



I.S.77

2008-09

**SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

SCHOOL: 24 / Q / IS077

ADDRESS: 976 SENECA AVE, RIDGEWOOD N.Y. 11385

TELEPHONE: (718) - 366-7120

FAX: (718) - 456-9512

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: 077 SCHOOL NAME: I.S.77

DISTRICT: 24 SSO NAME/NETWORK #: ICI LSO/ 13

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 976 SENECA AVE. RIDGEWOOD N.Y. 11385

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718- 366-7120 FAX: 718- 456-9512

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Marilyn Berrios & Peter Caccioppoli EMAIL ADDRESS: mberrio@schools.nyc.gov, pcaccio@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON

BETH KUHLMAN

JOSEPH A. MILLER

PRINCIPAL

BETH KUHLMAN

UFT CHAPTER LEADER

RIA TILLERY

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools)

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT

CATHERINE POWIS

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position/Constituency Represented	Signature
Joseph A. Miller	*Principal or Designee	
Beth Kuhlman	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Ria Tillery	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Tabatha Cortez	PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Peggy Swanson	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
Sheina Rivera	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Maribel Rodriquez	Parent	
Yvonne Bosone	Dean/ Social Studies teacher	
Albert Gonzalez	Teacher	
Carlos Canales	Parent Coordinator	
Peter Caccioppoli	Assistant Principal/Data Specialist	

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

Intermediate School 77, located in Ridgewood, Queens, has been designated as an America's Choice Model School, an honor bestowed upon only ten middle schools throughout the United States. This sixth to eighth grade school serves a population of approximately 1,149 students. The majority of the students are Hispanic (73%), while the remainder of the student body is Caucasian (14%) and Asian (8%). Our English Language Learners comprise 14% of our school population.

The motto of IS 77, "A Family of Learners," illustrates the commitment of the faculty and staff to ongoing professional development in order to provide the most up – to-date research-based instruction available. The faculty and staff have participated in a number of initiatives such as Quality Teaching for English Language Learners (Q-TEL) and Expediting Comprehension for English Language Learners (ExCEL). These initiatives have enabled the staff to incorporate best practices in teaching for our sizeable population of English Language Learners. Since many of our students reside in homes where English is a second language, these practices have become invaluable tools for teaching all students. Our parent facilitator regularly holds workshops for parents in English and Spanish as well.

IS 77 recognizes that in order to meet the diverse needs of the students and families of this community, the role of the school should expand beyond traditional teaching and learning. We are preparing our students to become entrepreneurs through Scribbles, our school store. The students, along with faculty members who volunteer their services, work at the store selling a variety of school related items. In addition, our school has maintained an ongoing relationship with P.S. 239, one of our feeder schools. Our sixth and seventh graders visit first grade classes at P.S 239 to teach the younger students reading strategies. These young mentors benefit by serving as role models to the younger students as well as sharpening their own skills in reading.

In addition to the above activities, a new initiative that is taking place this year involves seventh graders participating in the Future Cities Competition. This competition incorporates key disciplinary areas, such as math, science, English, and social studies as well as technology. The goal is for students to create a future city that

will be self-sufficient, self-sustaining, and will enable the students to become aware of the important environmental issues in the world today.

Another new initiative is the teacher-student book club facilitated by the librarian and the literacy coach. The goal of this club is to enable students from different cultures and academic levels to share their understandings about literature and to develop the desire to become life-long readers.

I.S. 77 is a dynamic learning environment that combines the best methods of research-proven educational techniques with caring faculty and staff to serve the specific needs of our students. We are proud of our past accomplishments and look forward to a continued future of academic excellence.

SECTION III – Cont’d

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	I.S.77				
District:	24	DBN:	24Q077	School BEDS Code #:	342400010077

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec.		
Enrollment:					Attendance:				
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)	2006	2007	2008		
Pre-K					92.4	92.9	92.4		
Kindergarten									
Grade 1				Student Mobility:					
Grade 2				(% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3					92.9	94.7	94.8		
Grade 4				Eligible for Free Lunch:					
Grade 5				(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 6	400	382	377		100	100	100		
Grade 7	443	422	383						
Grade 8	397	439	401	Students in Temporary Housing:					
Grade 9				(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 10					4	3	4		
Grade 11				Recent Immigrants:					
Grade 12				(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Ungraded Secondary	24	22	23		59	50	46		
Total	1264	1265	1184						
Special Education Enrollment:					Suspensions:				
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	82	80	83						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	32	35	45	Principal Suspensions	44	23	15		
Number all others	43	43	44	Superintendent Suspensions	26	18	12		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
				Special High School Programs:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants			
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes				Early College HS Participants			
# in Dual Lang. Programs							
# receiving ESL services only	176	166	167	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	10	8	22	(As of October 31; includes all full and part-time staff)	2006	2007	2008
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers			
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	22	16	26
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	5	TBD	2
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender:				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100	100	100
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.1	0.2	0.3	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	73.9	84.1	84.3
Black or African American	4.3	5.0	4.7	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	45.7	58.5	65.2
Hispanic or Latino	71.4	70.1	70.7				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	9.4	9.2	8.9	Percent Masters Degree or higher	87.0	91.0	89.0
White	14.8	15.4	15.4	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	91.1	97.2	98.1
Multi-racial							
Male	52.0	53.6	53.0				
Female	48.0	46.4	47.0				

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:	
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):		<input type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NCLB Restructured – Year <u>4</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____		

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Individual Subject/Area Ratings	Elementary/Middle Level		Secondary Level	
	ELA:	Restructuring Year 4	ELA:	
	Math:	PFR	Math:	
	Science:	IGS	Grad. Rate:	

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-				
Black or African American	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Hispanic or Latino	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Multiracial						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> sh	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Limited English Proficient	X	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Economically Disadvantaged	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	7	8	7			

Key: AYP Status

√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status		

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

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	W
Overall Score	74	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	W
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	8.9	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	W
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	17.9	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	W
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	38.9	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W
Additional Credit	8.3	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	W

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

PROGRESS REPORT- STUDENT PROGRESS

As part of our Year 4 Restructuring Plan here at I.S. 77 that was developed five years ago, we have included a variety of strategies and focused interventions that will likely improve student achievement in English Language Arts with our subgroup English Language Learners. School-wide advisories in which the students worked on the Overcoming Obstacles curriculum also read Jackie's Nine, which is about Jackie Robinson's struggles to make the major leagues. We also created four academics, the Achievement, Believers, Cooperation, and Dynamic. This change leads to smaller learning communities under the direction of an assistant principal, dean, and guidance counselor.

Currently, all classes within the English language arts department are restructured according to the balanced-literacy format that provides daily 90 minutes period blocks. This time frame is utilized by incorporating mini-lessons, work periods, and closings, which is the balanced literacy approach for the Readers and Writers Workshop. The America's Choice curriculum has been revised to support the New York State Learning Standards.

DATA SOURCE- PROGRESS REPORT

Student Progress for English Language Arts:

- Percentage of Students Making 1 Year of progress: 61.2% of our students made at least 1+ year of progress, which is 65.2% of the way from the lowest (40.2%) to the highest (72.4%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 66.4% of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- Average Change in Proficiency for Level 1 and 2 Students: 0.21 is our average change in student proficiency, which is 48.5% of the way from the lowest (0.05) to the highest (0.38) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 46.7% of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- Average Change Lowest 1/3 Students: 81.6% is our average change in proficiency in our lowest 1/3 students, which is 58.9% of the way from the lowest (63.1%) to the highest (94.5%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 63.2% of the way relative to our City Horizon.
The overall score for students' progress was 38.9 out of 60. Additionally, the school received extra credit with two groups. Exemplary gains were shown with our Students with Disabilities

(29.5%) and our Black students (27.3%) in the lowest third. We did not receive credit for our ELL students, Hispanic and Other students in the lowest third.

Student Progress for Mathematics:

- Percentage of Students Making 1 Year of progress: 66.2% of our students made at least 1+ year of progress, which is 67% of the way from the lowest (37.1%) to the highest (80.7%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 65.6% of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- Average Change in Proficiency in Level 1 and 2 Students: 0.41 is our average change in student proficiency, which is 65% of the way from the lowest (0.06) to the highest (0.66) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 73% of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- Average Change Lowest 1/3 Students: 79.8% is our average change in proficiency in our lowest 1/3 students, which is 73.1% of the way from the lowest (48%) to the highest (91.5%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 78.1% of the way relative to our City Horizon.

The overall score for student progress was 38.9 out of 60. Additionally, the school received extra credit on all 5 high-need categories. Our students showed exemplary gains of 37.7% for English Language Learner, 34.8% gains for Students with Disabilities, and 42.7% for Hispanic students in the lowest third citywide. Gains of 45.0% and 41.2% were also shown with our Black students and other students in the lowest third in the city respectively.

PERFORMANCE TRENDS

Data Source: Comparison of Accountability Status Reports and School Report Cards.

MATH PERFORMANCE TRENDS: This year all student groups (8 out of 8) met AYP in mathematics, while last year 1 group (SWDs) did not make AYP, although they met the criterion for Test Performance by qualifying for safe harbor. This year, our SWDs made significant progress and achieved a performance index that exceeded the Effective AMO; therefore, met AYP without the need to qualifying for safe harbor. This data highlights the tremendous progress that has been made in the area of mathematics. However, the progress shown by Students with Disabilities, in mathematics, will be carefully monitored through the analysis of data from ARIS, the Progress Report and Acuity. We have also targeted this population (SWD) as part of our Annual School Goals. Our goal is that 3% of our SWD, will show 1.5 years of progress as measured on the New York State Mathematics Exam. Additional Tier I differentiated instructional support, along with Tier II Academic Intervention Services will be provided in order to maintain this positive trend in student achievement.

ELA PERFORMANCE TRENDS: This year 7 out of 8 student groups met AYP in ELA. In this group Students with Disabilities made AYP by qualifying for Safe Harbor. One group, our LEP students received an Effective AMO score of 99, which was 15 points short of meeting the AYP for this group. All groups (8 out of 8) met the participation rate criterion in ELA. Additional instructional support is a top priority for our LEP and SWD populations. These groups will be monitored through the use of Acuity, Performance Series and ARIS. Some of our LEP students will be targeted as part of our formal Inquiry Team.

SCIENCE PERFORMANCE TRENDS:

Regarding participation rate, this year all of our student groups met the criterion for participation rate. Regarding test performance, this year all student groups including our Hispanic and White populations as well as the Students with Disabilities and LEP students, all met the test

performance criterion because each groups Performance Index (PI) exceeded their Progress Target (PT). This enabled our students to remain in “Good Standing” as part of the AYP.

SOCIAL STUDIES PERFORMANCE TRENDS:

Data from the Comprehensive Information Report 2005-2006 for Grade 8 in Social Studies indicated that 72% of all students scored at Levels 1&2 and 28% scored at Levels 3& 4. New data from School Year 2006-2007 indicates that 75% scored at Levels 1&2 and 25% scored at Levels 3& 4. Most recent data, from 2007-2008 indicates that Levels 1&2 were 72%, while Levels 3&4 were at 28%. This data suggests that while there were fewer students that received a Level 1, a higher percentage received a Level 3 or 4.

This is a positive trend in student performance. The most significant positive indication of this trend can be seen in the amount of students scoring a Level 2 and a Level 3. There is a steady decrease of students achieving a Level 1. Students are progressively moving out of Level 1. Additional modifications and differentiation instruction has been utilized and continues to be implemented in the classroom in order to maintain this positive trend. Modifications and enrichment programs have been initiated in order to move more students to Level 3 and 4.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

**TOTAL SCHOOL – ALL TESTED STUDENTS
ELA PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	33	2.9	521	45.9	576	50.8	4	0.4
2007	76	6.3	607	50.6	502	41.8	15	1.2
2006	142	12.7	541	48.4	410	36.7	25	2.2

Total School Trends: : Over a three-year period from 2006-2008 the percentage of all tested students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 12.7% to 2.9% (-9.8). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 48.4 % to 45.9% (-2.5). Students scoring at Level 3 increased from 36.7% to 50.8% (+14.1). Additionally, Level 4 students decreased from 2.2 to 0.4% (-1.8).

The trend in student achievement from Level 2 to Level 3 was significant as well as was the decrease in Level 1 to Level 2 students. Additionally, there was a decrease in students scoring at Level 4.

**ELA
ALL GRADES- ELL STUDENTS**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	21	13.8	113	74.3	18	11.8	0	0
2007	45	28.0	105	65.2	11	6.8	0	0
2006	48	58.5	34	41.5	0	0	0	0

Total ELL School Trends: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of all ELL tested students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 58.5% to 13.8% (-44.7). The

percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased from 41.5% to 74.3%. (+32.8). Students scoring at Level 3 increased from 0% to 11.8% (+11.8). There was no change in the number of students scoring at Level 4. An analysis of the three-year trend in ELL tested students, indicates a significant improvement in the percentage of students that moved from Level 1 to Level 2 and from Level 2 to Level 3. Level 3 students increased from no representation in that group in 2006 to 12% of that group in 2008.

**ELA
ALL GRADES – Students with Disabilities**

YEAR	LEVEL 1		LEVEL 2		LEVEL 3		LEVEL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	18	11.8	115	75.7	19	12.5	0	0
2007	37	27.4	85	63.0	13	9.6	0	0
2006	66	47.5	63	45.3	10	7.2	0	0

Total Special Education Trend: Over a three year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of Special Education students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA Assessment decreased from 47.5% to 11.8% (-35.7). The percentage of Level 2 students increased from 45.3% to 75.7% (+30.4). The percentage of Level 3 students increased from 7.2% to 12.5% (+5.3). Additionally, the Special Education students did not achieve at Level 4. An analysis of the three-year trend for Special Education students indicate a significant improvement in the percentage of students that moved from Level 1 to Level 2 and from Level 2 to Level 3.

**ELA
GRADE 6 – ALL STUDENTS**

YEAR	LEVEL 1		LEVEL 2		LEVEL 3		LEVEL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	11	3.0	164	45.2	187	51.5	1	0.3
2007	5	1.3	206	55.1	158	42.2	5	1.3
2006	40	11.2	150	42.0	155	43.4	12	3.4

Grade 6 All Student Trend: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 11.2 % to 3.0% (-8.2). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased from 42 % to 45.2% (+3.2). The percentage of Level 3 students increased from 43.4% to 51.5% (+8.1). The percentage of students scoring at level 4 decreased from 3.4% to 0.3% (-3.1).

**ELA
GRADE 6 ELL STUDENTS**

YEAR	LEVEL 1		LEVEL 2		LEVEL 3		LEVEL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	8	13.8	40	69.0	10	17.2	0	0
2007	2	4.9	38	92.7	1	2.4	0	0
2006	15	75.0	5	25.0	0	0	0	0

Grade 6 ELL trend: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 75% to 13.8% (-61.2). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased from 25% to 69%. (+44.0). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 0% to 17.2%. Level 3 students increased from no representation in that group in 2006, to 17% of that group in 2008.

**ELA
GRADE 6 Students with Disabilities**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	6	10.2	45	76.3	8	13.6	0	0
2007	4	9.1	38	86.4	2	4.5	0	0
2006	19	40.4	22	46.8	6	12.8	0	0

Grade Six Special Education Student Trend: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of special education students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 40.4% to 10.2% (-30.2). The percentage of Level 2 students increased from 46.8% to 76.3% (+29.5). The percentage of Level 3 students increased from 12.8% to 13.6% (+0.8). The percentage of students achieving a Level 4 remains at 0%.

**GRADE 6
OVERALL SUMMARY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN ELA**

Strengths and Weakness (Item Skills Analyses): According to the ELA **Item Skills Analyses for Sixth Grade** for general education, special education, and LEP students, the following strengths and weaknesses were identified:

Strengths:

- Students can identify the ways in which characters change and develop through the story.
- Students can determine the meaning of unfamiliar word by using context clues, a dictionary or a glossary
- Identify literary elements

Weaknesses:

- Inferring, main idea, details, cause and effect, and drawing conclusions.
- Identifying missing, conflicting, unclear and irrelevant information
- Comparing and contrasting information from multiple sources
- Writing skills
- Vocabulary

Effectiveness of Curriculum: The implementation and continuation of Balanced Literacy and the workshop model has been effective as a mode of instruction for the students. The revised ELA Scope & Sequence is aligned with the New York State Learning Standards. By the end of grade 6, students will be exposed to variety of genres and authors across a wide range of young adult multi-cultural literature, emphasizing personal identity, to develop their reading, writing and critical thinking skills. Students will have the necessary knowledge, skills and strategies to navigate through non-fiction and

literary genres, such as memoirs, autobiographies, editorials, folktales, and adventure and mystery stories. Sixth graders have been on a yearlong quest to answer: Who am I? How do I view myself? In **Readers Workshop**, students will practice various reading strategies such as cause and effect, inferring, compare and contrast, and examining character’s actions. Through **Writers Workshop**, students will be exposed to professional mentor texts, paying particular attention to the writer’s craft, focusing on various organizational structures and style. Spelling, grammar and conventions, with technology, are embedded into daily lessons. Practicing reflection and introspection, students are asked to present their work to others, building on their speaking and listening skills.

Root Causes/Contributing Factors/Significant Findings: The ELA Scope & Sequence was revised to include the New York State Learning Standards and literacy competencies. Some teachers are having difficulties implementing the revised ELA Scope & Sequence. Although common planning time has been implemented, teachers need to use the time more efficiently thus spending more time collaborating and creating purposeful lessons that are aligned with the ELA Scope & Sequence. Teachers who service SWD and LEP students need additional support in differentiating their instruction thus enabling them to meet the unique needs of their students. Professional development is required in differentiated instruction, examining summative and formative assessments, and developing purposeful lessons that address the New York State ELA Learning Standards.

**ELA
GRADE 7 – ALL STUDENTS**

YEAR	LEVEL 1		LEVEL 2		LEVEL 3		LEVEL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	4	1.1	149	39.7	222	59.2	0	0
2007	28	7.0	177	44.4	187	46.9	7	1.8
2006	55	13.7	195	48.6	143	35.7	8	2.0

Grade 7 ELA trend: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 13.7% to 1.1% (-12.6). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 48.6% to 39.7% (-8.9). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 35.7% to 59.2% (+23.5). The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 decreased from 2% to 0%.

**ELA
GRADE 7 – ELL STUDENTS**

YEAR	LEVEL 1		LEVEL 2		LEVEL 3		LEVEL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	2	3.9	43	82.7	7	13.5	0	0
2007	19	33.3	30	52.6	8	14.0	0	0
2006	15	42.9	20	57.1	0	0	0	0

Grade 7 ELL Student Trend: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of seventh grade ELL students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 42.9% to 3.9% (-39.0). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased from 57.1% to 82.7% (+25.6). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 0% to 13.5%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 remains at 0%

ELA
GRADE 7 – STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	2	4.9	30	73.2	9	22.0	0	0
2007	12	27.9	23	53.5	8	18.6	0	0
2006	25	55.6	18	40.0	2	4.4	0	0

Grade 7 Special Education Student Trend: Over a three-year period 2006-2008, the percentage of seventh-grade special education students scoring at Level 1 decreased from 55.6% to 4.9% (-50.7). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased from 40% to 73.2% (+33.2). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 4.4% to 22 % (+17.6). The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 remains at 0%.

GRADE 7
OVERALL SUMMARY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN ELA

Strengths and Weakness (Item Skills Analyses): According to the ELA **Item Skills Analyses for Seventh Grade** for general education, special education, and LEP students, the following strengths and weaknesses were identified:

Strengths:

- Determine meaning of unfamiliar words
- Discern the differences between fact and fiction
- Identify literary elements
- Interpretation of literary text

Weaknesses:

- Identifying figurative language
- Draw conclusions and make inferences from implied information
- Identifying different perspectives
- Comprehending informational texts
- Recognizing organizational formats in non-fiction

Effectiveness of Curriculum: The implementation and continuation of Balanced Literacy and the workshop model has been effective as a mode of instruction for the students. By the end of Grade 7, students will be exposed to a variety of genres and authors across a wide range of young adult multicultural literature, emphasizing personal inspiration, to develop their reading, writing, and critical thinking skills. Students will acquire knowledge, skills and strategies to navigate through non-fiction and literary genres, such as biographies, informational reading, contemporary, historical, and science fiction, poetry and song. Seventh graders will be on a yearlong quest to answer: What is inspiration? Where do I find it? How do I inspire others? – using meaningful, relevant and significant literature as a guide. In **Readers Workshop**, students will practice various reading strategies such as formulating questions, identifying main idea and supporting details, and using context clues. Through **Writers Workshop**, students will be exposed to professional mentor texts, paying particular attention to the writer’s craft, focusing on various organizational structures and style. Spelling, grammar, vocabulary, and oral fluency are highlighted, with technology embedded into daily assignments. Students have been encouraged to collaborate and share their work with a wide range of audiences.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

Root Causes/Contributing Factors/Significant Findings: Similarly, some teachers are having difficulties implementing the revised ELA Scope & Sequence. Although common planning time has been implemented, teachers need to use the time more efficiently thus spending more time collaborating and creating purposeful lessons that are aligned with the ELA Scope & Sequence. Teachers who service SWD and LEP students need additional support in differentiating their instruction thus enabling them to meet the unique needs of their students. Professional development is required in differentiated instruction, examining formative and summative assessments, and developing purposeful lessons that address the New York State ELA Learning Standards.

**ELA
GRADE 8 – ALL STUDENTS**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	18	4.6	208	52.5	167	42.2	3	0.8
2007	43	10.1	224	52.5	157	36.8	3	0.7
2006	47	13.1	196	54.4	112	31.1	5	1.4

Grade Eight ELA Student Trend: Over a three-year period 2006-2008, the percentage of Eighth grade ELA students decreased from 13.1% to 4.6% (-8.5).

The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 54.4% to 52.5% (-1.9).

The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 31.1% to 42.2% (+11.1).

The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 decreased from 1.4% to .8% (-0.6)

**ELA
GRADE 8 ELL**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	11	26.2	30	71.4	1	2.4	0	0
2007	24	38.1	37	58.7	2	3.2	0	0
2006	18	66.7	9	33.3	0	0	0	0

Grade Eight ELL Student Trend: Over a three-year period 2006-2008, the percentage of students achieving at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 66.7% to 26.2% (-40.5). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased from 33.3% to 71.4% (+38.1). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 0% to 2.4%. The percentage of students scoring at level 4 remains at 0%.

**ELA
GRADE 8 – STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	10	19.2	40	76.9	2	3.9	0	0
2007	21	43.8	24	50.0	3	6.3	0	0
2006	22	46.8	23	48.9	2	4.3	0	0

Grade Eight Special Education Student Trend: Over a three-year period 2006-2008, the percentage of students achieving at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from 46.8% to 19.2% (-27.6). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased from 48.9% to 76.9% (+28). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 decreased from 4.3% to 3.9% (-0.4). The percentage of students scoring at level 4 remains at 0%.

GRADE 8 OVERALL SUMMARY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN ELA

Strengths and Weakness (Item Skills Analyses): According to the ELA **Item Skills Analyses for Eighth Grade** for general education, special education, and LEP students, the following strengths and weaknesses were identified:

Strengths:

- Interpret facts, data and ideas
- Identifying main idea
- Determine meaning of unfamiliar words
- Identify literary elements

Weaknesses:

- Draw conclusions and make inferences from implied information
- Recognizing how the authors use of language creates images or feelings
- Identifying different perspectives
- Comprehending informational texts

Effectiveness of Curriculum: The implementation and continuation of Balanced Literacy and the workshop model has been effective as a mode of instruction for the students. By the end of grade 8, students will be exposed to variety of texts from wide range of young adult multi-cultural literature, emphasizing independence and social awareness, to develop their reading, writing, and critical thinking skills. Students will have the necessary knowledge, skills and strategies to navigate through non-fiction and literary genres, such as informational texts, new stories, functional documents, digital texts, and drama. Eight graders will be on a year-long quest to answer: Who am I as an independent learner and thinker? How do I make decisions? How do I determine choices? – using meaningful, relevant, and significant literature as a guide. In **Readers Workshop**, students will practice various reading strategies such as recognizing text features, analyzing theme and point of view, as well as develop a greater ability to analyze characters, synthesize information, and reflect on their reading. Through **Writers Workshop**, students will be exposed to professional mentor texts, paying particular attention to the writer’s craft, focusing on various organizational structures and style. Students will use grade appropriate and precise vocabulary throughout the writing process, while focusing on organizational structure and style. Spelling, grammar, and technology are embedded into daily assignments. Practicing reflection and introspection, students will present their work to others, building on their speaking and listening skills.

Root Causes/Contributing Factors/Significant Findings:

Although common planning time has been implemented, some teachers need to use the time more efficiently thus spending more time collaborating and creating purposeful lessons that are aligned with the ELA Scope & Sequence. Teachers who service SWD and LEP students need additional support in differentiating their instruction thus enabling them to meet the unique needs of their students. Professional development is required in differentiated instruction, examining formative and summative assessments, and developing purposeful lessons that address the New York State ELA Learning Standards.

TOTAL SCHOOL- ALL TESTED MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	44	3.8	224	19.5	677	58.9	205	17.8
2007	98	7.9	403	32.6	587	47.4	150	12.1
2006	198	15.8	445	35.6	516	41.3	91	7.3

SCHOOL WIDE TRENDS: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of all Students tested in all grades, scoring at Level 1, decreased from 15.8% to 3.8% (-12.0%). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 35.6% to 19.5% (-16.1%). Students scoring at level 3 increased from 41.3% to 58.9% (+17.6%). Students scoring at Level 4 increased from 7.3% to 17.8% (+10.5). An analysis of the three-year trend school wide indicates a significant improvement in students moving from Level 1 to Level 2, and from level 2 to level 3. There is also noticeable improvement in the percentage of students scoring at Level 4. The number of students receiving a level 4 more than doubled in a three-year period. School wide, of all students tested, many have made significant gains in their overall performance in Mathematics.

GRADE 6 - ALL STUDENTS PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	18	4.9	43	11.7	211	57.2	97	26.3
2007	17	4.4	79	20.4	212	54.6	80	20.6
2006	47	11.5	113	27.8	206	50.6	41	10.1

GRADE 6 STUDENTS TRENDS: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of all students tested in the sixth grade scoring at Level 1, decreased from 11.5% to 4.9% (-6.6%). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 27.8% to 11.7% (-16.1%). Students scoring at level 3 increased from 50.6% to 57.2% (+6.6%). Students scoring at Level 4 increased from 10.1% to 26.3% (+5.6). An analysis of the three-year trend in grade six indicates a significant improvement in students moving from Level 1 to Level 2, and from level 2 to level 3. There is also noticeable

improvement in the percentage of students scoring at Level 4. Six grade students have made significant gains in their overall performance in Mathematics.

**GRADE 6 - ELL STUDENTS
PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	5	8.3	8	13.3	35	58.3	12	20.0
2007	5	9.4	15	28.3	26	49.1	7	13.2
2006	15	24.6	15	24.6	25	41.0	6	9.8

GRADE 6 ELL STUDENTS TRENDS: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of ELL students tested in the sixth grade scoring at Level 1 decreased from 24.6% to 8.3 % (-16.3%). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 24.6% to 13.3% (-11.6%). Students scoring at level 3 increased from 41.0% to 58.3% (+17.3%). Students scoring at Level 4 increased from 9.8% to 20.0% (+10.2%). An analysis of the three-year trend in our ELL population on grade six indicates, a significant improvement in students moving from Level 1 to Level 2, and from level 2 to level 3. There is also noticeable improvement in the percentage of students scoring at Level 4. Our ELL population students have made significant gains in their overall performance in Mathematics.

**GRADE 6 – STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	13	21.7	18	30.0	23	38.3	6	10.0
2007	11	25.0	17	38.6	16	36.4	0	0
2006	25	53.2	19	40.4	2	4.3	1	2.1

GRADE 6 STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of Students with Disabilities tested in the sixth grade scoring at Level 1 decreased from 53.2% to 21.7 % (-31.5)The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 40.4% to 30.0% (-10.4%). Students scoring at level 3 increased from 4.3% to 38.3% (+34.0). Students scoring at Level 4 increased from 2.1% to 10.0% (+7.9). An analysis of the three-year trend in sixth grade students with disabilities indicates, a significant improvement in students moving from Level 1 to Level 2, and from level 2 to level 3. There is also noticeable improvement in the percentage of students scoring at Level 4. Our sixth grade students with disabilities have made significant gains in their overall performance.

**GRADE 6
OVERALL SUMMARY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN MATH**

Strengths and Weakness (Item Skills Analyses): According to the MATH *Item Skills Analyses* (generated from ATS) for Sixth Grade for general education, students with disabilities and ELL students, the following strengths and weaknesses were identified:

Strengths:

- Algebra – evaluating algebraic expressions and formulas

- Number Sense and Operations – representing repeated multiplication in exponential form, expressing equivalent ratios as a proportion, operations with integers, evaluating numerical expressions involving exponents
- Geometry –volume of prisms, area and circumference of circles
- Statistics and Probability – record experiment results as ratio/fraction, use of sample space to determine probability of single event, finding measures of central tendency of a set of data, read and interpret graphs
- Measurement – identify equivalent metric units of measurement, identify equivalent customary units of measurement

Weaknesses:

- Algebra – solving simple one-step equations
- Number Sense and Operations – estimate a percent of a quantity, solving percent problems
- Geometry - plotting points on the coordinate plane to form geometric shapes
- Statistics and Probability – justify predictions made from data
- Measurement – estimate volume, area, circumference of figures identified in geometry strand

Effectiveness of Curriculum: The Impact Mathematics curriculum offers many opportunities for an effective balanced mathematics workshop. It contains problem sets that provide differentiation within the classroom. Questions are posed to develop higher order thinking skills. The problem sets are scaffolded and spiral to connect previous mathematical concepts. It is algebra-based and develops a foundation for high school mathematics. The Family Letter provides opportunities for families to assist the students in their math education at home. There is an internet site and a CD-ROM that provides students with help at home with the day’s work.

Root Causes/Contributing Factors/Significant Findings: Although the Impact Math Curriculum provides students with a complete balanced math curriculum, we have found that the comprehension level of our students is lacking and more comprehensive planning and professional development was necessary to incorporate this curriculum into teaching. The use of Q-Tel and ExCel strategies enabled teachers to reinforce the concepts found in the Impact Math Curriculum. These strategies aided with the acquisition of academic language. Additionally, the continuous assessment of monthly departmental math exams provides teachers with data that allows them to create guided math groups. These groups are tracked in order to ensure improvement in specific performance indicators.

**GRADE 7 - ALL STUDENTS
PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	6	1.6	70	18.3	233	61.0	73	19.1
2007	31	7.6	145	35.4	195	47.6	39	9.5
2006	66	14.8	161	36.2	189	42.5	29	6.5

GRADE 7 ALL STUDENTS TRENDS: Over a three-year period from 2006 – 2008, the percentage of ALL STUDENTS tested scoring at Level 1 on the grade 7 math assessment decreased from 14.8% to 1.6% (-13.2). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 36.2% to 18.3% (-17.9). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 42.5% to 61.0% (+18.5). The percentage

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

of students scoring at Level 4 increased from 6.5% to 19.1% (+12.6). An analysis of the three-year trend in grade seven for all students indicates that there has been significant movement from Levels 1 and 2 into Levels 3 and 4.

**GRADE 7 – ELL STUDENTS
PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	2	3.6	20	36.4	28	50.9	5	9.1
2007	15	22.1	27	39.7	21	30.9	5	7.4
2006	26	34.2	31	40.8	18	23.7	1	1.3

GRADE 7 ELL STUDENTS TRENDS: Over a three-year period from 2006 – 2008, the percentage of ELL STUDENTS tested scoring at Level 1 on the grade 7 math assessment decreased from 34.2% to 3.6% (-30.6). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 40.8% to 36.4% (-4.4). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 23.7% to 50.9% (27.2). The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 increased from 1.3% to 9.1% (+7). An analysis of the three-year trend in grade seven for ELL students indicates a considerable decrease in Levels 1 and 2 and a significant increase in Levels 3 and 4.

**GRADE 7– STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	3	7.3	22	53.7	16	39.0	0	0
2007	14	31.8	22	50.0	7	15.9	1	2.3
2006	20	46.5	19	44.2	4	9.3	0	0

GRADE 7 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS TRENDS: Grade Seven SWD Trends: Over a three-year period from 2006 – 2008, the percentage of SWD STUDENTS tested scoring at Level 1 on the grade 7 math assessment decreased from 46.5% to 7.3% (-29.2). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased from 44.2% to 53.7% (+9.5). The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 9.3% to 39.0% (+29.7). The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 stayed at 0%. An analysis of the three-year trend in grade seven for SWD indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 significantly decreased. Although there was significant increase in Level 2s and 3s, there was no movement in Level 4s.

**GRADE 7
OVERALL SUMMARY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN MATH**

Strengths and Weakness (Item Skills Analyses): According to the MATH Item Skills Analyses (generated from ATS) for Seventh Grade for general education, students with disabilities and ELL students, the following strengths and weaknesses were identified:

Strengths:

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

- Algebra – solve and explain two-step equations using inverse operations, evaluate formulas for given input values, use substitution to evaluate algebraic expressions
- Number Sense and Operations – identifying two consecutive whole numbers between which the root of non-perfect squares lies up to 225, translate numbers from scientific notation into standard form, determine multiples and least common multiple of two or more numbers
- Geometry – calculate the area of basic polygons drawn on the coordinate plane, identify and plot points in all four quadrants, identify the two-dimensional shapes that make up the faces and bases of prisms, pyramids, cylinders and cones
- Statistics and Probability – read and interpret data represented graphically, interpret data to provide the basis for predictions and establish experimental probabilities, compare actual results to predicted results
- Measurement – convert capacities and volumes within a given system, determine the tool and technique to measure with an appropriate level of precision, estimate surface area

Weaknesses:

- Algebra – translate two-step verbal expressions into algebraic expressions
- Number Sense and Operations – operations with integers, recognize the difference between rational and irrational numbers
- Geometry – calculate the radius or diameter given the circumference or area of a circle, calculate the volume of prisms and cylinders using a given formula
- Statistics and Probability – construct Venn diagrams to sort data, record data in a frequency table
- Measurement – draw central angles in a given circle using a protractor, convert mass within a given system

Effectiveness of Curriculum: Impact Mathematics has many positive components. The problem sets provide rigorous activities that support collaborative, small group instruction. Additionally, the curriculum provides materials that spiral back to previously introduced mathematical concepts. This supports the linkage of prior knowledge to newly developed concepts. Critical thinking skills are reinforced through journal writing and accountable talk in the classroom. Furthermore, a family letter provides a home-school connection that contains an overview of the unit of study along with extended home activities to reinforce learning.

Root Causes/Contributing Factors/Significant Findings: We have made significant improvements in the area of mathematics. Using common planning and teacher collaboration we were able to better prepare teachers to meet the needs of their students. The sophistication of the Impact curriculum, which posed a comprehension problem for many of our students, was resolved through more effective lesson planning. Teachers were expected to infuse a vocabulary component into their lessons, establish interactive word walls within the classroom and use the academic language when instructing students. The common planning sessions also allowed teachers to plan together providing additional instructional supports that addressed the limitations of the Impact curriculum for the identified targeted subgroup. Teachers of SWD need additional supports in deepening content knowledge and delivery of instruction for this rigorous mathematics curriculum to meet the differentiated needs of grade 7 students. Although there is use of manipulative enhanced instruction, not all teachers are comfortable using them. Therefore, additional professional development in classroom management and effective use of math manipulatives is required of all teachers including SWD teachers. Additional support is needed for all teachers in order to ensure continued progress.

**GRADE 8 – ALL STUDENTS TESTED
PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	20	5.0	111	27.8	233	58.4	35	8.8
2007	50	11.4	179	40.7	180	40.9	31	7.0
2006	85	21.4	171	43.0	121	30.4	21	5.3

GRADE 8 STUDENTS TRENDS: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of all students tested scoring a Level 1 on the Grade 8 math assessment decreased from 21.4% to 5.0% (-16.4). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 43.0% to 27.8% (-15.2). Students scoring at Level 3 increased from 30.4% to 58.4% (+28.0). Students scoring at Level 4 also increased from 5.3% to 8.8% (+3.5). An analysis of the three year trend in grade eight mathematics for All Students indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 have decreased significantly. The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 continues to decrease, while the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 and 4 has increased significantly

**GRADE 8 – ELL STUDENTS
PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	4	8.9	13	28.9	19	42.2	9	20.0
2007	20	29.9	27	40.3	20	29.9	0	0
2006	21	35.0	22	36.7	16	26.7	1	1.7

GRADE 8 ELL STUDENTS TRENDS: Grade Eight ELL Trends: Over a three-year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of ELL students tested scoring a Level 1 on the Grade 8 math assessment decreased from 35.0% to 8.9% (an 81.0% decrease in Level 1s). The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 36.7% to 28.9% (a 4.1% decrease in Level 2s). Students scoring at Level 3 increased from 26.7% to 42.2% (an 18.8% increase in Level 3s). Students scoring at Level 4 also increased from 1.7% to 20.0%. An analysis of the three year trend in grade eight mathematics for ELL students indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 have decreased significantly. The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 continues to decrease, while the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 and 4 has increased.

**GRADE 8– STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
PERFORMANCE ON NYS MATHEMATICS EXAM**

YEAR	LEVEL	1	LEVEL	2	LEVEL	3	LEVEL	4
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	12	22.6	33	62.3	8	15.1	0	0
2007	24	48.0	19	38.0	7	14.0	0	0
2006	36	69.2	14	26.9	2	3.8	0	0

GRADE 8 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS TRENDS: Over a three year period from 2006-2008, the percentage of grade eight special education students scoring at Level 1 in mathematics decreased from 69.2% to 22.6%. (-46.6) The percentage of students scoring a Level 2 increased from 26.9% to 62.3% (+35.4). The percentage of students scoring Level 3 increased from 3.8% to 15.1% (11.3) and there were no students scoring at Level 4. An analysis of the three year trend in grade eight mathematics for SWDs indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased significantly while the percentage of students who scored at Level 2 increased significantly.

GRADE 8 OVERALL SUMMARY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN MATH

Strengths and Weakness (Item Skills Analyses): According to the MATH **Item Skills Analyses** (generated from ATS) for Eighth Grade for general education, students with disabilities and ELL students, the following strengths and weaknesses were identified:

Strengths:

- Algebra – write verbal expressions that match given mathematical expressions, multiply and divide monomials, add and subtract polynomials
- Geometry – identify parts of a right triangle, calculate the missing angle measurements when given two intersecting lines and an angle, identify pairs of vertical angles as congruent
- Number Sense and Operations – estimate percent of a quantity given an application
- Measurement – calculate distance using a map scale

Weaknesses:

- Algebra – apply algebra to determine the measure of angles formed by or contained in parallel lines cut by a transversal and by intersecting lines, describe a situation involving relationships that matches a given graph
- Geometry – determine angle pair relationships when given two parallel lines cut by a transversal, use the Pythagorean Theorem to determine the unknown length of a side of a right triangle, draw the image of a figure under a dilation
- Number Sense and Operations – apply percents to tax, percent increase/decrease, simple interest, sale price, commission, interest rates, gratuities
- Measurement – calculate unit price using proportions, convert money between different currencies with the use of an exchange rate table and calculator

Effectiveness of Curriculum: The third course in the Impact Math Series for middle school is a pre-algebra curriculum. The grade 8 focus is on Algebra and Geometry and Impact Math provides the support for students to acquire the foundation necessary to succeed in High School. The problem sets provide questions that follow the scaffolded questions of Benjamin Bloom. Higher order thinking and problem solving practice can be found frequently throughout the text. Mathematical communication through journal writing is available.

Root Causes/Contributing Factors/Significant Findings: Although Impact Math provides many great opportunities for students to internalize the math concepts expected them, the language barriers present prevent comprehension of these key concepts. We have answered this by training teachers in Q-tel and ExCel strategies. They in turn infuse these strategies into the Impact Math curriculum.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

Many other resources have been incorporated into lesson planning to aid in the differentiation of instruction. Guided math groups are evident. Students' improvement in key performance indicators are established after an analysis of each monthly departmental exam. SWD receive individualized exams with modifications on a monthly basis as well.

Three Year Performance Trends In Social Studies For All Students

**8th GRADE - ALL STUDENTS
PERFORMANCE ON NYS SOCIAL STUDIES EXAM**

Year	Total Tested	Level 1 #	Level 1 %	Level 2 #	Level 2 %	Level 3 #	Level 3 %	Level 4 #	Level 4 %
2007	386	30	8	250	65	100	26	7	2
2006	327	36	11	209	64	78	24	3	1
2005	353	49	14	205	58	85	24	14	4

Grade 8 – General Education Trends:

Data from the Comprehensive Information Report 2005-2006 for Grade 8 in Social Studies indicated that 72% of all students scored at Levels 1&2 and 28% scored at Levels 3& 4. New data from School Year 2006-2007 indicates that 75% scored at Levels 1&2 and 25% scored at Levels 3 & 4. Most recent data, from 2007-2008 indicates that Levels 1&2 were 72%, while Levels 3&4 were at 28%. This data suggests that while there were fewer students that received a Level 1, a higher percentage received a Level 3 or 4.

This is a positive trend in student performance. The most significant positive indication of this trend can be seen in the amount of students scoring a Level 2 and a Level 3. There is a steady decrease of students achieving a Level 1. Students are progressively moving out of Level 1. Additional modifications and differentiation instruction has been utilized and continues to be implemented in the classroom in order to maintain this positive trend. Modifications and enrichment programs have been initiated in order to move more students to Level 3 and 4.

**8th GRADE – STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
PERFORMANCE ON NYS SOCIAL STUDIES EXAM**

Year	Total Tested	Level 1 #	Level 1 %	Level 2 #	Level 2 %	Level 3 #	Level 3 %	Level 4 #	Level 4 %
2007	49	15	31	29	59	5	10	0	0
2006	42	13	31	27	64	2	5	0	0
2005	44	19	43	25	57	0	0	0	0

Grade 8 – Students with Disabilities Trends:

Data from the Comprehensive Information Report 2005-2006 for Grade 8 Social Studies Students with Disabilities indicated that 100% of all students scored at Levels 1&2 and 0% scored at Levels 3& 4. New data from School Year 2006-2007 indicates that 95% scored at Levels 1&2 and 5% scored at Levels 3. Most recent data, from 2007-2008 indicates that Levels 1&2 were 90%, while Levels 3 were at 10%. This data suggests that while there were fewer students that received a Level 1, a higher percentage received a Level 2 or 3. This is a positive trend in student performance. The most significant positive indication of this trend can be seen in the amount of students scoring a Level 2 and a Level 3. There is a steady decrease of students achieving a Level 1. Students are progressively moving out of Level 1. Additional modifications and differentiation instruction has been utilized and continues to be implemented in the classroom in order to maintain this positive trend. Modifications and enrichment programs have been initiated in order to move more students to Level 3 and 4.

GRADE 8 OVERALL SUMMARY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN SOCIAL STUDIES

Strengths and Weaknesses (Item Skills Analysis): According to the social studies **Item Skills Analysis for Grade Eight** pertaining to both general education and which includes all LEP's and special education students, the following strengths and weaknesses were indicated.

Strengths:

- Listing current and past events
- Understanding events on a time line (sequencing)
- Identifying similarities and differences of various cultures
- Recognizing the connection between cause and effect

Weaknesses:

- Essay writing and short responses
- Applying facts and historical events to real life situations
- Comprehending non-fiction text
- Strategies needed to develop an organized response to a document based essay question
- Map skills

Effectiveness of Curriculum: At Intermediate School 77, the Social Studies curriculum is effective, as it is being delivered by teachers who are highly qualified, and are acutely aware of their student's strengths and weaknesses. Utilizing key concepts in history, geography, economics, and civics, students are required to gather, organize and present information using a plethora of medium. Teachers create a student centered learning environment where students are expected to excel and achieve daily goals extracted from the curriculum. The curriculum will be delivered in a learning environment where student achievement is evident. Using the workshop model, teachers will demonstrate and support the learning of students. The use of technology has come to the forefront in Social Studies. The Social Studies department is now developing a Teacher Assessment notebook to collect statistical data on student progress. Students are also administered a Learning Styles Inventory Assessment to aid teachers in differentiating instruction. A Social Studies pre-assessment test is given to promote individual instruction which determines strengths and weaknesses.

Root Causes/Contributing Factors/Significant Findings: Possible significant variables affecting student achievement:

- Low student reading comprehension levels
- Developing a thesis statement for DBQ
- Difficulty in responding to multiple choice questions
- Language acquisition (ELL's)
- Use of academic language

The Social Studies department at Intermediate School 77 is determined to achieve academic excellence. Social Studies classrooms continue to provide a platform for discussion and debate. These discussions will be used not only to teach historical content but to inspire students to make positive changes in their school and their community. In addition, trips have been taken to cultural institutions throughout New York allowing the students to see actual artifacts and historic sites. These include but not limited to The Museum of Natural History, The Cloisters, The Brooklyn Museum, The New York Historical Society, City Hall, and the New York State Supreme Court.

Most of the Social Studies department has been trained and participated through the “Teaching American History” Grant. This school year the grant is focusing on English Language Learners. The teaching strategies focus on the development of content vocabulary, higher order thinking and skills necessary to acquire deep social studies knowledge. Presently, the school has addressed learning through vocabulary by participating in Ex-CELL and Q-TEL training. These teaching programs place a special emphasis on the acquisition of academic and content vocabulary, while incorporating all of the components of interactive lessons. Teachers are trained in the Reading/Writing workshop model that addresses the necessary strategies needed to comprehend and interpret historical content. All of this information is then turn-keyed to the staff at professional development sessions.

SCIENCE

8th GRADE - ALL STUDENTS PERFORMANCE ON NYS SCIENCE EXAM

YEAR	TOTAL TESTED	LEVEL 1		LEVEL 2		LEVEL 3		LEVEL 4	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2007	373	37	10	149	40	157	42	30	8
2006	337	20	6	131	39	148	44	37	11
2005	354	46	13	149	42	120	34	39	11

GRADE 8 – General Education Trends: From 2005- 2007 **General Education** level one students decreased from 13% to 10% (-3%) Students scoring at level 2 decreased from 42 % to 40 % (-2%) Level 3 students increased from 34 % to 42 % (+ 8%). Level 4 students decreased from 11 % to 8 % (-3%). An analysis of the scores indicates that there is a decrease in scoring at levels 1,2, and 4. However, there was a significant increase in level 3. We will continue our successful interventions that moved students from level 1 and 2 to 3. We will continue to differentiate instruction and provide additional enrichment opportunities to move students from level 3 to 4.

**8th GRADE – STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES
PERFORMANCE ON NYS SCIENCE EXAM**

YEAR	TOTAL TESTED	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 4
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2007	49	14	29	26	53	8	16	1	2
2006	41	13	32	21	51	7	17	0	0
2005	45	16	36	24	53	5	11	0	0

GRADE 8 – Students with Disabilities Trends: From 2005-2007 **Students with Disabilities** scoring at level 1 decreased from 36% to 29% (-7 %). There was no change in level 2 (53%) over the 3 year range. There was an increase in level 3 from 11% to 16% (+ 5%). Level 4 increased 2 %. The analysis indicated that the lack of progress towards achieving the NYS Learning Standards in Science indicates the need for acceleration of targeted interventions for Level 1 and 2 students so that they can make progress in achieving the state standards for the upcoming year.

**8th GRADE – ELL STUDENTS
PERFORMANCE ON NYS SCIENCE EXAM**

YEAR	TOTAL TESTED	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 4
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2007	52	21	40	27	52	4	8	0	0
2006	53	17	32	24	45	12	23	0	0
2005	55	26	47	27	49	2	4	0	0

GRADE 8 – English Language Learners Trends: **English Language Learners** scoring at level one decreased from 47% to 40% (-7%) over the 3 year period of 2005- 2007. Level 2 increased from 49 % to 52 % (+3%). Level 3 increased from 4% to 8 % (+3 %). There were no students in level 4 over the three year period. The analysis indicated that the lack of progress towards achieving the NYS Learning Standards in Science indicates the need for acceleration of targeted interventions for Level 1 and 2 students so that they can make progress in achieving the state standards for the upcoming year.

Specific Areas of Strength and Weakness

Student strengths:

- Students demonstrate strengths in data collection and calculation
- Students demonstrate strength in graphing
- Students demonstrate strength in utilizing scientific tools (microscope, balance beam etc.)

Student weaknesses:

- Grade 6 students come to Middle School with minimal scientific background knowledge.
- Students display a weakness in content area vocabulary
- Students have a weakness in their ability to write in the content area and do in depth analysis

Analysis of the effectiveness of the curriculum and instruction: Results of the effectiveness of the Glencoe curriculum have been discussed during the professional development sessions for the Science department in order to focus on the goals for the next school year. They agreed that the use of a pacing calendar was beneficial; especially when careful attention is paid to align it with the New York State core curriculum. Inquiry-based instruction should range from a very structured activity for students requiring more guidance, to a more open-ended approach where students lead the investigations. Inquiry lessons do not look the same in each classroom. A future goal is for teachers to differentiate and modify the activities to support the student so the children will be successful. Our Special Needs and ELL populations need intensive support via differentiating the instruction and individualized attention to help them approach the learning standards. Additionally, our English language learners must focus on cognitive academic language proficiency required for comprehension in the science classroom. The four elements of language acquisition must be incorporated in the instructional plan: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Finally, the Science teachers expressed an interest in furthering their knowledge and incorporating skills into the curriculum through expanding the professional development to include information on brain research, multiple intelligences, and learning styles. These subjects will aid in the teaching and evaluating of the students more effectively.

Identification of root causes or contributing factors, for each significant finding:

- There needs to be increased communication with parents on the requirements for graduation – especially the attendance and punctuality of the students;
- Parent involvement is a key factor and continues to be a cause of low achievement. Many parents do not realize the intensity of the science curriculum and do not help their child at home.
- In order to support content-based literacy, aside from the standardized data, science teachers need the instructional reading levels from the Gates- McGinitie assessment and the Item Skills Analysis from the NYS ELA exam for each student.

Key topics, such as multiple intelligence and learning styles, which will aid the differentiation of instruction, need to be further explored and implemented.

GREATEST ACCOMPLISHMENTS

As indicated in the Quality Review, I.S. 77's greatest accomplishments are that the school is organized in an effective and meaningful way. The principal provides excellent leadership and fosters an atmosphere of collegiality and collaboration among teachers enabling mutual assistance. The principal, supported by his instructional leadership team, provides dynamic leadership. Effective management systems assist the staff in targeting school goals and academic needs.

Academy teams work collaboratively to provide high quality teaching and learning conditions. Students are well known across the school, thereby encouraging high levels of mutual trust and respect in an orderly learning environment. Students are actively engaged and challenged through rigorous, engaging learning experiences. The halls and classrooms are richly decorated with high quality student work demonstrating the high expectations of the school.

It is our belief that the teamwork and collaborative efforts on the part of all members and the school community will help create a community of life long learners. The following are examples of the partnerships that I.S. 77 share:

- **“Cross-grade tutoring”** – Students from our school visit P.S. 239 classrooms to assist in the English language arts elementary students by reading books and using reading strategies for comprehension and fluency.
- **BOSE Corporation- “Journey into Sound”** Supplied two full classroom set ups of Bose Wave Music Systems, and musical instruments from around the world. Arts teachers were trained to administer this interactive program and over 90% of our students participated.
- **Title II Technology Grant** – Enables technology to be incorporated into the social studies classrooms through projects connected with historical events.
- **Teaching American History-** In collaboration with the CUNY Graduate Center and Department of Education, social studies teachers work with scholars to develop innovative ways to increase student interest and learning. In addition to a series of lectures geared to augment teacher understanding of the curriculum, they spend one week during the summer creating document-based questions to be utilized throughout the Region.
- **Future Cities Competition-** Students engage in creation of a future city plan while working with Engineer Mentors. They will create a computer design while working in conjunction with ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies and Technology teachers.
- **Greater Ridgewood Youth Council Association** – This community-based organization works cooperatively with the school to provide the Beacon Program for the students after school. Homework assistance, counseling and sports activities are provided for the boys and girls.
- **Kiwanis Club of Glendale** – Business owners support the efforts of our school Peer Mediation Team to provide acceptable ways to resolve student problems.

Best teaching practices in the Social Studies department at Intermediate School 77 is being reinforced through departmental professional development sessions. The focus of these meetings is to create a comprehensive arsenal of instructional strategies that have been organized in an effective and meaningful way. Holding all stakeholders accountable, which include administrators, coaches, lead teachers, and support staff serving as valuable educational and professional resources to raise student performance. Teachers continue to work collaboratively in order to analyze the various data sources and consistently use it to drive instruction.

As a result, the Social Studies department has made great progress in targeting the issues identified for improvement. Teachers have continued to create a student centered learning environment where students have excelled and achieved daily goals extracted from the curriculum. The New York State Social Studies Standards are continually met in classrooms, using current data that capitalizes on students’ strengths. Using the workshop model, teachers demonstrate and support all learning styles which include visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic. The use of technology in the Social Studies classrooms aid teachers in activity differentiation and writing proficiency. Teachers have implemented the use of the web-based tool, “Renzulli Learning,” which targets the Special Placement classes and can be modified for lower function groups. Recently, the Social Studies department rolled out textbooks which were complimented with software the students can use in the classroom and at home.

The Science department works collaboratively to share ideas and instructional strategies. Members of the science department attend professional development and turn key information during the departmental meetings. Our special progress students are highly motivated to achieve in order to complete the accelerated eighth-grade Earth Science curriculum. Special education science teachers and ELL teachers collaborate regularly with licensed science teachers to plan instruction. Teachers utilized a pacing calendar development by Glencoe and aligned with the new core curriculum.

The Science and Social Studies departments are now developing a Teacher Assessment notebook to collect statistical data on student progress. Both departments continue to develop a deeper understanding of data, they become more adept in their ability to identify students' strengths and weaknesses. This data is utilized not only in the classroom, but during Extended Day instruction. Students are also administered a Learning Styles Inventory Assessment to aid teachers in differentiating instruction. We have put in place departmental tests which are given at the end of every unit of study. The data collected from the exams is analyzed on a timely basis. The questions on these exams are aligned with the New York State Assessments. Source books are maintained by each student as a means of archiving evidence of their learning. The source books are a means to assist teachers in evaluating student strengths and weakness during the year.

Last year, our Inquiry Team studied 21 eighth grade students who received a Level 2, and whose math performance was slipping. Through the action research intervention performed by the team, 85% of the students made significant progress.

The results of the Mathematics "A" Regents test for 2006-2007 showed 74% scored above 85% and 100% scored above 65%. This was an improvement over the 2005-2006 results which showed 59% scored above 85% and 96% scored above 65% and 100% scored over 55%.

AIDS TO CONTINIOUS IMPROVEMENT

The majority of our teachers and staff are on board with the mission and vision of I.S. 77. Our teachers collaborate with their colleagues while having the constant guidance of coaches and administrators. This year our Inquiry Team will again be vital in getting our staff to pay closer attention to the students who are not making progress and to their style in which they deliver the information. Based on last years findings of the inquiry team, some of the students in the study failed to make progress because they found classes boring and felt that the teachers did not care. In some instances we found there were students who were excelling with one teacher and then the same students were failing with another teacher. The inquiry team will publish frequent memos where such findings will be highlighted and will encourage teachers to examine their level of expectations for all students as well as effectiveness of their daily lessons. The lead teachers and Coaches will work closely with targeted teachers. This work will be monitored and will then be adapted school wide. The inquiry team will continue to work with the administrative team to ensure that all relevant student data is disseminated to teachers and staff. Whenever necessary the inquiry team will also conduct professional development designed to share and disaggregate student data.

A significant aid to our continuous improvement can be attributed to the departments' collective efforts to develop and maintain Social Studies and Science Assessment Notebooks. The notebook provides a continual collection of data. The data is then used to differentiate and drive instruction. Throughout the Social Studies and Science departments, highly qualified teachers make instructional decisions based on the information compiled from student data, and address the needs of their population. Through Focus Walks and Observations, the following practices have been targeted for improvement:

- The continuous use of data to differentiate and drive instruction
- The further development of teacher assessment books
- The continued development of cognitive of academic language

- Improvement in student retention of Social Studies facts to improve grades for the 8th grade Social Studies State Assessment
- Continue to monitor student self-assessment
- Collaboration is encouraged to foster better understanding of historical context
- Continued infusion of Social Studies and ELA teachers to improve reading comprehension and writing strategies
- The science curriculum must stress investigations and inquiry-based learning for constructing knowledge and understanding concepts and principles.
- Collaboration between the ELA and science departments will increase support for academic goals.
- The science program needs to evaluate more student work through the use of a rubric where students may self-evaluate.
- AIS assistance must be continued through the mandated 37.5 minutes extended day.
- There should be an increase in the use of technology in the science classroom.
- Additional science equipment and a supplemental program should be purchased to support the new-spiraled curriculum.
- Parent meetings (possibly PTA) should include a presentation by the science department on the comprehensive program.

BARRIERS TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Cultural barriers and mastery of language often prevent students from having extra support at home. Academic language is often not heard at home which inhibits the necessary dialogue from taking place out of the classroom. Very often the lack of parental supervision deters students from acquiring and maintaining learned knowledge. The following areas of improvement were identified.

- Increase students comfort of cognitive language
- Demystify figurative expressions
- Students need to practice focusing on the main clause that contains essential information in the body of the text.
- Parents/care givers must receive the necessary information regarding the general school goals in their native languages.
- Parents are limited in their involvement regarding specific individual student goals.
- Continued emphasis is needed on the ELL and Special Education population.
- Lack of funding prohibits the continued growth of technology in the Science and Social Studies classrooms, as a tool for instruction and differentiation.
- There is a need for a lab specialist.
- There is a need for more lab equipment and kits.
- Teachers need common planning time to integrate Science and Social Studies curriculum with Math and ELA.
- Teachers still need to implement more inquiry-based Science activities and long-term investigations.
- A weakness that was discovered during our Leadership Meeting was the need to align the ELA standards to student writing and teacher developed tasks.
- There is a continued need to take an in-depth look at student work (journals and sourcebooks).
- There needs to be more staff development for the differentiating of instruction in the Science classroom using data to improve student performance using multiple measures to address areas of weakness and target areas of growth on a continuous basis.

- Differentiation of instruction that is driven by data addressing individual student needs must be consistent. Additional emphasis needs to be placed on the acquisition of content area vocabulary.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

Directions: Based on the findings and implications from the comprehensive needs assessment (Section IV), determine your school's instructional goals for 2008-09 and list them in this section along with a few phrases of description. The resulting list should include a limited number of goals (5 is a good guideline), and the list as a whole should be a clear reflection of your priorities for the year. Good goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.

Notes: (1) In Section VI of this template, you will need to complete an "action plan" for each annual goal listed in this section. (2) Schools designated for improvement (SINI/SRAP/SURR or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification. (3) When developed, Principal's Performance Review (PPR) goals should presumably be aligned to the school's annual goals described in this section.

SCHOOL-WIDE GOALS FOR 2008-09

Based on the finds and implications from the comprehensive needs assessment I.S. 77's school-wide instructional goals for 2008-09 will be as follows:

1. According to our School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot for 2008, our English Language Learners did not meet their AYP in English Language Arts. By June 2009, there will be a 3% increase in the number of ELL students making at least 1.5 years of progress as measured by the New York State ELA Assessment.
2. According to our School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot for 2008, our Students with Disabilities made safe harbor. Our goal for June 2009 will be a 3% increase in the number of SWD making at least 1.5 years of progress as measured by the NYS ELA Assessment.
3. According to the Learning Environment Survey Report for 2007-2008 only 19% of the parents completed the parent survey. We need to build upon current strategies to improve parental involvement. By June 2009, there will be a 5% increase in the number of parental involvement opportunities focusing on establishing goals for their children, as measured by attendance records at school functions.
4. According to the 2008 Quality Review, teachers did not utilize differentiated instruction in their classrooms on a regular basis. Our goal for June 2009 will be 90% of the teachers will set appropriate goals for all students using data to differentiate instruction, as measured by lesson plans, observations, and informal and formal walkthroughs.
5. According to our School Demographic and Accountability Snapshot for 2008, our Students with Disabilities made their AYP. Our goal for June 2009 is not only to maintain but also improve student performance as measured by the NYS Mathematics Assessment. By June 2009, there will be a 3% increase in the number of SWD making at least 1.5 years of progress as measured by the NYS Mathematics Assessment.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #1

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, there will be a 3% increase in the number of ELL students making at least 1.5 years of progress in English Language Arts, as measured by the New York State ELA Assessment</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents will receive progress reports detailing students’ performance and areas of focus. • Teachers will focus on Tier I interventions to assess students’ needs. • Students will be required to attend 37.5 minutes extended morning sessions, where staff will focus on students’ areas of weakness as based on ELA item skills analysis. • America’s Choice curriculum was revised to support the New York Learning Standards. New curriculum uses thematic units instead of genre and author studies • Students will be encouraged to attend SES programs to target and improve specific areas of weakness in ELA. • Professional development will be given in the areas of using EX-CELL and Q-TELL strategies to scaffold instruction. • Through the use of student data (Acuity, Scantron, Gates- MacGinitie and Reading Plus) teachers will be able to set goals and plan for instruction. <p>Responsible Staff Members: Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, Lead Teacher, ELA Teachers, Parents/Guardians Implementation Timelines: October 2008- June 2009</p>

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>ALIGNING RESOURCES- Literacy Coach, Lead Teachers, ELL Teachers, Literacy Teachers, AIS Providers, Assistant Principals <i>Funding for substitutes or coverage by teachers funded through Tax Levy/ Title I</i> <i>Teacher release time paid for through Tax Levy/ Title I</i> <i>AIS Provider, C4E/TL/ Title I</i> <i>Inquiry Team funded through: Title I</i></p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher Assessment Notebooks (TAN) • Conferencing with students • Informal and Formal assessments • Assessment of students homework and class work • Gates-MacGinite • Reading Plus • Acuity • Departmental Walkthroughs • Inquiry Team Meetings • Scantron- Performance Series <p>Interval of Periodic Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly Inquiry Team meetings • Weekly and Monthly teacher review • Tri-Annual Gates-MacGinite assessment <p>Projected Gains: 3% of ELL students will show at least 1.5 years of progress as measured by NYS English Language Arts Exam.</p>

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #2

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, there will be a 3% increase in the number of SWD making at least 1.5 years of progress in English Language Arts, as measured by the NYS ELA Assessment</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-going, data-based assessment will drive instruction as teachers plan to meet the needs of their students through the following research-based programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Janet Allen Author Study ○ Wilson Reading System ○ Great Leaps Reading Program • Teachers will focus on Tier I interventions to assess students’ needs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guided reading groups ○ Small group instruction • Students will be required to attend 37.5 minutes extended morning sessions, where staff will focus on students’ areas of weakness as based on ELA item skills analysis. America’s Choice curriculum was revised to support the New York Learning Standards. New curriculum uses thematic units instead of genre and author studies • America’s Choice curriculum was revised to support the New York Learning Standards. New curriculum uses thematic units instead of genre and author studies • On going IEP professional development • Parents will receive progress reports detailing students’ performance and areas of focus.

	<p>Responsible Staff Members: Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, Lead Teacher, ELA Teachers, Wilson Providers, Parents/Guardians Implementation Timelines: October 2008- June 2009</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>ALIGNING RESOURCES- Literacy Coach, Lead Teachers, Literacy Teachers, AIS Providers, Assistant Principals <i>Funding for substitutes or coverage by teachers funded through Tax Levy/Title I Teacher release time paid for through Tax Levy/Title I AIS Provider, C4E/TL/ Title I</i></p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher Assessment Notebooks (TAN) • Conferencing with students • Informal and Formal assessments • Assessment of students homework and class work • Gates-MacGinite • Reading Plus • Wilson Reading Program (where applicable) • Acuity • Departmental Walkthroughs • Scantron- Performance Series <p>Interval of Periodic Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly Inquiry Team meetings • Weekly and Monthly teacher review • Tri-Annual Gates-MacGinite assessment <p>Projected Gains: 3% of SWD will show at least 1.5 years of progress as measured by NYS Language Arts Exam.</p>

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #3

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): Parent Involvement

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, there will be a 5% increase in the number of parental involvement opportunities focusing on establishing goals for their children, based on attendance records at school functions.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I.S. 77 examined the Home Language Survey and the School Tabulation of Languages spoken at home to determine the language(s) spoken at home by the parents and students. • All communication materials to be sent to the home will be translated into English and Spanish. Materials will be mailed in a timely fashion. • Parent workshops on how to analyze data from the Item Skill Analysis for Math and ELA, Acuity, Gates-MacGinite, Performance Series, and monthly departmental Math exams. • Parent Coordinator will organize classes to teach parents how to access Survey Web Tool to log in to Learning Environment Survey. • Review the Parent Survey Reports from our school to see how their answers align with those from other schools. • View progress Report and Quality Review to assess areas of parental concern. <p>Principal, Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselors, PTA, SLT team and Parent Coordinator Implementation Timelines: October 2008- June 2009</p>

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>ALIGNING RESOURCES- Literacy Coach, Lead Teachers, Literacy Teachers, AIS Providers, Assistant Principals <i>Parent Coordinator funded through Tax Levy</i> <i>Teacher release time paid for through Tax Levy/Title I</i> <i>SLT Team Members funded through Title I</i></p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Learning Environment Survey to assess Parents participation. • Attendance records of PTA Meetings, • SLT Meetings • Special Events/Workshops <p>Projected Gains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of parental involvement opportunities focusing on establishing goals for their children will increase by 5%

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #4

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): Professional Development

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, 90% of the teachers will set appropriate goals for all students using data to differentiate instruction, as measured by lesson plans, observations, informal and formal walkthroughs.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents will receive progress reports detailing students’ performance and areas of focus. • Teachers will focus on Tier I interventions to assess students’ needs. • Students will be required to attend 37.5 minutes extended morning sessions, where staff will focus on students’ areas of weakness as based on ELA item skills analysis. • Through the use of Great Leaps Reading, Reading Plus, Wilson Reading, • Janet Allen’s Plugged Into Reading • Through the use of Teacher Assessment Notebooks/Student Assessment Notebooks (TAN/SAN) • Using the data to create guided math and reading groups • Through the use of Exploring Math and differentiated monthly departmental math assessments. • Revised ELA Scope and Sequence using thematic units allows teachers to target and differentiate instruction. • Students will be encouraged to attend SES programs to target and improve specific areas of weakness in ELA. • Establish professional study groups to examine the research on cognitive apprenticeship that supports complex comprehension • Professional development will be given in the areas of Reciprocal

	<p style="text-align: center;">Teaching, and Questioning the Author. Responsible Staff Members: Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, Lead Teacher, ELA Teachers, Parents/Guardians Implementation Timelines: October 2008- June 2009</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>ALIGNING RESOURCES- Literacy Coach, Lead Teachers, ELL Teachers, Literacy Teachers, AIS Providers, Assistant Principals <i>Funding for substitutes or coverage by teachers funded through Tax Levy/ Title I</i> <i>Teacher release time paid for through: Tax Levy/ Title I</i> SETREC Trainers: Tax Levy OSEI: Tax Levy</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher Assessment Notebooks (TAN) • Conferencing with students • Informal and Formal assessments • Assessment of students homework and class work • Gates-MacGinite • Reading Plus • Acuity • Departmental Walkthroughs • Scantron- Performance Series <p>Interval of Periodic Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly Inquiry Team meetings • Weekly and Monthly teacher reviews • Tri-Annual Gates-MacGinite assessment <p>Projected Gains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Jan 2009 100% of the Special Education teachers will be trained in Strategies of Effective use of Paraprofessionals. • By June 2009 90 % of CTT teachers will be trained in Planning and Differentiation of Assessment • By June 2009 90% Of the ELA department will be trained in Reciprocal teaching.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN #5

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, there will be a 3% increase in the number of SWD making at least 1.5 years of progress in Mathematics, as measured by the NYS Mathematics Assessment.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents will receive progress reports detailing students’ performance and areas of focus. • Teachers will focus on Tier I interventions to assess students’ needs. • Students will be required to attend 37.5 minutes extended morning sessions, where staff will focus on students’ areas of weakness as based on Math item skills analysis. • Use of observation process to monitor and assess the effectiveness of Math instruction and differentiation to identify areas for teacher development • Professional development will be given in the areas of using EX-CELL and Q-TELL strategies to scaffold instruction. • Through the use of student data (Acuity and Scantron,) teachers will be able to set goals and plan for instruction. • Teachers will set up guided math groups based on data collected from the Student Assessment Notebook (SAN). • Differentiate monthly departmental Math assessments. <p>Responsible Staff Members: Assistant Principals, Literacy Coach, Lead Teacher, ELA Teachers, Parents/Guardians Implementation Timelines: October 2008- June 2009</p>

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>ALIGNING RESOURCES- Literacy Coach, Lead Teachers, ELL Teachers, Literacy Teachers, AIS Providers, Assistant Principals <i>Funding for substitutes or coverage by teachers funded through Tax Levy/ Title I</i> <i>Teacher release time paid for through Tax Levy/ Title I</i> <i>AIS Provider, C4E/TL/ Title I</i> <i>Inquiry Team funded through: Title I</i></p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Assessment Notebooks (SAN) • Conferencing with students • Informal and Formal assessments • Assessment of students homework and class work • Monthly Departmental Exams • Acuity • Departmental Walkthroughs • Inquiry Team Meetings • Scantron- Performance Series <p>Interval of Periodic Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly Inquiry Team meetings • Weekly and Monthly teacher reviews • Monthly Departmental Exams <p>Projected Gains: 3% of the students will show 1.5 years of progress as measured on the New York State Math Exam.</p>

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K			N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								
5								
6	36	36	23	19	33	5	2	17
7	85	89	10	15	58	2	3	11
8	52	50	8	67	61	2	2	6
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.

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiate instruction in all ELA classes – Tier I Intervention • Through Tier II interventions such as Wilson Reading, Reading Plus, Great Leaps and Rewards Reading. • Students will have the option of staying after school 2 days per week for extra help with Inquiry Team teachers.
Mathematics:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiate instruction in all math classes – Tier I intervention • Through frequent content and skills based assessment the effectiveness of Tier I intervention will be determined. Students who are not making progress from Tier I will be referred for Tier II intervention. These students will then be given Tier II interventions administered by designated staff. Students will be given teacher generated exams on Acuity to focus on areas of weakness. There will be individualized plans created for each student focusing on their specific need. • Students will have the option of staying after school 2 days per week for extra help with Inquiry Team teachers. • Mathematics lead teacher will meet with targeted students 1 period per week (schedule permitting) to focus on specific targeted topics as related to the monthly performance indicators.
Science:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the State mandated periods of science instruction students will receive an additional 37.5 minute period of AIS instruction in science per week. • Differentiate instruction in all Science classes – Tier I intervention (implementation of teacher generated assessment notebooks and test leveling through core curriculum.) • Use of Teacher assessment (i.e. Portfolios, Lab Reports, Science Assessment notebooks, Rubrics, classroom tests, Exit Projects) to drive instruction during the school day.
Social Studies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the State mandated periods of social studies instruction students will receive an additional 37.5-minute period of AIS instruction in social studies per week. • Differentiate instruction in all Social Studies classes – Tier I intervention (i.e.- Use of individualized oral assessment, rubrics, portfolios) to drive instruction during the school day

At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counselors provide group and or individual counseling based upon the at-risk students' need. • Counselors provide classroom and auditorium presentations dealing with topics such as bullying and peer-pressure. • Counselors provide mediation services to students. • Counselors meet with parents/guardians to discuss issues relevant to each individual student. • Counselors track student performance through grades, standardized test scores and or attendance/lateness to provide better services to the at risk student and their families. • Parent meetings are held to discuss issues that are relevant to the student as well as their parent /guardian. • Counseling services are offered in both English and Spanish
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The School Psychologist will offer counseling services, outside referrals and academic and social/emotional support during the school day on an as needed basis to students at-risk. • The School Psychologist will also collaborate with administrative, teaching and counseling staff to assess intervene and remediate significant academic and behavioral issues exhibited by students within the classroom. All of these services will identify the social, emotional, academic and behavioral factors that impede student performance and provide the necessary support services.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The social worker provides support and counseling services to our at-risk students working collaboratively with the psychologist and guidance staff. • She assists students in dealing with family and social emotional difficulties which interfere with the educational process • Supportive assistance is provided to family members developing effective strategies to work with their child in the home environment. • Referrals to outside agencies and community support groups are provided.
At-risk Health-related Services:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health related services are provided to all students deemed at risk during the school day. • Students will be provided with support and coping skills to deal with health issues such as asthma, diabetes, nutrition, obesity, and high blood pressure • Parents and family members will be assisted in dealing with individual health related needs for their child.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

LANGUAGE ACQUISITION POLICY 2008-2009

I.S. 77’s LAP team consists of Mr. Joseph Miller, Principal, Ms. Marilyn Berrios, A.P., Mr. Carlos Canales, Parent Coordinator, Karen Posey, Literacy Coach, Christina Alexiou, Math Coach, Melinda Di Scala, ESL Teacher, Monica Brodsky, ESL Teacher and Regan Schwartz, ESL Teacher.

We have six classes, two per grade, which are serviced by certified content area teachers as well as 6 certified ESL teachers. We also have a population of ELLs in the general and special education classes serviced by certified ESL teachers. The certified ESL teachers use a Push-In Co-Teaching model in ELA and other literacy based classes. In addition, the content area teachers use ESL strategies. All students are provided with differentiated instruction, data driven, to meet and exceed criteria for city and state learning and performance standards.

Part IV: Parent Program Choice:

Our free-standing ESL classes have students from many different language groups. These include Spanish, Chinese, Urdu, Arabic, Polish, Albanian, Nepalese and others. All students’ parents are given Parent Survey and Selection forms at the appropriate time. Beginning in the month of September, parents are invited to attend a series of parent workshops to discuss the various program options stated on the Parent Survey and Selection forms. At the workshops, we discuss the available programs at I.S. 77. We inform parents that their child will be taught the content area subject by certified teachers. Parents watch a video and read brochures in their native languages (whichever are available) describing the available programs. Translators are provided when available to answer questions. Additionally, Parent Surveys and Program Selection forms, in English and in most native languages, are given to parents to read and to make selections.

Students whose parents do not attend these workshops are sent home with the survey and selection form to complete at home. The students sign for these forms to prove that they have been received. The majority of the forms are returned completed in a timely manner. Those few that are not returned or completed are given a duplicate. They are encouraged to return them quickly for proper placement.

According to the response, the trend by parents is to choose unanimously the free-standing ESL program for their child.

Part V:

Part A: Assessment Analysis:

After reviewing the data analyzed by both proficiency level and the modalities of listening, speaking and writing, the following is incorporated into the program:

Beginners need to strengthen all areas of language acquisition. They will be instructed using ESL strategies and methodologies such as: scaffolding, differentiated instruction, meta-cognitive strategies, linking and bridging information, teachers modeling good habits of reading, writing, speaking and listening, using

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

proficiency level-based text for the beginner to move forward. The same strategies will be used with the intermediate and advanced students in order to challenge them in furthering their language acquisition and in their academic subjects to become more proficient and test out of the ESL program. The Workshop Model is used to foster learning and encourage English language acquisition in a supportive environment. Within this framework the more proficient student is working with the less proficient student to increase communication and academic success.

Instruction in the four modalities is affected by the proficiency levels in the class. Utilizing the ESL certified teacher to intensively work with the less proficient student in small groups fosters acquisition.

Part B:

Those students who are eligible to take the ESL exam scored at Levels 1, 2, and 3. We do have a few students who take tests in their native language, but a comparison of this data is difficult since they are only permitted to submit one exam. The majority of our ELLs take their exams in English. Many ELLs do pass the NYS Math exam.

The teachers are using the data from the Interim Assessments to group students and formulate differentiated instruction within the classroom as aligned with the NYS and NYC content and performance standards. Using the data from the LAP to drive instruction, students will be instructed in appropriate groups according to proficiency across the four modalities.

Part VI: Planning for ELLs:

SIFE students, newcomers, long term ELLs and former ELLs are enrolled in the extended day academic programs for math, reading, writing and speaking where the emphasis is the on building competence in the four modalities. The incorporation of differentiated instruction in the classroom and the Workshop Model of Readers and Writers Workshop will help the ELLs in the content-based subjects by using language acquisition strategies and more proficient students to foster learning as modeled by the teacher. The incorporation of technology-infused learning will add to the classroom teacher's repertoire of interactive instructional approaches for the ELLs. Some long term ELLs have been selected to participate in an inquiry team, based on specific criteria. In addition to the aforementioned academic programs, these groups receive targeted instruction in Language Arts. The former ELLs (students who have tested out within two years) are entitled to time and a half of any standardized test. These students get additional support by attending the extended day program.

ESL certified teachers' program reflect the mandated number of minutes of instructional time for the beginner, intermediate and advanced learner.

Our ELLs are serviced by ESL certified teachers with a push-in co-teaching model.

Part VII: Resources and Support:

All classes are taught in English and all materials are in English. The instructional materials used to support ELLs is subject and proficiency level specific.

Professional Development focuses on providing teachers with scaffolding and differentiated instruction strategies for teaching the ELLs. It will focus on how to prepare ELLs to meet and exceed the NYS Performance and Learning Standards and to achieve higher scores on all city and state assessments. Topics that will be addressed during these professional development sessions are as follows:

- Differentiated Instruction for ELLs
- Scaffolding Across Disciplines
- Aida Walqui instructional strategies to enhance student performance (Q-TEL)
- Improving language acquisition in the content area

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

- ExC-ELL (Expediting Comprehension for English Language Learners_Dr. Margarita Calderon)

Part VIII: Program Description:

I.S. 77 has a free-standing E.S.L. program. We have six classes, two per grade, servicing 188 E.L.L. students. Out of those 188, 10 students are SIFE. We also have a population of English Language Learners in the general and special education classes. There are 40 students out of the 188 that are in the Special Education population. Many of those Special Education students are X-Coded. X-Coded students are serviced as per their IEP's, which indicate "Monolingual Services without ESL." The X-Coded students are still required to take the NYSESLAT. The free standing classes are heterogeneously grouped and based on proficiency in English as determined by the NYSESLAT. Their subjects are departmentalized. Each class travels as a group to their content area classes. Each group is serviced by a certified ESL teacher using a Push-In Co-Teaching model in addition to content teachers who use ESL strategies. The students dispersed throughout the regular classes (such as CTT and SETTS classes) are serviced by a certified ESL teacher who pushes in during ELA and other literacy-based classes.

The ESL teacher services beginner and intermediate ELL students 360 minutes per week (2-45 minute sessions, 8 times per week). Students at the advanced level of English proficiency are serviced 180 minutes per week (1-45 minute session, 4 times per week). Some of our teachers work on one grade level while others work across grade levels. Our ESL strategies, our close contact with classroom teachers, our focus on the content areas and alignment of instruction and our co-teaching model provide much reinforcement for the ELL's, which help them meet higher standards.

All of our students are provided with differentiated instruction within the America's Choice Workshop Model to meet the New York State Learning Standards. Our school includes the creation of a learning community in which all members learn together through meaningful and educational experiences. In addition, staff members and parents participate in quality professional development to enhance teaching and learning in order to improve children's knowledge, performance and achievement in school.

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

Type of Program: ___ Bilingual ESL ___ Both Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08: 170
(No more than 2 pages)

- I. Instructional Program for ELLs (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc). Program planning and management description to include identification and placement of ESL/Bilingual certified teachers, utilization of appropriate instructional materials (English and other languages) and technology, school-based supervisory support, use of external organizations, compliance with ELL-related mandates, and use of data to improve instruction:

A. Curricular: Briefly describe the school's literacy, mathematics and other content area programs and explain ELLs' participation in those programs. Briefly describe supplemental programs for ELLs (i.e., AIS, Saturday Academies).

Our Free-Standing ESL classes (six classes, two per grade) are comprised of students with a variety of native languages-Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Polish, Albanian and Tibetan. Certified ESL teachers co-teach with content-area teachers in social studies, science and English language arts. Individuals are placed in English-language instruction ESL classes after reviewing data for both proficiency level and modality of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Beginners, in order to strengthen all areas of language acquisition, are instructed using ESL strategies such as scaffolding, differentiated instruction, meta-cognitive strategies, and linking and bridging information. Teachers model good habits of reading, writing, speaking and listening and utilize proficiency level content for the beginners to move forward. The same strategies are used with the intermediate and advanced students but on a more in-depth level. This is done to further their language acquisition and to reach a proficiency level to be able to test out of the ESL program. All students are provided with a standards-based curriculum; aligned instructional materials in their home language and accessible English; and teachers prepared in a subject matter and English language development. Supplemental programs include Extended Day (4 days a week), AIS services, SES services, and Holiday Academy, where language skills are reinforced in the major subject areas. All ESL classes incorporate ELL strategies that were discussed during extensive professional development (ExC-ELL and Q-TEL).

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

Extracurricular activities for ELL students include our Math Club, Robotics, Early-morning Beacon, basketball program, GO committee, Calligraphy, Chorus and Dance. ELLs are offered numerous opportunities for social activities within the school. Past records reveal that many students do attend.

- II. Parent/community: Describe parent/community involvement activities planned to meaningfully involve parents in their children's education and to inform them about the state standards and assessments.

Parents are invited to attend our ESL adult classes conducted during the school day and our ESL computer classes given in the evening hours. We also offer Saturday trips to educational sites around New York for ELL students and their parents to foster academic knowledge

and language skills. Parents are invited to attend “Back-to-School” night, Parent Teacher Conferences and special school events. These events have translators available in multiple languages for parental understanding.

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

I.S. 77 will hold three open house events for our feeder schools (newly arriving sixth-grader) in anticipation of incoming students. During these sessions, parents of ELLs, general and special education children are invited to view the school and its educational programs. Teachers and administrators, through the use of translators, allow parents the opportunity to discuss observations and concerns. Newly enrolled ELL/LEP students also have the opportunity to speak to our guidance counselors prior to the first day of school.

- IV. Staff Development (2008-2009 activities—tentative dates and ELL-related topics): Describe how staff will participate in ongoing, long-term staff development with a strong emphasis on the State learning standards and high impact differentiated and academic language development strategies.

Teachers, coaches and administrators attended a series of workshops to enhance the ELL classroom. We will continue to implement and refine the strategies learned during these workshops in the summer and the upcoming school year.

Quality Teaching for English Learners (Q-TEL) Series: Quality Teaching for English Learners is a unique professional development series that helps all teachers explore the attitudes, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to work effectively with adolescent language learners. Participants learn how the scaffold disciplinary discourse in specific subject matter areas through the exploration and analysis of classroom exemplars. Participants also learn to develop students’ metacognitive awareness of language and generative learning strategies.

Expediting Comprehension for English Language Learners (ExC-ELL) Series: This program, collaboratively develops, implements, and refines the staff development program and instructional design for middle school teachers of English, Science and Social Studies who have English Language Learners in their classrooms. The program focuses on helping content teachers develop students’ word knowledge, basic reading skills, comprehension of texts, discussion skills, grammatical knowledge, spelling and writing skills.

RIGOR: This program will be used as a supplementary program during the extended day for out at-risk students which include those with limited English proficiency. The summer institute will focus on strategies for both ELL and SWD students in ELA skills, language acquisition skills, content area vocabulary and fluency.

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

- *The Pupil Personnel Team (PPT) consists of the Academy assistant principal, dean, teachers, guidance counselor and school psychologist. This team meets regularly to target students at risk, both academically and emotionally.*

- *Our full time guidance counselors offer services to students which include individual and small group, counseling, crisis counseling, educational and personal information services and agency referrals.*
- *AIS services are offered to students who score at or below the proficiency on the state exams.*
- *Peer Mediation programs are offered for conflict resolution.*
- *The attendance coordinator monitors student attendance.*
- *A department of health and a department of education nurse identify students with health problems and provide a plan to maintain the health of the students.*

VI. Name/type of native language assessments administered (bilingual programs only): Describe how you assess the level of native language development and proficiency of the ELLs who are in a bilingual program.

N/A

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

School Building: I.S. 77

District: 24

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	
	4					4

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

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

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

Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules

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

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 24

School Building: IS 77

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 7:53 To: 8:30	Subject (Specify) ESL PULL OUT EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) ESL PULL OUT EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) ESL PULL OUT EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) ESL PULL OUT EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) NA
2	From: 8:45 To: 9:30	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) LA / ESL PUSH IN	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) LA/ ESL PUSH IN	Subject (Specify) MUSIC
3	From: 9:30 To: 10:15	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) LA/ ESL PUSH IN	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) LA / ESL PUSH IN	Subject (Specify) ACADEMY ASSEMBLY
4	From: 10:15 To: 11:00	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH
5	From: 11:00 To: 11:45	Subject (Specify) LA/ ESL PUSH IN	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) MUSIC	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES
6	From: 11:45 To: 12:30	Subject (Specify) LA/ESL PUSH IN	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ART	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE
7	From: 12:30 To: 1:15	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) MUSIC	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) PHYS EDUCATION
8	From: 1:15 To: 2:00	Subject (Specify) BAND	Subject (Specify) ART	Subject (Specify) LA/ ESL PUSH IN	Subject (Specify) ART	Subject (Specify) MATH
9	From: 2:00 To: 2:45	Subject (Specify) PHYS ED	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) LA / ESL PUSH IN	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE
10	From: NA To:	Subject (Specify) NA	Subject (Specify) NA	Subject (Specify) NA	Subject (Specify) NA	Subject (Specify) NA

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (Bilingual) : N/A

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

School District: 24 School Building: I.S. 77

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

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) 6, 7, 8 Number of Students to be Served: 188 LEP _____ Non-LEP _____

Number of Teachers 4 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

Our Free-Standing ESL classes (six classes, two per grade) are comprised of students (approximately 188) with a variety of native languages – Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Korean, Polish and Albanian. Certified ESL teachers co-teach with content-area teachers in mathematics, social studies, science and English language arts. Individuals are placed in English-language instruction ESL classes after reviewing data for both proficiency level and modality of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Beginners, in order to strengthen all areas of language acquisition, are instructed using ESL strategies such as, scaffolding, differentiated instruction, meta-cognitive strategies, and linking and bridging information. Teachers model good habits of reading, writing, speaking and listening and utilize proficiency level information. Teachers model good habits of reading, writing, speaking and listening and utilize proficiency level content for the beginners to move forward. The same strategies are used with the intermediate and advanced students but to a more in-depth level. This is done to further their language acquisition and to reach a proficiency level to be able to test out of the ESL program. All students are provided with a standards-based curriculum; aligned instructional materials in their home language and accessible English; and teachers prepared in a subject matter and English language development.

Flocabulary consultants will provide supplemental language instruction to the English language learners using a multimedia vocabulary program. This is a rigorous standards-based curriculum that teaches vocabulary, reading comprehension, and critical thinking in an engaging format. The vocabulary words in each level have been selected according to how frequently

they appear on state assessments. This rigorous standards-based curriculum teaches vocabulary, reading comprehension, and critical thinking in an engaging format. The vocabulary words in each level have been selected according to how frequently they appear on state assessments. This program empowers students to use the words in their own speech and writing.

Professional Development Program – Describe the school’s professional development program for teachers and other staff responsible for the delivery of instruction and services to limited English proficient students.

English language learners are required to learn content curriculum and demonstrate this knowledge through performance on state mandated exams. The Morning ESL sessions will focus on literacy using ESL strategies to help students achieve higher scores on the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT). The morning sessions will concentrate on vocabulary, reading comprehension, and critical thinking. The focused lessons will reinforce specific comprehension strategies for non-fiction.

During the Spring Break Flocabulary consultants will provide language instruction to the English language learners using a multimedia approach. Teachers working in the supplementary instructional programs will receive professional development before and after school. Topics that will be addressed during the professional development sessions are:

- Differentiating Instruction
- Comprehension Strategies for Non-fiction
- Flocabulary

SECTION XVII
BUDGET NARRATIVE

School District L.S. 77/District 24 For Title III
 BEDS Code 342400010077

*** MUST BE SUBMITTED WITH EACH BUDGET IN THIS DCEP ADDENDUM UPDATE**

If Transferability is used for 2007-2008, the Transferability Form must be submitted online and a hard copy must be submitted with the budget narrative to expedite the review of the FS-10.

Additionally, on the Budget Narrative and FS-10, please indicate the amount of funds to be included under transferability in the budget categories and the Title where funds will be used. Example: In the Title IIA budget under Code 15 – Transferability - Title I Reading Teacher – FTE. 35 - \$15,000.

<i>CODE/ BUDGET CATEGORY</i>	<i>EXPLANATION OF EXPENDITURES IN THIS CATEGORY (as it relates to the program narrative for this Title)</i>
<i>Code 15 Professional Salaries</i>	<i>ESL Morning Program 4 teachers x 6 hours x 6 days @\$49.73 = \$1,193.52 ESL Enrichment Program 3 teachers x 20 hours x 3 days @\$49.73= \$2,983.80 1 supervisor x 20 hours x 3 days @\$51.34 = \$1,078.14</i>
<i>Code 16 Support Staff Salaries</i>	
<i>Code 40 Purchased Services</i>	<i>ESL Enrichment Program – Flocabulary consultants @ \$6,408 (Instruction for students) Professional Development – Sussman Sales consultants @ \$6,855</i>

CODE/ BUDGET CATEGORY	EXPLANATION OF EXPENDITURES IN THIS CATEGORY <i>(as it relates to the program narrative for this Title)</i>
Code 45 Supplies and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Flocabulary books/cds class set @\$407.75 x 3 = \$1,223.25</i> • <i>Sundance Comprehension Strategies Kit @\$273.90 x 4 = \$1,095.60</i> • <i>Exploring Non-Fiction @\$549.99 x4 =\$ 2,199.96</i> • <i>Chart paper @\$22.83 x 15 = \$342.45</i> • <i>Notebooks @ \$2.99 x 50 = \$149.50</i> • <i>Markers @ \$3.12 x 10 = 31.20</i>

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

I.S. 77 examined the Home Language Survey and the School Tabulation of Languages spoken at home to determine the language(s) spoken at home by the parents and students.

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.

Our findings showed that a majority of students spoke Spanish at home. Polish, Arabic, Chinese, and Tibetan each constituted 1% of the languages spoken at home. The school is in the process of translating official school communication documents to parents.

Part B: Strategies and Activities

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

All communication materials to be sent to the home will be translated into English and Spanish. Materials will be mailed in a timely fashion. A staff member will translate all communication materials in Spanish. A staff member is currently training to acquire another language in Polish, the schools other language spoken at home.

2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Indicate whether oral interpretation services will be provided by an outside contractor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

The oral interpretation provided by I.S. 77 will be Spanish. This was determined after checking the language survey for "Spoken language at Home" and the Student Language Tabulation conducted by the school.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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

Our goal is to communicate 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 education options, and parents' capacity to improve their children's achievement. To this end, a team of individuals will be responsible for translating all documents in a timely manner. Parents will receive a letter explaining their rights.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

1. Enter the anticipated Title I allocation for the school for 2008-2009: **\$710,000**
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program: **\$7,100**
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified: **\$35,000**
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year: **100%**
5. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2007-2008 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year. N/A

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Policy

IS 77 agrees to implement the following statutory requirements:

- a. IS 77 will put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents, consistent with section 1118 of the ESEA. Those programs, activities and procedures will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children.
- b. IS 77 will ensure that the required school level parental involvement policy meets the requirements of section 1118(B) of ESEA and includes as a component a school parent compact consistent with section 1118 (D) of the ESEA.
- c. IS 77 will incorporate this parental involvement policy into its school improvement plan.

- d. In carrying out the Title I, Part A parental involvement requirements, to the extent possible, IS 77 will provide full opportunities for the participation of parents with limited English proficiency, parents with disabilities, and parents of migratory children, including providing information and school reports required under section 1111 of the ESEA in an understandable and uniform format and including alternate formats upon request and to the extent possible, in a language the parents understand.
- e. IS 77 will involve the parents of children served in Title I, Part A programs in decisions how the 1% of Title I Part A funds reserved for parental involvement is spent.
- f. IS 77 will be governed by the following statutory definition of parental involvement and will carry out programs activities and procedures in accordance with this definition:
 - i. Parental involvement in the form of regular two way and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring
 - ii. That parents play an integral part in assisting their child's learning
 - iii. That parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school;
 - iv. That parents are full partners in their child's education and are included as appropriate in decision making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child, the carrying out of other activities such as those described in section 1118 of the ESEA.
 - v. The school will inform parents and parental organizations of the purpose and existence of the parental information and resource center in the state.

IS 77 will take the following actions to involve parents in the joint development of its school parental involvement plan under section 1112 of the ESEA:

1. 50% of the SLT will be comprised of parents where the parental involvement plan will be discussed.
2. Monthly meetings will be held for parents to attend.
3. Informational PTA meetings will be held to discuss the P.I.P.

IS 77 will take the following actions to involve parents in the process of school review and improvement under section 1116 of the ESEA:

- Notifications will be sent home with the child in the home language if possible.
- Instructional meetings will be given to reveal the plan for improvement.
- Parents will be notified by letter, about the Public School Choice Transfer policy.

IS 77 will provide the following necessary coordination, technical assistance and other support in planning and implementing effective parental involvement activities to improve student academic achievement and school performance:

1. IS 77 will take the following actions to conduct with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of this parental involvement policy in improving school quality. The evaluation will include identifying barriers to greater participation by all parents in parental activities. IS 77 will use the findings of this evaluation about its parental involvement policy and activities to design strategies for more effective parental involvement and to revise if necessary its parental involvement practices.

2. IS 77 will build the schools' and parent's capacity for strong parental involvement in order to ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership with the parents and the community to improve student academic achievement through the following activities described below:

IS 77 will provide assistance to parents of children served by IS 77, as appropriate in understanding topics such as the following:

1. State's academic content standards
2. State's student academic achievement standards
3. State and local academic assessments including alternate assessments, the requirements of Part A, how to monitor their child's progress and how to work with educators.

IS 77 will provide materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve their child's academic achievement, such as literacy training, using technology as appropriate to foster parental involvement by:

- Lending library
- Family math night
- ESL classes

IS 77 will, with the assistance of parents, educate the teachers, pupil services personnel, principal and other staff on how to reach out to communicate with and work with parents as equal partners in the value and utility of contributions of parents and in how to implement and coordinate parent programs and build times between parents and schools by:

- Providing PD on communicating with parents
- Request voluntary assistance by the teachers and staff at parent-student events.

IS 77 will take the following actions to ensure that information related to the school and parent programs meetings and other activities is sent home to the parents of participating children in an understandable and uniform format.

- Required letters will be sent to parents in their home language
 - Translators will be available at important function.
-
- Involving parents in the development of training for teachers, principals, and other educators to improve the effectiveness of that training
 - Providing necessary literacy training for parents from Title I, Part A funds, if the school district has exhausted all other reasonably available sources of funding for that training
 - Paying reasonable and necessary expenses associated with parental involvement activities, including transportation and child care costs, to enable parents to participate in school-related meetings and training sessions
 - Training parents to enhance the involvement of other parents.
 - In order to maximize parental involvement and participation in their children's education, arranging school meetings at a variety of times, or conducting in-home conferences between teachers or other educators, who work directly with participating children, with parents who are unable to attend those conferences at school

- Adopting and implementing model approaches to improving parental involvement
- Developing appropriate roles for community-based organizations and businesses, including faith-based organizations, in parental involvement activities.
- Providing other reasonable support for parental involvement activities under section 1118 as parents may request.

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

Intermediate School 77 and the parents of the students participating in activities, services, and programs funded by Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (participating children), agree that this compact outlines how the parents, the entire school staff, and the students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership that will help children achieve the State's high standards. This school-parent compact is in effect during school year 2008-2009.

School Responsibilities

1. Involve parents in the joint development of any School Wide Program plan (for SWP schools), in an organized, ongoing, and timely way.
2. Hold an annual meeting to inform parents who wish to be involved in Title I, Part A programs. The school will hold the meeting at a convenient time to parents, and will offer a flexible number of additional parental involvement meetings, such as in the morning or evening, so that as many parents as possible are able to attend. The school will invite to this meeting all parents of children participating in Title I, Part A programs (participating students), and will encourage them to attend.
3. Provide information to parents of participating students in an understandable and uniform format, including alternative formats upon the request of parents with disabilities, and to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand.
4. Provide to parents of participating children information in a timely manner about Title I, Part A programs that includes a description and explanation of the school's curriculum, the forms of academic assessment used to measure children's progress, and the proficiency levels students are expected to meet.
5. On the request of parents, provide opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions, and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions about the education of their children. The school will respond to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible.
6. Provide to each parent an individual student report about the performance of their child on the State assessment in at least math, language arts and reading.
7. Provide each parent timely notice when their child has been assigned or has been taught for four (4) or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified within the meaning of the term in section 200.56 of the Title I.

Parent Responsibilities

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

- Monitoring attendance
- Making sure that homework is completed
- Monitoring amount of television our children watch.
- Volunteering in my child's classroom.
- Participating, when appropriate, in decisions relating to my children's education
- Promoting positive use of my child's extracurricular time.
- Staying informed about my child's education and communicating with the school by promptly reading all notices from then school or the school district either received by my child or by mail and responding, as appropriate.
- Serving, to the extent possible, on policy advisory groups, such as being the Title I, Part A parent representative on the school's School Improvement Team, the Title I Policy Advisory Committee, the District wide Policy Advisory Council, the State's Committee of Practitioners, the School Support Team or other school advisory or policy group.

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards. As reflected on page 10-11.

A comprehensive needs assessment is compiled from many sources. It is the centerpiece of our planning process and includes the following:

- a. NYC DOE Quality Review
- b. Learning environment survey
- c. Progress report
- d. Annual report card
- e. Comprehensive information report
- f. Classroom observations
- g. Student work

2. School wide reform strategies that:

- a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
- b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:

- Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
- Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
- Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
- Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the School wide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
- Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

School wide reform strategies that will be in place for the 2008-2009 year will provide opportunities for all children, including those who are low academic achievers, to meet State's proficient and advanced levels of academic success. These provisions will take place before, during, and after school to provide remedial and enrichment activities in the following ways:

- Guidance counselors, AP's, classroom teachers and the attendance teacher will closely monitor attendance. Students who are truant or have excessive absences will be discussed during the weekly AIS meetings and strategies will be put in place to address the concerns.
- Supervisors, coaches, lead teachers will receive PD to turnkey information to staff members.
- Lead Teachers will facilitate and model best practices and strategies to assist teachers provide opportunities for student academic success in the four major content areas.
- ESL classroom teachers will incorporate Q-Tel and EXC-ELL strategies within the 4 major content areas to assist students with language development and academic achievement.
- Data driven instruction and student assessments (Acuity, departmental) will be key to classroom instruction in ELA, math, social studies and Spanish. Small group instruction will be required to address student weakness and logs of assistance will be utilized for remedial purposes.
- Implementation of remedial programs to assist students with basic reading and math skills will be incorporated into the classroom (Wilson Reading Program and Understanding Math) through small group instruction.
- Continuation of AIS teachers to assist (ELA and math) low performing students through small group instruction.
- New curriculum will be implemented in ELA to strengthen and deepen knowledge of the students.
- IMPACT math will continue to be used throughout all grades. Supplemental material will be incorporated to ensure that all of the NYS performance indicators are being addressed.
- Extended day programs will continue to address the needs of struggling students in ELA, math, social studies, and science.
- Continuation of the academy setting to build upon the smaller learning community structure and to foster a sense of support and belonging.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

Each content teacher holds a bachelor's degree and is fully licensed by NYS. We demand that they also demonstrate knowledge in the subject area that they teach. Approximately 80% of current teachers possess a masters Degree or higher.

4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the School wide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.

Professional development will be offered to content area teachers and will include but is not limited to activities that:

- Improve and increase teachers' knowledge of academic subjects and assist teachers to become highly qualified.
- Are an essential part of extensive school wide and network wide educational improvement plans.
- Provide the principal, assistant principals, teachers and parents with the knowledge and skills to help students meet and exceed challenging State academic standards.
- Improve classroom management skills
- Are continual, intensive, and classroom focused and are not one day or short term workshops
- Increase teacher understanding of effective instruction strategies that are centered on scientifically based research.

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

- Advertise vacancies through DOE website
- Attendance at city wide job fairs
- Committee comprised of supervisors and teachers to interview candidates and observe demonstration lessons

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

- Inclusion of Family coordinator to the Instructional leadership team and principal's cabinet.
- Adult education/ESL classes for parents
- Book fair aligned with PTA meetings

7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.

N/A

8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
 - Instructional Leadership Team meets weekly and is comprised of supervisors, coaches, lead teachers and subject teachers. Activities include analyzing student work and both teacher created and standardized assessments and interviewing students,
 - Monthly department meetings for teachers and subject supervisor to review all assessments and data.
 - Pre and post-observation meetings with individual teachers and supervisors to discuss assessment and instruction.

9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.
 - Listed under school wide reform strategies B (as seen on page 47-48).

10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.
 - Advisory program for students in 6th grade
 - School wide drug prevention (Red Ribbon Week) program
 - Conflict mediation program
 - Anti-bullying program
 - Anti-bias program
 - Adult education classes
 - CHAMPS program
 - SES programs
 - 21st Century program

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS N/A

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

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

N/A

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

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

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

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

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

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and

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

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

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: Re-Structuring year 4

SURR¹ Phase/Group (If applicable):

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

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

In our latest accountability snapshot, the school's adequate yearly progress (AYP) was not meet with our English Language Learners in English language arts and we only achieved Safe Harbor with our Students with Disabilities also in English language arts.

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.
 - **Lead Teacher positions to work with teachers in all subjects and with all subgroups to prepare them for the grade 8 curriculum;**
 - **Utilize on-going, data-based assessment that will drive instruction as teachers plan to meet the needs of their individual students including the continuation and refinement of the AIS team to address the Level 1 and 2 students.**
 - **Intensive professional development in the understanding and use of specialized instructional strategies to meet the needs of all struggling mathematics students through the services of the Assistant Principal, Math Coach, and Lead Teacher.**
 - **Continuation of the ELL strategies and collaborative-team teaching approach in the ESL, special education, and general education classroom.**
 - **Increased training and participation in the Wilson Reading Program and the Understanding Math software program will be given to special education and regular education teachers to decrease the percent of Level I students.**

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified.
 - (a) Provide the following information: 2008-09 anticipated Title I allocation = \$ 710,000 ; 10% of Title I allocation = \$ 71,000
 - (b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement.
 - **Hold site-based professional development on the NYS Content Standards**
 - **Conduct workshops by the lead teacher on best practices and data-driven instructions**
 - **Supply summer school teachers with professional development to integrate all academic subjects into a literacy-based program**
 - **Attend professional development conferences**
 - **Provide opportunities to turnkey information to content area teachers**
 - **2 coaches**
2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school's strategy for providing high-quality professional development.
 - **Lead Teachers- Two lead teachers will be working across the curriculum in grade seven to model and support best practices in the classroom and strategies to increase academic achievement.**
 - **Full-time literacy and mathematics coach-support the balanced-literacy and balanced-mathematics models with the classroom teachers through modeling, one-on-one meetings, and study groups.**
 - **NYC Fellows are mentored by the Dept. of Education mentors during the school year**
 - **Mentors from participating colleges conduct monthly visitations with the Fellows who attend classes at their campuses.**
 - **Inter-visitations is provided to new teachers as a mentoring technique**

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.

Notices will be generated in multiple languages and distributed to the students to bring home to their parent/guardian. Additionally, information about the school's identification for school improvement will be posted on the school website and will be discussed by the Parent Coordinator at the June 2008 and September 2008 PTA meeting.

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: N/A

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

Directions: All schools are expected to reflect on the seven (7) key findings of the “audit of the written, tested, and taught curriculum” outlined below, and respond to the applicable questions that follow each section.

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

A curriculum that is in alignment will present the content to be taught (as outlined by the state standards), with links to the following: an array of resources from which teachers may choose in teaching this content; a pacing calendar and/or suggested timeframe for covering the curriculum material; a description of expectations for both the teacher’s role and the student level of cognitive demand to be exhibited; and a defined set of student outcomes—that is, what the student should know and be able to do as a result of having mastered this curriculum. The New York State ELA Standards identify seven different areas of reading (decoding, word recognition, print awareness, fluency, background knowledge and vocabulary, comprehension, and motivation to read) and five different areas of writing (spelling, handwriting, text production, composition, motivation to write) that are addressed to different degrees across grade levels. Although listening and speaking are addressed

within the New York State ELA Standards, they are not further subdivided into topic areas. A written curriculum missing literacy competencies or performance indicators at any grade level will impact the alignment of the curriculum to state standards. A written curriculum that does not address the areas in reading identified by the state standards will also impact vertical and horizontal alignment within and between schools by creating gaps in the Grades K–12 curriculum. *Vertical alignment* is defined as the literacy knowledge addressed at a grade level that builds upon and extends learning from the previous grade level, whereas *horizontal alignment* refers to agreement between what is taught by teachers addressing a common subject across a single grade level.

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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.

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?

Several teachers from the English Language Arts department met last spring to revise the scope & sequence and align it with the New York State Learning Standards. The creation of this new scope & sequence addressed the New York State ELA Learning Standards as well as the psychological needs of the adolescent learner. This scope & sequence allows for differentiation since it contains materials that address the needs of the English language learners and special education students. Our professional development sessions are centered around the implementation of the revised ELA scope & sequence.

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

The findings are not applicable to our school because the ELA teachers revised the scope & sequence to address all deficient areas.

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

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?

With the implementation of the newest version of the Impact Mathematics textbooks, the gaps that appeared in the areas of measurement, geometry, and number sense and operations, have been filled with the inclusion of these topics within corresponding

chapters of the text. The Impact textbook across grade level, gives the opportunity to the teachers to incorporate these *Process Strands* (Problem Solving, Reasoning and Proof, Communication, Connections, and Representation) which are imbedded into the curriculum.

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

2A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. Our instructional leadership team visits classrooms weekly to observe current instructional practices, including direct instruction (mini-lessons), independent work, and level of student engagement.

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?

Our school utilizes the workshop model which is based on direct instruction through mini-lessons, independent work, and a high level of student engagement. Our lesson plans are designed to reflect these practices and during walkthroughs and classroom observations, we examine the components of the workshop model.

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (SOM³) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

2B.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?

Through frequent focus walks, it is evident that more than 80% of the teachers are implementing the components of the mathematics workshop model successfully. These three components consist of an opening meeting, work period and closing meeting. During the opening meeting, the teachers are instructing the students for fifteen minutes through modeling or think aloud. During the work period, students are working on an assigned task either independently, with a partner, or with the group. During the closing meeting, select students present their findings. They are assessed at the end of the workshop via an exit slip. Any students who had misconceptions based on the results of the Exit Slip are placed into a guided math group the next day where there misconceptions are specifically addressed. Students are actively participating during the work period and questioning the teacher when necessary. Therefore, they are improving their self assessment skills. Teachers have been trained in questioning techniques and the facilitating process required of them in a mathematics workshop. The use of technology is evident during school, before and/or after school. Teachers incorporate smart board programs into their instruction. For review of math topics, math classes use the CPS program and devices. Students in our Regents classes use graphing calculators to solve higher level math problems in their area of study. In addition to the Regents classes, our grade 8 CTT classes use the graphing calculators to develop grade 8 concepts that may have been otherwise unattainable without the use of these calculators. Our Future Cities Teams are working with SimCity4 Deluxe to create computer designs of their future city. Teachers incorporate a document camera into their instruction and invite students to share their work with their fellow classmates.

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

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

We have a stable staff. There are two new teachers this year. According to the 2006-2007 school report card, we have less than 11% turnover rate of teachers with fewer than 5 years of experience and 11% turnover rate of all teachers in this 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?

The school report card 2006-2007 dispels this finding.

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

ESL teachers, content teachers, coaches and administrators attended a series of workshops to enhance the ELL classroom. Quality Teaching for English Learners (Q-TEL) series: Quality Teaching for English Learners is a unique professional development series that helps all teachers explore the attitudes, knowledge and dispositions necessary to work effectively with adolescent language learners. The participants learned how to scaffold disciplinary discourse in specific subject matter areas through the exploration and analysis of classroom exemplars. They also learned to develop students' meta-cognitive awareness of language and generative learning strategies.

Expediting Comprehension for English Language Learners (ExC-ELL) series: This program collaboratively develops, implements, and refines the staff development program and instructional design for middle school teachers of English, science, and social studies who have English language learners in their classroom. The program focuses on helping content teachers develop students' work knowledge, basic reading skills, comprehension of texts, discussion skills, grammatical knowledge, spelling and writing skills. Every year we turn key this professional development for new teachers, content area teachers, and anyone who needs a refresher course.

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.

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?

During informal and formal walkthroughs, administrators use the "Focused Walk: CALP Hunt Protocol" and examine how the teachers are addressing the BICS and CALP.

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

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?

During our monthly departmental meetings, the NYSESLAT scores are distributed to the English language arts teachers. The ELL funded teachers and the ELA teachers have common planning periods to discuss the data. The content area teachers are also aware of the

NYSESLAT scores. The principal and ESL supervisor meet with teachers who teach the ELL's to discuss the data and academic rigor in those classrooms.

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

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?

At the beginning of the school year, there was professional development for the general education and special education teachers to discuss special education initiatives and the individual IEP's. Every teacher who teaches SETTS and CTT received a copy of the IEP's. Case managers, consisting of the Special Education teachers, were assigned to the work with the General Education teachers to review each student's individual IEP. In Initial evaluations, the General Education teachers are required to conference with the IEP team prior to the implementation of the IEP.

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

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?

At the beginning of the school year, there is professional development for the general education and special education teachers to discuss special education accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities. Every teacher who teaches SETTS and CTT received copies of the IEP's. There has been professional development training in the use of grade specific performance indicators to assist in determining modified promotional criteria. Staff including all Special education teachers, Guidance Counselors, paraprofessionals and the IEP team, have all been trained and are active participants in the development and implementation of Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIP). The IEP teacher and the Special Education supervisor have distributed a list with the needs of all students to each classroom teacher. This outlines each student's promotional criteria, testing modifications, and behavioral goals / health issues that need to be addressed in the classroom.

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.

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

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

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

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

Submit date: **Jul 16, 2008** Email address: **jmiller2@schools.nyc.gov**

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

School DBN	24Q077
School Name	IS 077
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 410,386
Principal Name	Joseph A. Miller
Principal Email	jmiller2@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7183667120

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
- No

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

Before- and After-School Programs	\$ 54,503
Summer School Programs	
Dedicated Instructional Time	\$ 259,310
Individualized Tutoring	

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

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

After school program will provide supplementary academic intervention to at-risk students.

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

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

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

- New implementation
- Program Expansion

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

- Yes

No

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

Yes

No

Please describe the program.

During the day academic intervention services in ELA and Math through push-in/pull-out model will target at-risk students.

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

English Language Learners

Students with Disabilities

Students in Poverty

Students with Low Academic Achievement / at Risk of Not Graduating

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

New implementation

Program Expansion

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

How much do you plan to allocate for this program?

Model Programs for ELLs **\$ 96,570**

Please describe the program.

C4E funds will support Model ELL program at 24Q077 by funding ESL push-in/pull-out teachers.

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

- New implementation
- Program Expansion