the pull-out model when more appropriate. One certified bilingual teacher provides the mandated ESL services for the one Spanish ELL student in his monolingual class. Whenever possible, students are clustered by instructional needs. Instruction is provided, with required supports and accommodations, during regularly scheduled academic periods.

Our five standard assessment ELL students participate in NYC predictive and NYS assessment programs. Our seventy-two alternate assessment ELL students participate in Brigance, ABLLS and/or NYSAA assessments. Additionally, teachers use informal and alternate methods to assess student progress. Data is reviewed to identify priority target skills and instructional strategies and materials are developed to address the identified skills. The average performance of our five ELL students participating in NYS standard assessments is a Level 2. Standard assessment ELL students and alternate assessment ELL students, as appropriate, participate in NYSESLAT testing. One standard assessment student performed at the Advanced level on the NYSESLAT; four at the Beginner level. One alternate assessment student performed at the Intermediate level; one at the Beginner level. The remaining seventy alternate assessment students are unable to demonstrate the required language skills. In general, during instructional and community based activities, our students are progressing well in communication/speaking and listening skills, but continue to require further remediation for their reading and writing skills.

As indicated above, ninety-four percent of our ELL students participate in alternate assessments. Seventy-five percent of English Language Learners who participated in the NYS Alternate Assessment during the 2007-2008 school year achieved Level 3 or 4 performance scores in each content area assessed, as demonstrated by the scoring data and student work included in their assessment portfolios. P138M's ELL population is

ranking as well in standard content area assessments as their non-ELL counterparts. Of the alternate assessment ELL students, the majority are progressing as well as their non-ELL counterparts.

Students' language and communication skills are significantly compromised by their disabilities and all instruction incorporates assisted language strategies and alternative communication systems. Nearly all of our seventy-two alternate assessment students use adaptive augmentative devices or low tech communication systems. Seventy percent of these students demonstrate beginner receptive and expressive language skills. Of the sixteen ELL students in bilingual classes, approximately one-third have limited skills. Three students with verbal abilities demonstrate beginner English listening and speaking skills. Intermediate English listening and speaking skills are demonstrated by one student with verbal abilities and one student with verbal abilities demonstrates more advanced skills in both listening and expressive tasks. Eleven students in the bilingual classes are nonverbal and are totally dependent on alternate communication systems for their expressive language. Approximately thirty percent of the students in this group are able to use augmentative switches and/or picture symbols independently and spontaneously to communicate. Eight nonverbal students demonstrate beginner English listening/receptive skills, and three students demonstrate intermediate listening/receptive language skills. Any expressive language is demonstrated through the use of picture symbol systems or adapted augmentative communication devices programmed by staff members. Expressive language is demonstrated through the use of picture symbol systems or adapted augmentative communication devices programmed by staff members. Students in our bilingual classes receive the required 180 minutes (1 unit) of Native Language Arts, as well as 360 minutes (2 units) of ESL pursuant to CR Part 154. Due to the nature of our students' disabilities, math, science and social studies content is imbedded within NLA/ELA instruction throughout the day; there is a 60:40 Spanish/English ratio per instructional unit.

ELL students who participate in standard assessment use textbooks, leveled libraries and standards based instructional materials that are aligned to the Department of Education's core curriculum. Our bilingual classes for students who participate in alternate assessment also use classroom libraries that include both Spanish and English fiction and nonfiction books. Nearly fifty percent of the books in each classroom are in Spanish. There is evidence of student work in both English and Spanish, and walls are print rich in each language. These print rich environments include assisted communication symbol coreboards to support each learning center; bilingual classroom/environmental labels and displays; and bilingual word walls when appropriate. Students use picture symbol communication systems; voice output devices, and picture symbol schedules that are developed specifically to meet the individual communication needs of each student. These individual systems support greater independence and increase participation in instructional activities. Additional supports include computer software, books on tape and music CDs. Teachers and students use Mayer Johnson Boardmaker and Writing with Symbols software to create communication materials. Students also have access to adapted books, science resource kits, science big books, thematic literacy sets. Object cues, manipulatives and modified materials further support instruction.

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

Brigance, ABLLS and NYC assessment data is reviewed periodically and target skills and instructional priorities are identified. The implication for the P138 Language Allocation Policy is that ELL students receive the number of units of ESL as required by CR Part 154. To insure that students meet the learning standards and alternate performance indicators, and pass the required state and local assessments, ESL instruction follows the NYESL standards and incorporates ESL strategies. These strategies include cognitive academic language learning approach (CALLA), total physical response (TPR), language experience, whole language, graphic organizers, assisted/augmentative language and cooperative learning to provide the differentiated instruction required to meet our students' varied needs. The use of technology is incorporated to give students additional instructional support. The classroom libraries and adapted books include a variety of books on all levels reflecting the background, needs and strengths of the ELL students. The students' level of literacy in their native language aids in the acquisition of English Language skills by having them transfer knowledge of their native language into the target language. Academic language is developed in collaboration with classroom teachers, content area teachers and the ESL teachers. Curriculum mapping and scaffolding strategies aid in the development of an academic language curriculum for our students.

Presently we do not have students identified as SIFE. At such time that we do have SIFE students, we will provide remedial ESL instruction. Identified students are mandated to receive the appropriate number of mandated ESL instructional units per CR Part 154. Units of study would be developed in partnership with the ESL, cluster and homeroom teachers. Alternate assessments and teacher observations are used to identify target skills and plan appropriate instruction for new students. Long term ELL students are supported by academic intervention services provided through individual and/or small group instruction, by adapted technology and by assisted communication materials. An Extension of services is provided for students requiring services beyond three years. Our special education students identified for an extension of services all demonstrate language and communication skills, both academic and social, which are severely compromised by their disabilities. They receive specialized instruction and academic intervention services as described for long term ELL students. ELLs are encouraged to transition their skill set from BICS to CALP. Students who no longer require Bilingual or ESL services according to their IEP will be supported for one year with ESL services.

The 2008-2009 academic professional development plan for P138M includes issues pertaining to the education of ELL students, such as the NYSESLAT, learning standards and alternate performance indicators, balanced literacy, teaching of ESL through content areas, math, standardized assessment and alternate assessment, use of technology in ESL education and the adaptation of ESL materials for the education of ELL students with severe disabilities. P138M's teachers and paraprofessionals who serve ELL students will also be supported with coaching services provided by the District 75 and school based instructional coaches. In addition, P138M will ensure the attendance of ESL monolingual teachers and paraprofessionals at district and city level conferences focusing on the education of ELL students.

Options for our ELL special education students are discussed with their parents during IEP and Educational Planning Conferences. Through the school's parent coordinator, P138M will offer parents of ELLs ongoing information in their home languages and translation services are available. A variety of workshops addressing varying aspects of their children's educational, social and emotional growth are conducted throughout the year. Such workshops include: effective parent participation in school activities; home activities to support learning; assessment; learning standards and achievement of goals.

The P138M LAP Committee members are as follows:

Jacqueline Keane, Principal

Susan Guzman, ESL Teacher

Mercedes Florez, BIS Teacher

Revenya Murray, Parent Coordinator

Patrice O'Donnell, P138M Staff Developer

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

---

**Type of Program:** \_\_\_ Bilingual \_\_\_ ESL **X Both**      **Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08: 57**

### **1. Instructional Program**

P138M implements Bilingual, ESL and Alternate Placement programs to ensure that students meet the learning standards, alternate grade level indicators and alternate performance indicators, and achieve high performance levels on state and local assessments. Instruction will be provided to address the mandates of CR Part 154 as follows: The seventeen students in our Spanish bilingual elementary classes are performing at the Beginner level and will receive 180 minutes of Native Language Arts and 360 minutes of ESL instruction per week. Forty-six Alternate Placement and fourteen ESL Only students are to receive 360 minutes of ESL instruction per week: the fifty-eight K-8<sup>th</sup> graders are performing at the Beginner level; the two high school students are performing at the intermediate level.

Seventy-seven students (18.6% of total register of 420 students) are identified as ELL students and participate in P138M's Bilingual and ESL programs. The students are enrolled in 12:1:1, 12:1:4, 8:1:1, and 6:1:1 classes. Seventy-four students are identified as Spanish speaking, and Cantonese is the identified language for the remaining three students. Of the seventy-seven ELL students, ninety-four percent participate in alternate assessment classes; only five ELL students participate in standardized assessment. Eight alternate assessment students are in Inclusion classes and two bilingual classes provide services to the remaining 17 ELL students. Both bilingual classroom teachers have NYC Bilingual licenses; one has NYS Bilingual certification as well. Forty-four bilingual students participate in alternate placement monolingual classes with the support of assigned paraprofessionals who speak the students' language. Fourteen students are designated as ESL only.

Our two bilingual classes are alternate assessment classes; one class is for students with multiple disabilities, the second class is for students with autism. Students' language and communication skills are compromised by these disabilities and all instruction incorporates assisted language strategies and alternative communication systems. Approximately two-thirds of the students in the bilingual classes are nonverbal and are totally dependent on alternative systems for their expressive language. Expressive language is demonstrated through the use of picture symbol systems or adapted augmentative communication devices programmed by staff members. In bilingual classes, the minimum required number of minutes of Native Language Arts (180 minutes = 1 unit) is provided to students, as well as the required number of minutes of ESL (360 minutes = 2 units) pursuant to CR Part 154.

Nearly half of our ELL students are in alternate placement. The ESL teachers work in collaboration with the students' subject area and homeroom teachers on lesson plans and methodology to ensure that students are receiving appropriate language instruction with an emphasis on both the ESL and ELA learning standards and alternate performance indicators. ESL services are provided to both students identified as ESL Only and to bilingual students in alternate placement. Our NYC licensed ESL teachers primarily utilize the push-in model, but do implement the pull-out model for select students when more appropriate. Additionally, whenever possible, students are clustered by language and instructional needs. Students are seen during their regular scheduled academic periods and given additional supports to aide them by scaffolding the material.

ELL students who participate in standard assessment use core curriculum materials, leveled libraries, and standards based supplementary instructional materials that are aligned to the Department of Education curriculum. Our bilingual classes for students who participate in alternate assessment also use classroom libraries that include both Spanish and English fiction and nonfiction books. Nearly fifty percent of the books in each classroom are in Spanish. Classroom libraries included adapted books and books on all levels that reflect the background, needs and strengths of the ELL students. There is evidence of student work in both English and Spanish, and walls are print rich in each language. These print rich environments include bilingual word walls, assisted communication symbol coreboards to support each learning center; and bilingual classroom/environmental labels and displays. Students use picture symbol communication systems, voice output devices, and picture symbol schedules that are developed specifically to meet the individual communication needs of each student. These individual systems support greater independence and increase participation in instructional activities. The use of technology is incorporated to give students additional instructional support. Teachers and students use MayerJohnson Boardmaker and Writing with Symbols software to create communication materials. Students also have access to site based adapted books, science resource kits, HarcourtBrace science and social studies books, and thematic literacy materials. Object cues, manipulatives and modified materials further support instruction. To insure that students meet the learning standards and alternate performance indicators, and pass the required state and local assessments, ESL instruction follows the NYESL standards and incorporates ESL strategies such as total physical response, language experience, whole language, graphic organizers, differentiated instruction, assisted/augmentative language and cooperative learning.

Standard assessment ELL students participate in the NYC predictive and NYS assessment programs. Students in alternate assessment classes participate in NYSAA, Brigance and ABLLS assessments. Standard assessment ELL students and alternate assessment ELL students, when appropriate, participate in NYSESLAT testing program. Additionally, teachers use informal and alternate methods to assess students' progress. Data is reviewed to identify priority target skills, and instruction and materials are developed to address the identified skills.

Long term ELL students are supported by academic intervention services provided through individual and/or small group instruction, by adapted instructional technology and by assisted communication materials. An Extension of Services is provided for students requiring services beyond three years. Our special education students identified for an extension of services all demonstrate language and communication skills, both academic and social, which are severely compromised by their disabilities. They receive specialized instruction and academic intervention services as described for long term ELL students.

## **II. Parent/Community Involvement**

Options for our ELL special education students are discussed with their parents during IEP and Educational Planning Conferences. Through the school's parent coordinator, P138M offers parents of ELL students ongoing information in their home languages. A variety of workshops addressing their children's educational, social and emotional growth are conducted throughout the school year (for example: home activities to support learning, assessments, learning standards and achievement of goals, effective parent participation in school activities).

## **III. Staff Development**

Academic professional development activities addressing the education of ELL students include:  
August/September - Curriculum Frameworks, Teaching ESL Through Content Areas, Balanced Literacy;  
November - Standardized and Alternate Assessments, Learning Standards and Alternate Performance Indicators;  
January - Adapting ESL Materials for ELL Students w/ Severe Disabilities, Integrating Technology for ELL Instruction.

D75's instructional coaches also provide support to P138M's teachers and paraprofessionals who serve ELL students. In addition, P138M will ensure the attendance of ESL monolingual teachers and paraprofessionals at district and city conferences focusing on the education of ELL students.

#### **IV. Support Services**

Services are provided to LEP students as recommended in their Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and or the results of state and local assessments. Services include speech, hearing, counseling, and occupational and physical therapy. Academic intervention services are provided as indicated. A Title III Afterschool Program provides supplementary services to participating ELL students.

#### **V. Native Language Assessments**

Students in our bilingual program are all exempt from standardized testing and participate in alternate assessments only. Expressive and receptive native language development and proficiency of the ELL students in our bilingual classes is assessed through observation, instructional activities directly eliciting language, and alternate assessment strategies designed by their bilingual classroom teachers. Assisted communication strategies including communication devices, picture symbols and modified curriculum materials are implementing when assessing students.

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

**School Building: P138M District 75**

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

Number of Teachers 2007-2008				Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals***		Total
Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**		Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program			
2	3	0	0	11	0	16

\* 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.

**P138M's sample schedules are the same as those submitted for 2007-08 school year.**



Language and communication skills of ninety-eight percent of our ELL students are compromised by their disabilities. Therefore, all instruction incorporates assisted language strategies and alternative communication systems. Students use picture symbol communication systems, voice output devices, communication core boards, and picture symbol schedules that are developed specifically to meet the individual needs of each student. These individual systems support greater independence and increase participation in instructional activities. Our bilingual classes have English and Spanish classroom libraries and classroom materials are print rich in each language. Additional supports for all students include adapted books, thematic materials, and computer software (Including MayerJohnson Boardmaker, and Writing with Symbols). Differentiated, best practice strategies are implemented by teachers and alternate placement paraprofessionals to meet our students' varied needs, interests and abilities.

Seventy-five percent of English Language Learners who participated in the NYS Alternate Assessment during the 2007-2008 school year achieved Level 3 or 4 performance scores in each content area assessed, as demonstrated by the data and student work included in their assessment datafolios. P138M's ELL population is ranking as well in standard content area assessments as their non-ELL counter parts. Of the alternate assessment ELL students, most are progressing as well as their non-ELL counter parts. Teachers will reference IEP goals, as well as Brigance and/or ABLLS Fall 2008 assessments, to identify priority target skills. Program effectiveness will be evaluated by 2008-09 NYSAA and Spring '09 Brigance and/or ABLLS data. Informal and alternate methods to address student progress are also used. Title III ELL teacher designed checklists will be reviewed monthly.

### **Parent/Community Involvement**

---

Options for our ELL special education students are discussed with their parents during IEP and Educational Planning Conferences. Through the school's parent coordinator, P138M offers parents of ELL students ongoing information in their home languages. Bilingual school staff members are available to interpret information and discussions during all meeting, phone calls and events during school hours, and a budget is in place to employ staff members to provide interpretation services during afterschool hours when needed. Parents are notified, in writing, of the availability of translation and interpretation services.

Title III supplemental program services are addressed in a special segment of a fall parent meeting. This orientation meeting informs parents of

programs available for their children, as well as scheduled parent workshops.

---

**P138M will provide the following supplemental instructional Title III funded programs:**

**1. Afterschool Program**

Afterschool activities will be conducted in collaboration with the existing United Cerebral Palsy (UCP) afterschool program. The UCP program provides school bus transportation after regular school hours for our participating non-ambulatory and ambulatory special education students. Without such transportation, most students are unable to remain after regular school hours. Six ELL students registered in the UCP program, along with six of their peers who, until recently, were also designated as ELL, will participate in the Title III afterschool program three afternoons each week. Additionally, a small group of approximately six ELL students who are able to travel on public transportation, and whose parents are able to pick them up a minimum of one afternoon each week, will also be included. Metro cards will be provided for these parents (2-way fare) and their children (1 way fare).

The Title III afterschool program will be conducted Tuesday, Thursday and Friday afternoons from 3-5pm. The program will run for twenty weeks, from November through June. Two certified bilingual teachers will provide supplementary instruction one afternoon a week each, and a certified ESL teacher will provide the instruction three afternoons a week. Our goal is to have eighteen students with autism or developmental disabilities attend. Approximately twelve students will participate three days a week; approximately six will participate one or two days a week.

Instruction will be provided as follows:

Tuesdays – Teacher A	Wednesdays – Teacher A and Teacher B	Fridays – Teacher A and Teacher C
3:00pm Individual Instruction	3:00pm Individual Instruction	3:00pm Individual Instruction
3:30pm Individual Instruction	3:30pm Individual Instruction	3:30pm Individual Instruction
4:00pm Small Group Instruction	4:00pm Small Group Instruction	4:00pm Small Group Instruction
4:30pm small Group Instruction	4:30pm Small Group Instruction	4:30pm Small Group Instruction

During the regular school day the students participate in 6:1:1 classes for children with autism or 12:1:4 classes for children with multiple disabilities. In contrast to the regular school day when the students receive instruction in self-contained bilingual classes or as part of the push-in ESL program, the afterschool program will provide opportunities for them to receive direct instruction individually and in small groups of two or three.

Recommended instructional ratios will be maintained for each small instructional group. It is anticipated that this specific and targeted instruction will be very effective for addressing each student's special communication and language needs. Due to the nature and severity of our students' disabilities, expanded opportunities for meaningful instructional and social experiences are always desirable and beneficial. The inclusion of six former English language learners provides just such communication and socialization opportunities for our participating students currently identified as ELLs. The afterschool program will provide time, focus and intense supports to positively impact student progress towards meeting learning standards and successfully achieving NYS alternate grade level indicators, and alternate performance indicators.

Small group instruction is an effective way to further differentiate instruction. Students develop interpersonal skills, learning to relate to their peers and to help each other through these structured interactions. Teachers have additional time to reinforce instruction and provide personal feedback, and students have more opportunities for active involvement in learning. Individual and small group instruction raises the level of supported instruction for our most challenged students. The benefits of these instructional strategies are supported by extensive research as represented by the following small sampling: *The Power of Small Group Instruction* by Theresa London Cooper; the Channel 13 Cooperative and Collaborative

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

Learning series; *Motivating Small Groups to Learn* by Dorit Sasson; and *Small Group Instruction* by Prof. Eugene R. Watson of UNC at Chapel Hill.

Our primary instructional objective is to increase student independence. To this end, it is necessary to expand the English language proficiency and communication skills of our ELL students. A wide variety of differentiated materials and communication systems will be developed by teachers to enhance hands-on experiential instruction for students participating in the afterschool program. Additionally, commercially published/produced materials will be purchased to further support best instructional practices.

ELL teachers will reference IEP goals, as well as Brigance and/or ABLLS Fall '08 assessments to identify priority target skills. Program effectiveness will be evaluated by '08-09 NYSAA and Spring '09 Brigance/ABLLS data. Teacher designed checklists will be reviewed monthly.

## **2. Saturday Staff Professional Development Workshops**

---

Two bilingual and two ESL teachers will participate in two Saturday curriculum development workshops.

Workshops will be conducted in November and December 2008, from 8am to 12noon at the P30 site.

A collegial review will be conducted during a working lunch.

Participants will receive the per session rate of pay.

The objective is to develop ELL curriculum activities incorporating best practices and strategies.

Teachers will also have the opportunity to make supplementary differentiated materials and structured tasks to support instruction for ELL students.

A third Saturday curriculum development workshop will be conducted in February 2009, from 9am to 1pm at the P30 site.

One bilingual and one ESL teacher will facilitate this workshop for twelve teachers and bilingual paraprofessionals who provide services to ELL students in alternate placement classes.

A collegial share and review will be conducted during a working lunch.

Facilitators will receive the per session rate of pay.

Participants will receive the training rate of pay.

The objective is to maximize the impact of materials created by collaborating with classroom staff who provide services to ELL students in alternate placement classes.

## **3. Saturday Parent/Student Workshop(s)**

---

Two bilingual teachers and two ESL teachers will conduct one workshop for twelve parents and their children who are designated as English language learners. Six bilingual paraprofessionals will assist to facilitate hands-on participation by students and their parents.

A share and review will be conducted during a working lunch.

Lunch will be provided for participating students and their parents.

Metro cards will be provided for participating students and their parents.

The workshop will be conducted in March 2009, from 10am to 1pm at the P30 site.

The objective is to demonstrate effective strategies for parents to implement at home and in the community. Hands-on activities will include students. Bilingual paraprofessionals will then work with students in a separate classroom while parents have the opportunity to make differentiated instructional materials to use at home with their children.

(If participation is positive, an additional workshop will be scheduled as the budget allows.)

**Form TIII – A (1)(b)**

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

<b>Allocation:</b> \$15,000.		
<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Budgeted Amount</b>	<b>Explanation of Proposed Expenditure</b>
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	\$14,086.32	<p><b>Teacher per session/afterschool program</b>            1 teacher @ 120 hrs = 120hrs @ 49.73 = \$5967.60            2 teachers @ 36 hrs each = 72hrs @ 49.73 = \$3580.56</p> <p><b>Teacher and para per session for Saturday workshop(s)</b>            4 teachers @ 8hrs each = 32hrs @ 49.73 = \$1,591.36 (PD Wksp)            2 teachers @ 4hrs each = 8hrs @ 49.73 = \$397.84 (PD Wksp)            4 teachers @ 3hrs each = 12hrs @ 49.73 = \$596.76 (Parent Wksp)            6 paras @ 3hrs each = 18hrs @ 27.70 = \$498.60 (Parent Wksp)</p> <p><b>Teacher and para training rate for Saturday workshop</b>            6 teachers @ 4hrs each = 24hrs @ 22.65 = \$543.60            6 paras @ 4hrs each = 24hrs @ 27.70 = \$664.80</p> <p><b>Secretary per session for payroll entry as described above</b>            1 sec'y @ 8hrs = 8hrs @ 30.65 = \$245.20</p>
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	\$0	N/A
Supplies and materials	\$553.68	ESL materials, software, and adaptive supplies for afterschool program and Saturday workshops
Travel	\$240.00	<p><b>Metro Cards for participating students/parents</b>            40 trips @ \$4 (parent/roundtrip) = \$160.            40 trips @ \$2 (student/one way) = \$80.</p>
Other	\$120.00	<p><b>Lunches for Saturday workshops</b>            1 Parent/Student Wksp (24 participants) = \$120.</p>

<b>TOTAL</b>	\$15,000.00	

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

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

School District D75 P138M

For Title     **III**    

BEDS Code 307500011138

<i><b>CODE/ BUDGET CATEGORY</b></i>	<i><b>EXPLANATION OF EXPENDITURES IN THIS CATEGORY (as it relates to the program narrative for this Title)</b></i>
<p><i><b>Code 15</b></i> <i><b>Professional Salaries</b></i> \$12,677.72</p>	<p><b>Teacher per session/afterschool program</b>            1 teacher @ 120 hrs = 120hrs @ 49.73 = \$5967.60            2 teachers @ 36 hrs each = 72hrs @ 49.73 = \$3580.56  <b>Teacher per session for Saturday workshop(s)</b>            4 teachers @ 8hrs each = 32hrs @ 49.73 = \$1,591.36 (PD Wksp)            2 teachers @ 4hrs each = 8hrs @ 49.73 = \$397.84 (PD Wksp)            4 teachers @ 3hrs each = 12hrs @ 49.73 = \$596.76 (Parent Wksp)  <b>Teacher training rate for Saturday workshop(s)</b>            6 teachers @ 4hrs each = 24hrs @ 22.65 = \$543.60</p>
<p><i><b>Code 16</b></i> <i><b>Support Staff Salaries</b></i> \$1,408.60</p>	<p><b>Para per session for Saturday workshop(s)</b>            6 paras @ 3hrs each = 18hrs @ 27.70 = \$498.60 (Parent Wksp)  <b>Para training rate for Saturday workshop(s)</b>            6 paras @ 4hrs each = 24hrs @ 27.70 = \$664.80  <b>Secretary per session for payroll entry as described above</b>            1 sec'y @ 8hrs = 8hrs @ 30.65 = \$245.20</p>
<p><i><b>Code 40</b></i> <i><b>Purchased Services</b></i></p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>
<p><i><b>Code 45</b></i> <i><b>Supplies and Materials</b></i> \$553.68</p>	<p><b>ESL materials, software, and adaptive supplies</b> for afterschool program and Saturday workshops \$553.68</p>

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

School District D75 P138M  
BEDS Code 307500011138

Title III

<i>Code 80</i> <i>Employee Benefits</i>	Included in Professional and Support Staff Salaries
<i>Code 90</i> <i>Indirect Cost</i> \$360.00	<b>Metro Cards for participating students/parents</b> 40 trips @ \$4 (parent/roundtrip) = \$160.00 40 trips @ \$2 (student/one way) = \$80.00 <b>Lunches for Saturday workshops</b> 1 Parent/Student Wksp (24 participants) = \$120.
<i>Code 49</i> <i>BOCES Services</i>	Not Applicable
<i>Code 20</i> <i>Equipment</i>	Not Applicable

### **APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION**

**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.
  - **Parents who may require written translation and oral interpretation services are initially identified by:  
A review of: ATS Home Language, POB/Lang/Geo (RPB) and ELL reports;  
A review of IEPs indicating parents' preferred language.**
  - **Specific details of individual translation and interpretation needs are ascertained by:  
Review of information provided in the annual parent Interests/needs survey**
  
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.
  - **According to recent data, fifty-one percent of our students/families are Hispanic and 4.5% are Asian. The majority of our Hispanic families require written translation and/or oral interpretation services to ensure a full understanding of the educational process for their children and a timely awareness of other pertinent information relating to the school community. Two Asian students are identified as English language learners and both families require translation and/or interpretation services.**
  - **Professional development activities, School Leadership Team meetings, IEP conferences, staff and PTA meetings present ongoing opportunities for raising staff awareness of parental needs and the school's responsibility to provide written translations and/or verbal interpretations as necessary and the availability of these services**

---

**LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION**

*CONTINUED*

---

**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.
  - **Spanish and Chinese language documents and forms are distributed and used when appropriate (ex. DOE publications, IEP forms).**
  - **School generated written materials for families are translated in a timely manner by school staff members, and these bilingual materials are sent to all households simultaneously.**
  - **School staff members translate parents' written communications to the school.**
  - **In the event a document cannot be translated in time (ex. before student boards school bus to return home at the end of the day), the parent will be called by a bilingual staff member and/or a note will be sent in the parent's native language indicating the item(s) of importance and requesting that a bilingual family member translates it for the parent.**
  - **NYCDOE Translation/Interpretation services will be used as needed.**
  
2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A.
  - **Bilingual school staff members are available to interpret information and discussions during all meetings, phone calls, events and IEP conferences conducted during school hours.**
  - **A budget is in place to employ staff members to provide interpretation services during afterschool hours, when needed.**
  
3. Describe how the school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services.
  - **Parents are notified, in writing, of the availability of translation and interpretation services. Information on how to obtain these services is included.**
  - **The *Notice for Parents Regarding Language Assistance Services* is posted at all school sites.**
  - **The NYCDOE Translation and Interpretation Unit will be contacted for assistance in the event that we are unable to provide esoteric language services.**
  - **The Parents' Bill of Rights and Safety Plan Procedures are provided to parents in their native languages.**

## APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

### NOT APPLICABLE

*All Title I schools must complete this appendix.*

#### **Directions:**

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

#### **Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES**

1. Enter the anticipated Title I allocation for the school for 2008-2009\_\_\_\_\_
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

**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<sup>1</sup> Phase/Group (If applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified.
  - (a) Provide the following information: 2008-09 anticipated Title I allocation = \$\_\_\_\_\_ ; 10% of Title I allocation = \$\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement.

---

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

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.

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

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

---

**CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS**

**KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM**

Overall: There was limited evidence found to indicate that the ELA and mathematics curricula in use are fully aligned to state standards. Although New York City is a standards-based system, teachers do not have the tools they need to provide standards-based instruction to all students at all levels, particularly ELLs. There is a lack of understanding across teachers, schools, and audited districts regarding what students should understand and be able to do at each level in ELA and mathematics.

***1A. English Language Arts***

**Background**

A curriculum that is in alignment will present the content to be taught (as outlined by the state standards), with links to the following: an array of resources from which teachers may choose in teaching this content; a pacing calendar and/or suggested timeframe for covering the curriculum material; a description of expectations for both the teacher's role and the student level of cognitive demand to be exhibited; and a defined set of student outcomes—that is, what the student should know and be able to do as a result of having mastered this curriculum. The New York State ELA Standards identify seven different areas of reading (decoding, word recognition, print awareness, fluency, background knowledge and vocabulary, comprehension, and motivation to read) and five different areas of writing (spelling, handwriting, text production, composition, motivation to write) that are addressed to different degrees across grade levels. Although listening and speaking are addressed within the New York State ELA Standards, they are not further subdivided into topic areas. A written curriculum missing literacy competencies or performance indicators at any grade level will impact the alignment of the curriculum to state standards. A written curriculum that does not address the areas in reading identified by the state standards will also impact vertical and horizontal alignment within and between schools by creating gaps in the Grades K–12 curriculum. *Vertical alignment* is defined as the literacy knowledge addressed at a grade level that builds upon and extends learning from the previous grade level, whereas *horizontal alignment* refers to agreement between what is taught by teachers addressing a common subject across a single grade level.

## ELA Alignment Issues:

- **Gaps in the Written Curriculum.** Data show that the written curriculum in use by many schools is not aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required. All reviewed curricula had gaps relative to the New York State ELA standards. The fewest gaps were found at Grade 2, but the gaps increased as the grade levels increased. Interviewed staff in a number of the schools that were audited reported less consistent and effective curriculum and instruction at the secondary level. These data further indicated that curricula were not adequately articulated—less articulated in secondary than elementary schools.
- **Curriculum Maps.** The curriculum alignment analyses noted that although a number of curriculum maps had been developed, the mapping has been done at a topical level only and does not drill down to an expected level of cognitive demand that will indicate to teachers what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. These curriculum maps addressed only content topics—not skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, or student outcomes to be attained.
- **Taught Curriculum.** The *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)*<sup>2</sup> data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.
- **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

---

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

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. ELA**

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.

**P138M's academic cabinet of lead teachers, school coach and administrators has reviewed and will further review the findings relevant to our students.**

- **The cabinet reviews findings of NYS Alternate Assessment (NYSAA), Brigance Inventory assessment, the Assessment of Basic Language and Learning Skills (ABLLS), and Acuity/Scantron assessments.**
- **Administration will share the findings with the school community at faculty conferences, cohort meetings, SLT/PTA meetings and during PD activities.**

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

**The report supports areas of need that our school exhibits. We follow a standards-based curriculum for all standardized assessment students and align instruction to NYSAA alternate grade level indicators for students participating in alternate assessment. The areas cited in the report, curriculum maps and ELA materials in particular, are the same areas that we find to be challenging for our teachers as they struggle to support their students. Curriculum maps aligned to the state standards have been, and continue to be, a challenge to differentiating the curriculum and meeting the diverse needs of the severely emotionally challenged and learning disabled students that we serve in our standardized classes. Additionally, core curriculum materials do not meet the diverse learning needs of many of these students. The use of formative assessments has provided us with additional evidence that highlights deficit areas. Our students with significant cognitive delays who participate in alternate assessment require differentiated ELA lessons and adaptations throughout their instruction, presenting ongoing challenges to their teachers. Also, an ESL curriculum that meets the varied and special instructional needs of our most disabled students is not available.**

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.

**P138M has begun to analyze data at greater depth to identify skill areas for targeted instruction and to better focus instructional planning. The students that we serve are all identified as having special needs. Eighty-seven percent of our students participate in alternate assessment and due to the severity of their disabilities perform significantly below grade level; thirteen percent of our students with disabilities participate in standardized assessment and the majority of these students are, at minimum, two years below grade level. We recognize that these students will not achieve full proficiency on NYS exams; however these students will eventually achieve standards at a different pace and since they are able to attend school until age twenty-one, we believe this will assist in moving students with special education needs forward.**

**In the absence of a uniform curriculum that addresses the needs of students with severe cognitive disabilities we have turned to the Special Schools District 75 Curriculum Frameworks as well as published curricula such as AbleNet Star Reporter, ABLLS, Syracuse Curriculum and Handwriting Without Tears. In addition, the District 75 Units of Study provide a detailed, structured format to assist in aligning core curriculum instruction to the standards. During professional development and cohort meetings we assist staff in the selection of appropriate components of each curriculum to address learning standards and academic needs of our students. D75 continues to provide support for assessing students and linking findings to the learning standards and IEP goals.**

**While an ESL curriculum that meets the needs of our most disable students is not available, the ESL standards are aligned to the ELA standards. Just as alternate grade level indicators are used to address ELA standards, they are also used to provide access to the ESL standards for our ELL students. Certified ESL and bilingual classroom and speech teachers provide ELL services to students and assist with our efforts to expand ELL professional development; district coaches provide a minimum of 10 hours of ESL training for new teachers. Additionally, paraprofessionals provide native language supports for ELL students in alternate placement classes. With the support of Title III funds, participating ELL students receive supplemental afterschool instruction to enrich their communication/language learning experiences; parent workshops and professional development are also offered.**

**Budgetary support from central is needed to support these specialized curriculum efforts.**

## **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. Math**

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.

**P138M's academic cabinet of lead teachers, school coach and administrators has reviewed and will further review the findings, identifying areas relevant to our students.**

- **The cabinet reviews findings of NYSAA, Brigance Inventory Assessments, and Acuity and Scantron assessments.**
- **Administration will share the findings with the school community at staff faculty conferences, cohort meetings, SLT and PTA meetings, and during professional development activities.**

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

**The report supports areas that challenge our teachers as they struggle to support their students. We follow a standards-based curriculum for all standardized assessment students and align instruction to NYSAA alternate grade level indicators for students participating in alternate assessment. Curriculum materials continue to be a challenge to differentiate the curriculum and to meet the diverse needs of the severely emotionally challenged and learning disabled students that we serve in our standardized classes. In particular, Everyday Math does not provide sufficient instructional time for our students to gain understanding and retain mathematical knowledge. The use of formative assessments has provided us with additional evidence that highlights deficit areas. Our students with significant cognitive delays who participate in alternate assessment require differentiated lessons and adaptations throughout their instruction, presenting ongoing challenges to their teachers.**

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

**P138M has begun to analyze data at greater depth to identify target skills for instruction and to better focus instructional planning. The students that we serve are all identified as having special needs. Eighty-seven percent of our students participate in alternate assessment and due to the severity of their disabilities perform significantly below grade level; thirteen percent of our students with disabilities participate in standardized assessment and the majority of these students are, at minimum, two years below grade level. We recognize that these students will not achieve full proficiency on NYS exams; however these students will eventually achieve standards at a different pace and since they are able to attend school until age twenty-one, we believe this will assist in moving them forward. In the absence of a uniform curriculum that addresses the needs of students with severe cognitive disabilities, we have turned to the Special Schools District 75 Curriculum Frameworks as well published curricula such as Attainment Math, and Checks and Balances functional curriculum. Math Steps, intended as a supplement, has been a better resource for instruction and mastery of mathematics skills for our students. In addition, the District 75 Units of Study provide a detailed, structured format to assist in aligning core curriculum instruction to the standards. Our focus is on functional mathematics (ex. numeration, time, money, budgets, measurement, computation, word problems) including the use of technology and community based instruction. During PD and cohort meetings we assist staff in selecting appropriate components of each curriculum to address learning standards and academic needs of our students. D75 continues to provide support for assessing students and linking findings to learning standards and IEP goals.**

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

**Budgetary support from central is needed to support these specialized curriculum efforts.**

**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:

***ELA Instruction***

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.

**P138M's academic cabinet of lead teachers, school coach and administrators reviewed and will further review the findings, identifying the areas relevant to our students.**

- **The cabinet reviews Inquiry Team findings, Brigance, ABLLS and NYSAA assessment data, as well as Acuity and Scantron reports.**
- **The administration will share the findings with the school community at staff faculty conferences, cohort meetings, SLT and PTA meetings, and during professional development activities.**

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

**The use of research based and best practices is evident by formal and informal observations, monitoring of such practices, and data indicative of positive outcomes. These practices include, but are not limited to TEACCH, PECS, Handwriting Without Tears, Therapeutic Listening, Augmentative Alternative Communication, Adaptive Technology, Getting Ready to Learn, and community based experiential instruction. Our observations show that to meet our students unique and varied learning styles, a *strategic* balance of differentiated direct instruction, interactive learning, individualized seatwork and independent workstations is evident in all classrooms.**

**We align instruction to the learning standards for all students and differentiate the curriculum to meet the diverse needs of our students with severe cognitive and/or emotional challenges, as well as our students on the autism spectrum and those with multiple disabilities. We are continually creating specialized learning opportunities to meet the individual goals of our diverse student population.**

**Budgetary support from central would assist us in expanding these specialized instructional efforts.**

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.

N/A

**2B – Mathematics Instruction**

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80% of K–8 math classes, it was observed at this level only in 45% of the high school math classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52% of Grades K–8 and 35% of Grades 9–12 math classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the math classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 math classes was frequently or extensively seen 75% of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65% 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 math 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.

**P138M's Academic Cabinet of lead teachers, school coach and administrators have reviewed and will further review the findings, identifying areas relevant to our students.**

- **The cabinet reviews Brigance and NYSSA assessment data, as well as Acuity and Scantron reports.**
- **Administration will share the findings with the school community at faculty conferences, cohort meetings, SLT and PTA meetings.**

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

**Observations show that a strategic balance of differentiated direct instruction, interactive learning, individualized seatwork and independent workstations is evident in all classrooms. The use of research based and best practices is evident by formal and informal observations, monitoring of such practices, and data indicative of positive outcomes. Practices include, but are not limited to TEACCH, PECS, Therapeutic Listening, Augmentative Alternative Communication, Adaptive Technology, Getting Ready to Learn, use of manipulatives and real life materials, and community based experiential instruction.**

**We align instruction to the learning standards for all students, as well as the math alternate grade indicators, and differentiate the curriculum to meet the diverse needs of our students with severe cognitive and/or emotional challenges, as well as our students on the autism spectrum and those with multiple disabilities. We are continually creating specialized learning opportunities to meet the individual goals of our diverse student population.**

**Budgetary support from central would assist us in expanding these specialized instructional efforts.**

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.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

N/A

**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.

**P138M's administrative cabinet of administrators and lead teachers has reviewed and will further review the findings, identifying areas relevant to our school.**

- **The cabinet reviews school personnel records and CEP school profile data.**
- **Administration will share the findings with the school community at faculty conferences, SLT and PTA meetings.**

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?

**We do not have a high teacher turnover rate. The opening of additional classes has been the primary reason for the addition of new teachers in recent years. A review of the CEP School Profile demographics and school personnel data indicates that the majority of teachers have been on staff for more than five years. We are fortunate to have a staff of highly qualified teachers: eighty-eight percent have a Masters Degree or higher; and 100% of our core classes are taught by "highly qualified" teachers according to NCLB/SED definition. P138M continues to provide professional development opportunities and instructional supports to build capacity among staff. Positive feedback on annual staff surveys reflects appreciation of these supports, increasing confidence, and work satisfaction.**

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

N/A

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

**P138M's academic cabinet of lead teachers (including BIS and ESL teachers), school coach, staff developer and administrators has reviewed and will further review the findings, identifying areas relevant to our students.**

- **Staff completes an annual survey of professional development interest and needs.**
- **Staff has access to the online professional development catalog of workshops; teachers receive, via e-mail, the Chancellor's *Teachers' Weekly* which highlights professional development opportunities.**
- **A log of PD activities and registered staff is maintained.**
- **The administration will share the findings with the school community at faculty conferences, cohort meetings, SLT and PTA meetings, and during professional development activities.**

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

**Teachers and paraprofessionals have access to information about professional development opportunities from a variety of sources. However, few take advantage. Our professional development logs indicate that only our ESL teachers have been registering and attending ELL workshops.**

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.

- **Academic cabinet will review ELL professional development offerings, highlighting recommendations for our staff.**
- **Memos highlighting recommended ELL professional development opportunities will be distributed to staff at all sites.**
- **School based ELL professional development activities will be expanded and ELL alternate placement classroom staff will be encouraged to attend.**

**Additional support from central, in the form of professional development specifically addressing academic needs of students with severe cognitive and physical disabilities, is needed.**

---

## **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.

**P138M's academic cabinet of lead teachers (including BIS and ESL teachers), school coach, and administrators has reviewed and will further review the findings, identifying areas relevant to our students.**

- **Academic cabinet will review ELL instructional data periodically.**
- **ATS reports (NYSESLAT, LAB-R) will be reviewed and analyzed for progress.**
- **Brigance and ABLLS Assessment data for ELL students will be reviewed and compared with that of their monolingual peers.**
- **Language Allocation Policy (LAP) will be reviewed and updated annually to reflect progress by students in their language acquisition skills, and to address implications for instruction.**
- **Administration will share findings with the school community at faculty conferences, cohort meetings, SLT and PTA meetings, and during professional development activities.**

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

**School coach and lead ESL teacher have access to all ELL assessment data for our students. However, a system for periodic review of ELL instructional and assessment data is not in place. Ninety-four percent of our ELL students have severe cognitive and physical disabilities and participate in alternate assessment. Only sixteen students are in bilingual classes. Therefore, it is important that data and instructional reviews should include teachers and paraprofessionals providing instruction in ELL alternate placement classes.**

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.

- **The academic cabinet will put in place a system for periodic review of all ELL data.**
- **School based ELL data reviews will include ELL alternate placement classroom teachers.**
- **Professional development activities will be expanded, with an emphasis on providing instructional supports to paraprofessionals providing native language supports to ELL students.**

---

**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.

**P138M's cabinet of lead teachers, SETTS, school coach, staff developer and administrators have reviewed and will further review the findings, identifying areas relevant to our school.**

- **The cabinet reviews IEPs, reports cards and assessment reports for student progress.**
- **Teachers complete an annual survey indicating their professional development interests and needs.**
- **Staff has access to the online professional development catalog of workshops; teachers receive, via e-mail, the Chancellor's *Teachers' Weekly* which highlights professional development opportunities.**
- **A log of PD activities and registered staff is maintained.**
- **Administration will share the findings with the school community at faculty conferences, cohort meetings, SLT and PTA meetings.**

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

**P138M's review of needs assessments completed by staff, cohort discussions, classroom observations, IEP reviews, report cards and data indicating positive outcomes reveals an ongoing need to provide professional supports to expand exemplary differentiated instructional models across all classrooms. While ongoing program growth and student progress is apparent, the instructional impact of our students' severe disabilities and the challenge faced by staff to differentiate curriculum to meet their diverse needs drives our professional development priorities. Professional development priorities include both increasing access to the general education curriculum for students participating in standardized assessment and differentiating instructional approaches to alternate grade indicators for students participating in the NYS Alternate Assessment.**

**General education partners who teach our students in inclusive classrooms need continued support addressing the content of students' IEPs, the use of individualized instructional modifications and the incorporation of assessment accommodations into classroom practice to improve the performance of their students with disabilities.**

**All staff should not only be aware of behavior intervention plans, but also develop the skills to implement the behavior intervention processes.**

**Also, the ongoing review of IEPs clearly indicates the need for system-wide CSE/IEP team professional development. Skills must be expanded to ensure the development of IEPs that clearly and accurately articulate student performance as well as instructional and therapeutic needs. Compliance with all procedural and clerical requirements is also a priority.**

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.

**P138M's SETTS teachers collaborate with general education partners to carefully review student IEPs, assist with the design of instructional modifications, and to implement appropriate assessment accommodations. District 75 coaches provide a series of workshops for inclusion teams and on-site support, as needed. Our school based coach conducts professional development activities addressing the core curriculum and learning standards. We continue to collaborate with our general education partners to increase awareness and understanding of our students' diverse learning styles, effective strategies and alternate indicators of success.**

**Staff participation in District 75, school based professional development activities, and classroom intervisitations continues to expand best practice skills and exemplary instructional programs.**

**Time for collaborative and professional development activities for special and general education partners during the school day is extremely limited. An adapted core curriculum, as well as budgetary support for per session activities, is needed from central.**

---

## **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.

**P138M's Pupil Personnel team which includes administrators, lead teachers and IEP coordinator**

- **Reviews IEPs for accommodations and modifications, as well as behavior plans when appropriate.**
- **Administrators observe use of accommodations/modifications during instruction.**
- **Administration will share findings with school based IEP team, instructional staff and related service providers.**

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

7.3: Based on your response to Question 7.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

**A review of our students' IEPs indicates that testing location and time are the most prevalent accommodations addressed. Not included, are appropriate assessment accommodations and modifications required by our students with severe cognitive disabilities to access the curriculum and support positive outcomes.**

**Behavior plans are a required addendum to IEPs for all P138M students with behavioral issues and concerns. However, in some instances the ancillary staff may not be informed of specific plans which impacts implementation of the plan.**

**Core curriculum content and instructional priorities drive the development of IEP goals, objectives and modified promotional criteria for students in standard assessment classes. Therefore, there is an alignment. However, IEP goals and objectives for our**

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

**students who participate in alternate assessment often reflect access and functional skill priority needs, rather than core curriculum content.**

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.

**Teachers and paraprofessionals regularly provide accommodations to student during instruction. Paraprofessionals assist with small groups of students, under teachers' supervision, so the appropriate accommodations can be met and all students have access to the instruction. P138M provides professional development to increase staff knowledge and implementation of appropriate accommodations needed by students to access instruction. We will expand this professional development to include our general education partners.**

**All staff should not only be aware of the IEP Addendum behavior intervention plans, but also develop the skills to implement the behavior intervention processes. Therefore, the IEP and Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) teams will expand their professional development to increase the number of trained staff.**

**Since appropriate accommodations and modifications are not addressed on page 9 of the IEPs for our students in alternate assessment, they are reflected in the present level of educational performance, management needs, and the goals and objectives. Professional development is used to increase staff capacity for developing quality IEPs.**

**Ongoing professional development addresses the alignment of instruction to the standards and alternate grade level indicators.**

**The support of a comprehensive DOE system-wide process, addressing both IEP compliance procedures and IEP content professional development, is needed.**