



P.S. 107 Q

2008-09

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: **25Q107**
ADDRESS: **167-02 45TH AVENUE, QUEENS, NY 11358**
TELEPHONE: **718-762-5995**
FAX: **718-461-4989**

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: PS 107 **SCHOOL NAME:** THE THOMAS A. DOOLEY SCHOOL

DISTRICT: 25 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** ICI-Judith Chin; Network 6

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 167-02 45th Avenue, Flushing, NY 11358

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-762-5995 **FAX:** 718-461-4989

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Patricia Howell **EMAIL ADDRESS:** phowell@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON

Teresa DiBella

James S. Phair

PRINCIPAL

Cara Jacofsky

UFT CHAPTER LEADER

Jackie Leto/Jackie Eng

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
CO-PRESIDENTS**

NA

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools)

Diane Kay

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT**

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position/Constituency Represented	Signature
James S. Phair	*Principal or Designee	
Cara Jacofsky	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Jackie Leto	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Teresa DiBella	Teacher/SLT Chairperson	
Michelle Casalo	Parent	
Patricia Howell	Assistant Principal	
Christine Kemmet	Parent	
Patricia Lombardo	Teacher	
Maureen Marsh	Parent	
Colette McArdle	Parent	
Doreen Petri	Parent	
Lily Widelec	Paraprofessional	

* 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.

PS 107 is a child-centered, barrier-free school located in Flushing, Queens, New York, serving an ethnically diverse population of approximately 890 students from over 30 countries in grades pre-kindergarten through five.

Classes are mostly grouped heterogeneously, with enrichment and academic intervention services provided throughout the grades. We are proud of our six self-contained special education classes, two IGC classes, and five reduced class size Academic Intervention Services classes in grades one through five.

PS 107 is considered a "Well Developed", "A" school recognized for our warm and nurturing environment and our collaborative approach of supporting the individual learning styles of all students. Our physically challenged/medically fragile students help define us as a social community and are full participants in all academic and extra-curricular activities. Parents, children, and staff members recognize our strong sense of community as being essential to creating the stimulating climate for learning that exists at PS 107. Students want to come to school because they "find learning fun." Parents are encouraged to be active members of our school community and feel welcomed and valued.

Our vision is to have all our students reach their academic potential by the time they graduate. We envision our school as an environment in which staff and parents are focused on empowering all students with the academic skills and rich civic and social experiences that will enable them to further their academic achievement and become active, responsible, and positive contributing members of society. Students will develop important decision making, critical thinking, and technological skills, and the ability to communicate effectively. All members of our school community will share accountability for creating a positive and supportive educational environment, and for achieving successful student outcomes.

Our mission is to provide a child-centered, standards-driven, language-rich environment that meets the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of all our children for the purpose of fostering increased academic achievement.

We will collaborate with all constituencies (including parents) to maximize the learning potential of our students. By incorporating the richness of the children's diverse cultures into our instructional programs, encouraging individual expression through music and art, as well as increased success in all aspects of school work, we will enhance children's self-esteem and self worth, making them more likely to become productive members of society.

Some of the school's special programs include music programs centered around children learning to play electronic pianos, recorders, and violins, two glee clubs, a dance troupe, assembly program, theater/drama, an art studio, two science labs, two fully stocked lending/research libraries, a state of the art technology program and lab, and physical fitness programs for all students.

We have partnerships with The American Museum of Natural History – Moveable Museum; The Intrepid Air, Sea and Space Museum; The Whitney Museum of Art; The Center for Architecture; Elders Share the Arts; Queens Museum of Art; Puppetry in Practice; Brooklyn Conservatory of Music; “Music and the Brain;” Center for Arts Education – Parents As Arts Partners; Chelsea Bank/Classroom Inc.; Queens Council on the Arts.

Extracurricular activities include Hot Shots basketball team, Cheerleading, Chess Club, Student Government, Peer Mediation, Penny Harvest, swimming and tennis.

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT									
School Name:		P.S. 107 Thomas A Dooley							
District:		25	DBN:	25Q107	School BEDS Code:		342500010107		
DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served:	Pre-K	√	3	√	7		11		
	K	√	4	√	8		12		
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded	√	
	2	√	6		10				
Enrollment					Attendance - % of days students attended:				
(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of June 30)	2005-06	2006-07*	2007-08*		
Pre-K	85	72	72		94.9	95.4	95.5		
Kindergarten	132	128	127						
Student Stability - % of Enrollment:									
(As of June 30)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08						
Grade 1	151	138	130		94.0	93.6	94.9		
Grade 2	114	149	127						
Grade 3	152	117	146						
Grade 4	137	149	116						
Grade 5	141	137	150						
Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:									
(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08						
Grade 6	153	141	0		41.4	41.6	42.5		
Grade 7	0	0	0						
Grade 8	0	0	0						
Grade 9	0	0	0						
Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:									
(As of June 30)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08						
Grade 10	0	0	0		0	0	0		
Grade 11	0	0	0						
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Recent Immigrants - Total Number:									
(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08						
Ungraded	21	4	18		15	14	8		
Total	1086	1035	886						
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:					
(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of June 30)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08		
# in Self-Contained Classes	57	48	53	Principal Suspensions	0	0	0		
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	0	Superintendent Suspensions	1	0	0		
Number all others	75	91	74						
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				Special High School Programs - Total Number:					
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08		
				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0		
				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0		
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:					
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08		
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Number of Teachers	66	67	67		
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0						
# receiving ESL services only	129	127	109						

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	11	12	8	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	39	7	39
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	21	N/A	18
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
(As of October 31)	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	97.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	87.9	91.0	91.0
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	72.7	79.1	80.6
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher	97.0	97.0	97.0
(As of October 31)	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	98.7	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4	0.3	0.3				
Black or African American	1.3	0.9	0.9				
Hispanic or Latino	25.3	26.4	26.4				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	46.0	47.0	47.9				
White	27.1	25.5	24.5				
Male	50.7	51.6	54.7				
Female	49.3	48.4	45.3				
2008-09 TITLE I STATUS							
	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
√	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)	No	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:					
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08) Based on 2006-07 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

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

This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
Student Groups		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate
All Students		√	√	√			
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native		-	-				
Black or African American		-	-	-			
Hispanic or Latino		√	√	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		√	√	√			
White		√	√	√			
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities		√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient		√	√	-			
Economically Disadvantaged		√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject		7	7	4			

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08					
Overall Letter Grade:	A	Overall Evaluation:					W
Overall Score:	64.1	Quality Statement Scores:					
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data					W
School Environment:	10.6	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals					W
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals					W
School Performance:	19.3	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals					W
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise					W
Student Progress:	31.9						
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	2.3						

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

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

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

SECTION 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?
-

We reviewed the quantitative and qualitative data regarding student performance trends and other indicators of progress for our school. We reviewed the results from the many accountability and assessment resources available to us, both from New York State and New York City. In addition, we reviewed classroom data from a variety of sources such as predictive assessments, ITAs, running records, unit assessments, and conference notes.

PS 107 is recognized as a "Well Developed," "A" school. Our commitment to providing the special programs we offer our students continues to be recognized throughout the school community, and is reflected over time in the Progress Report, Quality Review, and School Learning Environment Survey.

Our 2007-2008 Progress Report indicates that we made overall gains. We moved from a "B" to an "A" over the last two years. We are continuing to look at our subgroups; our student performance for "all students tested" in both ELA and Math improved. Our student progress is increasing incrementally. We are implementing strategies in our classrooms to meet the specific needs of students in all subgroups.

Having reviewed the Quality Reviews for the past two years, we acted immediately on the recommendations for areas of improvement as soon as we received the feedback. In fact, two of the goals set for 2008-2009 address the improvements the reviewers suggested. We will continue to create greater opportunities for applying technology skills across all curriculum areas. We will also extend our use of data to establish goals that will inform instruction.

One of the performance trends we have noticed over the last three years is that our school-wide performance in both the ELA and Math is continuing to increase, most noticeably for general education students. However, we notice that while our performance scores increase, our students' annual yearly proficiency growth is an area of interest for us. We are redesigning instructional delivery to focus on differentiated lessons to meet the needs of all students, especially ELLs, AIS, and special education students, and on enrichment opportunities for students at levels 3 and 4.

Over the past three years, general education and special education trends indicate that the overall category of "All students tested" in grades 4 and 5 are making gains in performance levels. As first-year test takers, grade three students create a baseline from which growth can be measured (approximately 88%). Their progress is tracked and has shown increases from year to year in Math with a slight decline in scores for the ELA (89.95% in 2006, 88.3% in 2007, and 87.9% in 2008). The category of "All students tested - General Education" in grades 3, 4, and 5 show overall increases in achieving performance levels 3 and 4. When tracking students from grades three to five, we found

that the three-year trend remained consistent (approximately 97%). Overall findings for the category of “Special Education students” indicate school-wide increases.

For “All students tested” over the past three years, students achieving a level 3 or above on the ELA have increased from 80% to 83.5%, while the AYP went up from 54% in 2006-07 to 57% in 2007-08. In Math for all students tested over the past three years, students achieving level 3 or above increased steadily from 89% to 95.6%, while AYP increased from 50% of all students to 73.3% in 2007-08. We noticed overall that “All students tested” in all grades either stayed the same or experienced a decline in students achieving level 3 or above for the ELA from 2006 to 2007. This was not the case with Math. “All students tested” in each grade including each subgroup of general education and special education saw a steady increase of students achieving level 3 or above in Math

It should be noted that when we disaggregate data into “Special Education” and “General Education” subgroups we find the following: for the category “All special education students tested,” 40% of the students achieved level 3 or above on the ELA in 2006, with a dip to 36.5% in 2007, then a rebound to 52.2% in 2008. During 2007, when most subgroups across the board experienced a decrease in students achieving at level 3 or above, grade three special education students remained the same (50% at level 3 and/or 4 for both year 2006 and year 2007) but then dropped to 40% in 2008. Yet in Math, grade three Special Education students’ scores steadily increased: 58% (2006) to 61% to 79% in 2008. Grade four and five Special Education students showed great gains in 2008 over 2006 (grade four: 42.9% to 52.2%, and grade five: 30.8% to 63.6%). In Math, during that same time period, grade four went from 52.2% to 70.8%, and grade five went from 50% to 82.6%.

A significant challenge and trend that has been identified and thus stands out is the performance of our special education students on NYS assessments. We find that our students’ needs and abilities are not adequately measured by these “traditional” standardized assessments. Therefore, we are currently evaluating the alignment of the NYSAA as an assessment tool where deemed appropriate to match our students’ abilities and more accurately reflect their progress.

When looking at general education students’ achievement over the past three years, for all students tested, 86.1% achieved at level 3 or above in 2006, 83.7% in 2007, and 89.8% in 2008 on the ELA. When looking at individual grades we noticed that grade three remained fairly consistent (89.9%, 88.3%, 87.9%), grade four had a slight increase from 90% to 92.6% while grade five went from 82.9% to 89.4% (the biggest improvement of scores) from 2006 to 2008. Based on these findings we have differentiated instruction to meet the specific needs of all students in all grades.

When analyzing our ELL subgroup’s performance in both the ELA and Math assessments we found the following: of the eighteen students tested in 2006, 16.7% achieved level 3 or above, compared to the 82.1% of English proficient students tested that same year. In 2007, 24.6% of the 61 ELLs tested scored at or above level 3 compared to 83.9% of English proficient students. For 2008, 41.2% of the 34 ELLs achieved level 3 or above, compared to the 87.4% of English proficient students. We continue to utilize a variety of instructional methods to meet the needs of ELLs, including a push-in model as well as pull-out sessions.

A trend that has been noticed over the last three years is that upper grade ELLs are passing out of ESL, as measured by the NYSESLAT, at a higher rate than previous years. Yet we find that these transitional students benefit from additional support in the classroom in order to gain the vocabulary and oral language skills necessary to become proficient in academic language and perform at standard-bearing levels.

Our Quality Reviews indicate that special education students and ELLs are well supported as we work to ensure that they make the best possible progress in their learning. In fact, all students are receiving differentiated instruction, with staff members receiving meaningful professional development to meet the needs of all students. The Learning Environment Survey supports these findings as well.

Our science scores over the past three years continue to show steady student performance, achieving our AYP each year. Eighty-nine percent of our general and special education students achieved a level 3 or above for the year 2006-2007. Fifty-seven percent of the ELLs taking the test achieved a level 3 or above compared to 94% of the English proficient students. Supporting ELLs continues to be a focus in our school based on the data extrapolated from our evaluative resources.

Our social studies scores over the past three years have shown that over 90% of our general education students have performed at level 3 or above. More than half of our students with disabilities have not performed at or above level 3. Many of these students are in self-contained special education classes. We will continue to infuse literacy skills and strategies into content area learning. Past years' data indicate we've achieved AYP each year.

One focus area which is a direct result of the Learning Environment Survey is that we have increased parental awareness of school-wide outreach programs and activities within the community. Over the past two years, we have expanded our means of communicating with parents. We are proud of our communication with parents. More materials are translated into more languages than ever before. We often have translators available at workshops to ensure parental understanding of workshop content. Feedback has been favorable.

Our greatest accomplishments include:

- Reviewing, evaluating and revising our instructional programs and planning to meet the needs of all of our students to meet or exceed NYS standards in all content areas.
- Introducing the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments school-wide this year to support increased proficiency in literacy. These informal assessments are for all students K-5, and replace the Rigby running records and ECLAS2 assessments.
- Continuing to implement all components of Everyday Math 3 school-wide, especially the assessment component, to its full potential, to inform all instruction. In addition, our focus will be on the EM3 differentiation options for all students including children at, below and above state standards. (EM3 was introduced last year.)
- Continuing to increase the different mediums for integrating technology into classroom and content area instructional programs. These mediums include laptops, smart boards and supportive software.
- Recognizing the need to continue to differentiate instructional delivery in meaningful ways by gathering, analyzing, and utilizing data to drive instruction, specifically for subgroups of students including AIS, ELLs, special education, and enrichment needs students.
- Continuing inquiry team work to inform instructional delivery decisions and practices. We established a part-time data specialist position to support our staff members with hands-on support and professional development in analyzing and utilizing student data on an ongoing basis as part of their planning.
- Staff members participating in study groups and turnkeying strategies and best practices with their colleagues. One group's area of study focuses on comprehension work for students achieving at levels 3 and 4. The other group's area of study focuses on designing a thinking curriculum for ELLs.
- Responding to our Learning Environment Survey, we introduced a series of enrichment programs this year in addition to maintaining the many special programs already in place. New programs this year include:
 - ELA - Performer's Unlimited
 - Mathematics - Math Mavericks
 - ELLs - Fairytales Unlimited; Passport to the World

- Actively involving parents in school events and celebrations - getting parents into the building and openly communicating with parents; increasing the number of translated communications to parents into many languages.
- Introducing a school pamphlet into the community highlighting all the curricular and extra-curricular programs our school offers.
- Actively seeking and obtaining grant monies for the school through our parent coordinator's diligent efforts; providing workshops and programs such as the new UFT-sponsored Parent Book Club.
- Planning for and staffing the AIS extended day program to truly differentiate learning opportunities.
- Providing our students with a wide range of experiences within the Arts including the art forms of theater/drama, visual arts, music and dance
- Celebrating over thirty-eight years of "Music in the Air," a community tradition of all children participating in a three-night extravaganza of music, dancing, singing and performing.
- Establishing a fully equipped and functional A.D.L. (Adaptive Daily Living) room for self-contained special education students. Students will engage in learning basic routines of daily living such as setting a table, preparing meals, etc.
- Planning for the needs of all students by establishing lower class size AIS classes on grades 1-5, one class each; and by providing IGC classes.
- Having nearly 100% of our teachers tenured.

Some of the most significant barriers to the school's continuous improvement include:

- Maintaining or increasing the school's educational services and achievement in all academic areas in light of recent, increasing budget cuts and changes in staffing/support due to current Department of Education structure.
- Time and budget limitations for continuous ongoing professional development to support staff members in literacy, Everyday Math 3, assessments, and data driven instructional planning. Opportunities for outside PD are limited although ICI is providing new and varied PD workshops and support this year (yet funding for substitutes and materials is still a concern). Scheduling time necessary to turnkey new information to colleagues remains a significant challenge.
- Meeting the increasingly greater needs of our special education and medically fragile students.
- Including special education students in the school's performance and proficiency levels.
- An ELL population who must take all content area tests which impacts our school's performance and proficiency levels.
- Providing the skills and resources necessary for all students to compete in the technological world of the 21st century.
- Having the resources to provide children with books that match their independent and instructional levels in all content areas and genres.
- Continuing to strengthen the home-school relationship to support students, especially getting more ELL parents involved in school activities and ongoing communications.

Some of the most significant aids to the school's continuous improvement include:

- A stable, highly trained staff, many of whom continue their own professional growth.
- Continuing to find ways to support our staff members within the building for Professional Development although we do not have enough funding and resources to fully implement the PD plan we deem fully adequate
- Continuing to support our special education students through a variety of health and academic services.
- Continuing to re-evaluate our thinking on student learning and the staff's commitment to providing students with a variety of learning opportunities to meet the needs of all children.

- A strong sense of community which includes over 146 staff members and nearly 900 children and their families.
- Strong fundraising activities that provide “extras” such as the “Book of the Month” program.
- Active parents and parent volunteers continue to provide a wide range of activities that support and enrich our children’s academic, social, emotional and artistic growth.

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.*

We are a well-developed school as reported in our October 2007 Quality Review. Additionally, we achieved a grade of “A” on our 2007-2008 Progress Report. From these reports and all available data sources, P.S. 107's instructional goals for the 2008-2009 school year are:

To continue to improve instruction in English Language Arts:

- To deepen differentiation of instruction in ELA based on data through small group instruction to better meet the needs of all students. By June, 2009, all students will be assessed three times through the use of the Fountas and Pinnell Reading Assessments for the purpose of determining an appropriate reading level, and developing short and long term goals for each student based on the results of each assessment at least three times.
- By June, 2009, all classroom teachers of grades K-5 will be able to demonstrate through their lesson planning that they analyzed and interpreted all summative and formative data to assign students at least 3 times per year to flexible groups for the purpose of small group instruction.

To further incorporate technology into the instructional program:

- To further incorporate technology into the instructional program, 25% of instructional areas will have Smart Boards by June, 2009.
- All teachers whose classrooms have Smart Boards will be given professional development at least five times per year through in-house support and by attending sessions provided by the NSS.
- All teachers whose classrooms have Smart Boards will demonstrate their use during at least one lesson that is either formally or informally observed.

To deepen and expand the work of the school inquiry team to influence school-wide positive change:

- By June, 2009, 75% of all teachers will participate in research action inquiry in conjunction with the School Inquiry Team by participating in a grade-level case study as an “Alternate to a Formal Observation.”
- Based on the findings of the School Inquiry Team, by June 2009 the school will implement at least one “school-wide change” for September, 2009.

To strengthen parent involvement and communications:

- To deepen and expand the efforts of staff members to actively communicate with parents in a way that parents recognize the contact. By June, 2009, 80% of all informational home-bound notices will be translated into the six identified languages currently available for translations.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To deepen differentiation of instruction in ELA based on data through small group instruction to better meet the needs of all students. By June 2009, all students will be assessed three times through the use of the Fountas and Pinnell Reading Assessments for the purpose of determining an appropriate reading level, and developing short and long term goals for each student based on the results of each assessment at least three times.</p> <p>By June, 2009, all classroom teachers of grades K-5 will be able to demonstrate through their lesson planning that they analyzed and interpreted all summative and formative data to assign students at least 3 times per year to flexible groups for the purpose of small group instruction.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchased the Fountas and Pinnell Reading Assessments for every teacher in the school. • Provide training for the new assistant principal so that she can support the work of the literacy coach. • Provide support through professional development for the literacy coach to assure successful implementation of the program. • The Assistant Principal and Literacy Coach will provide training and support for all teachers on the implementation of the assessments and the interpretation of the results. • Provide additional resource materials for the teachers to support the management and implementation of the assessment program. • Provide time for teachers by grade level in addition to their common planning periods to work with the Coach and AP to analyze reports and make data-driven instructional decisions. • Through informal observations and formal walkthroughs the creation of flexible student groupings will be monitored. • All teachers will administer the F & P three times a year: fall, winter, and spring.

<p>The Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Funds were used to purchase grade appropriate F & P kits as per a request to the Superintendent which was granted. • Literacy Coach attended workshops for F & P administration; she turnkeyed for staff. • MONDO trainer supports F & P as well, from school budget PD allocation. • Paper costs; aide time for copying materials. • Flexible scheduling in-house to meet training needs and ongoing staff needs.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchase order for new assessments. • Schedule of professional development. • Teachers' programs reflecting common planning periods as well as specifically arranged assessment analysis periods. • Attendance sheet for professional development sessions. • Lesson plans aligned to professional development including student grouping based on F & P assessments. • Formal and informal observations.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Subject/Area (where relevant): Technology

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>To further incorporate technology into the instructional program, 25% of instructional areas will have Smart Boards by June, 2009.</p> <p>All teachers whose classrooms have Smart Boards will be given professional development provided by the NSS at least five times per year through in-house support and by attending sessions.</p> <p>All teachers whose classrooms have Smart Boards will demonstrate their use during at least one lesson that is either formally or informally observed.</p>
---	---

<i>Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i>	conjunction with the School Inquiry Team by participating in a grade level case study as an “Alternate to a Formal Observation.” Based on the findings, the school will implement at least one “school-wide change” for September, 2009.
Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry Team and subcommittees will meet regularly, keeping meaningful documentation. • Allow tenured teachers to work on their “Alternative to a Formal Observation” by selecting a sampling of students from their own class and utilize aspects of the Inquiry Team model to improve student achievement. • All teams will share their work with the larger school community. • Continue to provide professional development aligned with findings of the teams in order to strengthen instruction and accelerate student learning. • Create a half position, in addition to the Data Specialist position, that will support the work of the subcommittees. • Continue to provide on-site training in the use of formative and summative data to staff through the support of the Data Specialist. • Meet regularly with the SAF and allow staff members the opportunity to attend professional development opportunities. • Utilize the services provided by the Network Support Specialist in the use of data and technology.
Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School budget - staffing • After school meetings and in-house support - school budget • Training through ICI NSS and DOE • Flexible scheduling in-house
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosters of team members • Schedule of meetings • Inquiry Team/Subcommittee attendance and minutes • Formal/Informal classroom observations

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools

designated for improvement (SINI/SRAP/SURR or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Parent Involvement

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase parent engagement of our non-English speaking families by 10% in our curriculum-based workshops and family fun events by June, 2009. To increase the amount of translated documents shared with families by 25% by June, 2009.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational notices will be translated into the languages available to us from the Translation Services department. • Phone conferences with translators will be scheduled as needed. • Workshops will be offered in the morning and evening. • Translators will be present at parent workshops to translate content information to parents in Korean, Chinese, and Spanish. • We will establish an art workshop series for ELL families with grant money. • Parents will continue to be encouraged to leave phone messages for later translations. • Parent notes written in native languages will be translated as needed by staff members or Translation Services. • Email will be utilized to share information in home languages of the community.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant money – Ezra Jack Keats Foundation \$500 • Translation services - school budget allocation; paraprofessionals translating services - school budget - staffing allocation • Parent Coordinator - school budget - staffing • Flexible scheduling
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of parent notices • Tear-offs for parent responses from informational notices sent home • Attendance logs for workshops, meetings and conferences • Evaluations (in home languages) and their translated responses • Email – sign-up drive, responses and replies to email notifications, and email messages generated • Records/logs of Translation Services - and purchase orders where applicable

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	45	15	N/A	N/A	15	0	0	0
1	67	23	N/A	N/A	18	0	0	0
2	57	35	N/A	N/A	20	0	1	0
3	52	28	N/A	N/A	20	0	0	0
4	50	36	35	40	25	0	1	0
5	41	20	37	41	25	0	1	0
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
<p>ELA: Foundations; Kindergarten Intervention Small groups: strategy lesson / guided reading; oral language small group work Chelsea Bank/Classroom Inc.</p>	<p>Grades K-5 small group work, SETSS support during the day; intervention small group work during extended day sessions Kindergarten small group intervention: phonics-enriched program during the day Grades K-1 Foundations small group during the day; Grade 2 during SETSS sessions during the day Grade 1 Recipe for Reading - an intervention program, small group daily Chelsea Bank is a simulation software program that integrates real world problem solving skills into a simulated banking model, connecting what they learn in school to real life (outside world) situations.</p>
<p>Mathematics: Everyday Math Small Group work Chelsea Bank/Classroom Inc.</p>	<p>Grades K-5 Everyday Mathematics; manipulatives; SETSS support during the day; small group work during the day; intervention small group work during extended day sessions Chelsea Bank is a simulation software program that integrates real world problem-solving skills into a simulated banking model connecting what they learn in school to real life (outside world) situations.</p>
<p>Science: Content Area materials</p>	<p>Grade 4-5 literacy materials and skills in the content area of science and literacy paraprofessional services during the day; two full-time science teachers, science lab/hands-on experiments, early morning test prep sessions (six) prior to the NYS test</p>
<p>Social Studies: Content Area materials</p>	<p>Grade 4-5 literacy materials and skills in the content area of social studies and literacy paraprofessional services during the day; early morning test prep sessions (six) prior to the NYS test</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<p>Small group and one-to-one sessions during the day; play therapy, peer mediation, anger management, group discussions, peer pressure, social skills, behavior modification programs, chess club. Consistent parent contact and follow-up with counseling agencies, ACS and physicians regarding medication issues, and student progress</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</p>	<p>Small group and one-to-one services, counseling, play therapy, group discussions during the day</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</p>	<p>One-to-one services during the day</p>
<p>At-risk Health-related Services:</p>	<p>One-to-one services during the day; screening for OT/PT/Hearing/Speech; OT/PT therapy, nursing services</p>

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY 2008-2009
P.S. 107Q

I. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

See Appendix 1

II. Teacher Qualifications

See Appendix 1

III. ELL Demographics

See Appendix 1

IV. Parent Program Choice

1. What structures are in place at your school to ensure that parents understand all three program choices? Please describe the process, outreach plan and timelines.

Following LAB-R testing and NYSELSAT score reporting at beginning of school year, ESL teachers schedule a Parent Orientation workshop. This workshop provides information to parents regarding NYS mandates of eligibility for ESL and bilingual programs, NYC Chancellor's mandates, and an overview of our school's ESL program. Invitation notices are sent home with students in the home language. At the workshop, parents view the NYC Chancellor's informational DVD on program choice options. The video is shown in the home languages of attending parents. Also on hand at the workshop are bilingual staff who can explain the information in greater detail.

2. Describe how your school ensures that all Program Selection Forms are returned?

The majority of parents at PS 107 are timely and responsive; most selection forms are returned either at the Parent Orientation workshop, or via their children returning them to school. For those parents who do not respond, we follow up with a personal mailing, and phone calls when necessary.

3. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection Forms for the past few years, what is the trend in program choices that parents have requested?

The results of Parent Choice paperwork indicate that most parents choose the freestanding ESL program offered at PS 107 (60% over a three-year period). Some parents, upon viewing the informational DVD, inquire about transitional bilingual and dual language programs. We share district program information with them because PS 107 offers Free-Standing ESL only. Invariably, parents are reluctant to leave PS 107 and are content with our ESL program as their final choice. In three years, no parent has moved their child to another school in order to enroll in bilingual or dual language programs.

4. Are the program models offered at your school aligned with parent requests?

Yes. The majority of parents at PS 107 request the Free-Standing ESL model.

V. Assessment Analysis

Part A: See Appendix 1

Part B: Data Review

1. What is revealed by the data patterns across proficiency levels and grades?

In Kindergarten, students at PS 107 tend to fall into either the Beginner or Advanced category. Beginners may be accounted for by the number of non-English speaking Kindergarten students who enroll in our school. Children with any English proficiency tend to do well on the LAB-R (e.g. falling into the Advanced category) due to the emphasis on oral language that characterizes the K-level LAB-R. Moving to the 1st grade data, proficiency levels are determined by the NYSESLAT

taken at the end of Kindergarten. Proficiency levels appear to decrease, with many more students falling into the Intermediate category. LAB-R and NYSESLAT are two different assessment instruments. NYSESLAT is more academically challenging than LAB-R with a greater emphasis on print conventions and higher order cognitive skills. A downward trend from Kindergarten to First Grade is not surprising given the difference between these two assessments. Moving through the middle grades, we notice that 3rd grade appears to have a decrease in overall proficiency. These levels are based on the score results of the 2nd Grade NYSESLAT taken by these current 3rd graders. The 2-4 Grade band NYSESLAT is very different from the K-1 Grade band with much more focus on academic literacy skills such as reading comprehension and essay composition. Subsequent grades' proficiency levels appear to balance out as the children move up through the Grade band. An overall pattern is that for the most part students move up through the proficiency levels at an expected rate. Students are classified at Advanced level in Listening and Speaking at a slightly higher rate than Reading and Writing. This follows the expected acquisition pattern of BICS before CALP.

2. How will patterns across the four modalities – L,S,R,W – affect instructional decisions?

Teachers review available data (e.g. LAB-R scores, NYSESLAT scores, other assessment information) and determine the best course of action for each student. Based on student data, instructional strategies are implemented in order to address areas needing the most support.

Part C: See Appendix 1

Part D: Assessment Data Review

1. Examine student results. What are the patterns across proficiencies and grades? How are ELLs faring in tests taken in English as compared to Native Language?

It is immediately apparent that ELLs at PS 107 unsurprisingly perform better on NYS Math than they do on NYS ELA. Lower test scores overall in ELA as compared to Math are due to several factors. First of all, English is not the native language of ELL students taking this test. CALP has not been acquired to the extent needed to perform at a Level IV on this assessment. Secondly, ELLs in 4th and 5th grade fall into two categories, neither of which can be expected to perform at Level IV: students who are recent arrivals to the country and long-term ELLs who exhibit overall academic deficiencies. In terms of comparison between English vs. Native Language tests, so few PS 107 ELLs opt to be assessed in the Native language that the numbers are not quantifiable. Of the students who chose to take Math in the native language, Level III and Level IV were achieved. However it is conceivable that they would have scored at the same level if the test had been taken in English.

2. Describe how the school leadership and teachers are using the results of the ELL Interim Assessments. At PS 107, ELL Interim Assessments are administered only to those children exempt from the NYS ELA (arrival one year or less). This year, the test was administered to 3 children. Due to such low numbers, the results are not quantifiable.

3. What is the school learning about ELLs from the Interim Assessments? How is the Native Language Used?

Due to low numbers of ELLs tested, data results from the Interim Assessments are not quantifiable. We continue to monitor the results of the Interim Assessments for useable data. The Native Language is not used in the administration of Interim Assessments.

4. Not applicable to PS 107.

VI. Planning for ELLs

1. How is instruction delivered?

a. What are the organizational models?

The ESL program at PS 107 comprises several different models within the context of a Free-Standing ESL Program. The majority of instruction is delivered through a small group pull-out format. Some push-in instruction is delivered to classes with high concentrations of ELLs.

b. What are the program models?

The basic program model at PS 107 is Homogeneous. Small groups are comprised mainly of grade level students who are at the same proficiency level as one another. Due to time and space limitations however, and based on yearly-changing student demographics, a Heterogeneous program model might be implemented. Some groups might have a mixed proficiency level such as Beginner-Intermediate or might have a mixed grade level such as 4th-5th.

c. What instructional approaches and methods are used to make content comprehensible and enrich language development?

At PS 107, a variety of instructional strategies are used that meet the needs of ELLs. Some of these are modeling, bridging, scaffolding, contextualization, schema building and metacognition.

2. How does your school assure that the mandated number of instructional minutes is provided according to proficiency levels in each program model?

ESL teacher schedules are created based solely on the mandated number of instructional minutes required by all ELLs at PS 107.

a. How is explicit ESL instruction delivered in each program model to comply with the mandates?

ESL instruction is delivered by certified ESL teachers in the pull-out model. Small groups of ELLs arranged homogeneously (for the most part) receive instruction in the four modalities based on the mandated minutes required by CR Part 154.

b. How is explicit ELA instruction delivered in each program model to comply with the mandates?

ELA instruction is delivered by certified Elementary Education classroom teachers who schedule Reader's and Writer's Workshop periods daily. Mandated minutes of ELA instruction for ELLs are exceeded by classroom teachers on a weekly basis. ELLs are present during classroom ELA instruction and are not pulled out for services at those times.

c. How is explicit NLA instruction delivered in each program model to comply with the mandates?

Not applicable to PS 107.

d. How are the content areas delivered in each program model?

ESL teachers access monthly grade-level curriculum mapping in order to align general curriculum with ESL instruction. ESL and classroom teachers confer on a regular basis to ensure alignment of content area instruction. This maintains school-wide consistency of focus. ESL methodologies are employed to promote and support learning in the content areas.

3. How do you differentiate instruction for ELL subgroups?

a. Describe your instructional plan for SIFE.

Once a SIFE is identified, PS 107 protocol would be to make available all existing support structures that might benefit the student, such as Extended Day, Resource Room, Speech and/or Tutorial Periods.

b. Describe your plan for ELLs in US schools for less than 3 years (newcomers). Also, since NCLB now requires ELA testing for ELLs after one year, specify your instructional plan for these ELLs. All ELLs receive mandated ESL instruction as per CR Part 154 regulations. Newcomers who arrive in 3rd grade or later are encouraged to take advantage of Title III Morning Program which provides additional support for our ELLs as they prepare to participate in NYS assessments (e.g. ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies). A Buddy System is in place in order to provide newly arrived ELLs with more English-proficient fellow native speakers as buddies. This helps lower the affective filter for language acquisition. In addition, bilingual picture dictionaries and dual language glossaries are in place to help support new learning. Most younger ELL newcomers at PS 107 are required to participate in the Extended Day program.

c. Describe your plan for Long-Term ELLs (in NYC schools 6 years or more). Our plan for long-term ELLs is based on principles and strategies learned at professional development sessions for teachers of ELLs which was provided by our Learning Support Organization, Integrated Curriculum & Instruction. Principles and strategies employed are the L2 Stall, Developing the Language of Thinking, Becoming a Language Watcher, Vocabulary Word Play, and Deconstruction and Reconstruction of Sentences. At this level (e.g. upper elementary grades) an emphasis is placed on non-fiction content in order to develop stronger academic language and to prepare ELLs for middle school curriculum.

d. Describe your plan for ELLs identified as having special needs. PS 107 students with special needs (e.g. cognitive and physical special needs, medically fragile) who are identified as ELLs are integrated in the mainstream ESL program based on collaborative judgment between ESL teachers and school Health Coordinator. Based on individual student needs, ESL strategies and instructional methods are utilized in order to maximize the educational benefit to the child.

4. Describe your targeted intervention programs for ELLs in ELA, Math, and other content areas (specify ELL subgroups targeted). Please list the range of intervention services offered in your school for the above areas. Title III Morning program targets ELA, Math and Science preparation for ELLs. ELLs also benefit from Extended Day program where they work in small groups with their classroom teachers targeting specific areas of need. Where appropriate, ELLs attend SETSS sessions tailored to their academic needs.

5. Describe your plan for continuing transitional support (two years) for ELLs reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT. Starting in September 2008, the NYS Education Department extended testing accommodations for transitional ELLs. PS 107 is fully compliant with these new mandated accommodations. Further transitional support is available through Extended Day program for all former ELLs. ESL staff participates in monthly Pupil Personnel Committee meetings which monitor all at-risk students some of which may include transitional ELLs.

6. N/A

VII. Resources and Support

1. What instructional materials including technology are used to support ELLs? Materials used to aid instruction of ELLs include picture dictionaries; realia; picture and photo cards; manipulatives; Reader's Theater; various trade books; leveled readers. In addition, computers and computer learning software is utilized in small-group ESL instruction.

2. Ongoing Professional Development

a. Describe the Professional Development plan for all ELL personnel at school.

ESL-certified teachers at PS 107 attend out-of-school professional development workshops provided by our LSO and/or Borough Compliance and Performance Office. They then turnkey workshop information to other school personnel. In addition, ESL teachers provide in-school workshops to other personnel covering a variety of issues confronting teachers of ELLs.

b. Describe the 7.5 hours of ELL training for all staff.

ELL training for classroom teachers is provided through Faculty Conferences presented by certified ESL teachers. This is in addition to any ELL training classroom teachers received as part of their teacher education or continuing education.

3. How is Native Language support delivered in each program model?

At PS 107, Native Language support is provided through the use of bilingual dictionaries, the buddy system among students, and bilingual staff when and where needed to communicate with students and/or families. In addition, ESL teachers encourage ELL families to maintain the use of their L1 at home in order to promote literacy skills that transfer from the native language to English.

4. What support do you provide staff to assist ELLs as they transition from elementary to middle school?

PS 107 ESL teachers provide information to teachers creating articulation cards for graduating ELL students. Such information may include years of service, proficiency levels and personal teacher observations of the student. ESL teachers are also available to share information with middle school personnel who make enquiries about PS 107 graduates coming to their school.

VIII. Program Description

PS 107 offers a Free-Standing ESL program to children identified as ELLs via the Home Language Survey and subsequent LAB-R testing. PS 107 ELLs receive the CR Part 154 mandated instructional minutes of 360/week for Beginners and Intermediates; 180/week for Advanced. ELA instruction is provided daily by classroom teachers. ESL and classroom teachers at PS 107 collaborate in order to deliver appropriate and cohesive instruction to all students in ELA as well as other content areas. ESL teachers incorporate current curriculum focus into ESL lessons; classroom teachers utilize ESL methodologies to support their ELL students. ELLs who do not exhibit expected progress receive additional support through appropriate personnel and programs (e.g. resource room, speech, reading intervention programs). Native language maintenance is encouraged through the use of bilingual dictionaries, student buddies, bilingual staff and parent-teacher communication.

IX. Completing the LAP

See Appendix 1

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

Type of Program: ___ Bilingual ___X___ ESL ___ Both Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08: 117
(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:
- PS 107 currently has 100 ELLs who are eligible for ESL instruction. Two full-time NYS-certified ESL teachers teach five 50-minute periods per day. Two full-time classroom teachers with ESL certification have 13 ELLs in their classrooms. ESL students receive instruction mainly in a free-standing pullout ESL program, while push-in instruction takes place in two AIS classrooms. According to the Part 154 mandates, beginning and intermediate students receive instruction 360 minutes per week, while advanced students receive 180 minutes per week. ESL teachers use NYSESLAT scaled scores to determine levels of proficiency in Listening/Speaking and Reading/Writing. Disparity of levels between the two combined modalities is used as a basis for tailored instruction, and at times for referrals to academic intervention. At PS 107, a variety of instructional strategies are used that meet the needs of ELLs, including those with interrupted formal education (SIFE) and special learning needs. Some of these are modeling, bridging, scaffolding, contextualization, schema building and metacognition. ESL teachers access monthly grade-level curriculum mapping in order to align ESL instruction with general curriculum. This maintains school-wide consistency of instruction. In addition, an extended day program that will implement appropriate ESL strategies continues to be provided at PS 107. Materials used to aid instruction of ELLs include picture dictionaries; realia; picture and photo cards; manipulatives; Reader's Theater; various trade books; leveled readers.
- 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).
- PS 107 utilizes best practices based on available research with the following programs: Teachers College/Balanced Literacy, Mondo, Foundations, and Everyday Math. ELLs participate in all instructional activities that occur in their classrooms. PS 107 is currently running a Math Mavericks program open to all 3rd grade students as well as a Performers Unlimited program open to all 4th grade students. Both programs will cycle throughout the grades during the academic year. Supplemental programs include Wilson/Foundations (literacy support) and Title III Morning Program (see Part E).
- B. Extracurricular: Briefly describe extracurricular activities available in your school, and the extent to which ELLs participate.
- All ELLs are encouraged to participate in the many extracurricular activities available at PS 107, including Basketball Team, Cheerleading, Chess Club, Dance Troupe, Glee Clubs (junior and senior), Safety Squad/Monitors, Peer Mediation.
- 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.

To meet the needs of the ELL parents and communities, parent involvement meetings and workshops are planned throughout the school year. A parent orientation takes place in October to provide information re: NYS mandates of eligibility for ESL and bilingual programs, NYC Chancellor's mandates, viewing the NYC informational DVD on program choice options in the various home languages of the PS 107 community and an overview of our school's ESL program. The results of Parent Choice paperwork indicate that most parents are happy to choose the freestanding ESL program offered at PS 107. For parents who are interested in other types of programs, we share district program information. Invariably, parents are reluctant to leave PS 107 and are content with our ESL program as their final choice. After parent orientation, the following workshops are offered throughout the course of the year in both morning and evening sessions: Homework Help, Successful Parent/Teacher Conferences, Everyday Math, and Balanced Literacy, as well as a variety of family-oriented activities such as Build-a-Kite, Scavenger Hunt, etc. The workshops are offered in the main languages of the school community: English, Korean, Spanish and Chinese. Bilingual staff is on hand for translation services during both Parent-Teacher Conference days. Bilingual staff is on hand throughout the year to assist in parent-teacher communication, whether by letter, by phone, or in person. In addition, there is a series of workshops offered specifically to ELLs and their family members. Invitation letters are sent home in the language of each ELL's family. This year's series is entitled "Open Doors" and involves various staff members, including art teacher, science teacher, ESL teachers, parent coordinator and bilingual staff to translate. For new admits throughout the course of the school year, parent letters are sent home with information about ESL enrollment, and new parents are encouraged to communicate with our school via individual parent meetings with parent coordinator, teachers and translators. PS 107 also offers a Translation Hotline for the convenience of the school community. The Hotline is open for calls after 4pm, and within 24-48 hours, answers to questions and concerns are returned in the native language. Throughout the year, information is sent home to parents in the home language. For example, our monthly literacy curriculum by grade level letters are translated and sent home in the language of each family so that non-English speaking parents/caregivers are kept informed about what children are learning in school, and how they might be supported at home. A full time Parent Coordinator, School Based Support Team (Psychologist and Social Worker), Guidance Counselor, translators and ESL teachers are available throughout the year to meet with ELL parents to provide information, answer questions, resolve problems and encourage parental involvement in their children's education. ESL teachers collaborate with classroom teachers, resource room teachers, speech teachers, and math and literacy coaches to provide academic support to ELLs new to the school system throughout the course of the year.

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

Not applicable.

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.

Two ESL teachers and two ESL-certified classroom teachers are participating in the ICI Network Professional Development for Teachers of ELLs taking place over the course of three months in the Fall semester. They will also be attending additional ICI Network Professional Development later in the school year. ESL teachers participate in monthly grade meetings with classroom teachers, as well as monthly faculty conferences. ESL teachers also work closely with PS 107's Inquiry Team to study available data and develop strategies to best support ELLs. As for staff development within PS 107, ESL teachers offer workshops throughout the year to staff members. Initial faculty workshop in October covered such topics as HLIS, LAB-R and LAT scores, placement issues, and basic suggestions for teachers of ELLs. Subsequent workshops have covered topics such as Reaching out to NE Parents, Teaching ELLs through the Content Areas, and Helping SIFES in your Classroom. All teachers are encouraged to use scaffolding, bridging, contextualization and schema building in their

instruction of ELLs. ESL teachers maintain an open door policy; whatever instructional or material help is requested is supplied in a timely fashion.

- V. Support services provided to LEP students: Describe other support structures that are in place in your school which are available to ELLs.
PS 107 has a therapy department with a full staff of Occupational and Physical Therapists, Speech Teachers, SETSS (Resource Room) Teachers. All students, including ELLs, who are found to be in need of these services have full access to these resources at PS 107.
- VI. Name/type of native language assessments administered (bilingual programs only): Describe how you assess the level of native language development and proficiency of the ELLs who are in a bilingual program.
Not applicable.

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

School Building: Thomas A. Dooley PS107Q **District:** 25

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

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

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

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

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

Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules

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

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

Indicate Proficiency Level: Beginning Intermediate Advanced

School District: _____ **25** _____

School Building: _____ **107Q** _____

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:10 To: 9:00	*Kindergarten Pull Out *4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out *4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out *4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*Special Ed Pull Out *4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out
2	From: 9:05 To: 9:55	*1st Grade Push In *Kindergarten Pull Out	*1st Grade Push In *Kindergarten Pull Out	*Special Ed Pull Out *Kindergarten Pull Out	*1st Grade Push In	*1 st Grade Push In Kindergarten Pull Out
3	From: 10:00 To: 10:50	*Special Ed Pull Out	*3 rd Grade Pull Out	*3 rd Grade Pull Out	*3 rd Grade Pull Out	*3 rd Grade Pull Out
4	From: 10:55 To: 11:45	*Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out		*Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out
5	From: 11:55 To: 12:45					
6	From: 12:50 To: 1:40	*1st Grade Pull Out	*1st Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Pull Out	*1st Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Pull Out	*1st Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Pull Out	*2 nd Grade Pull Out
7	From: 1:40 To: 2:20	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out		*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out

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: _____ **25** _____

School Building: _____ **107Q** _____

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:10 To: 9:00	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out		*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out *Special Ed Pull Out
2	From: 9:05 To: 9:55	*1 st Grade Push In *Kindergarten Pull Out	*1 st Grade Push In *Kindergarten Pull Out	*Special Ed Pull Out *Kindergarten Pull Out	*1 st Grade Push In	*1 st Grade Push In *Kindergarten Pull Out
3	From: 10:00 To: 10:50	*Special Ed Pull Out *2 nd Grade Push In	*2 nd Grade Push In *3 rd Grade Pull Out	*2 nd Grade Push In *3 rd Grade Pull Out	*2 nd Grade Push In *3 rd Grade Pull Out	*3 rd Grade Pull Out
4	From: 10:55 To: 11:45					
5	From: 11:55 To: 12:45					
6	From: 12:50 To: 1:40	*1 st Grade Pull Out	*2 nd Grade Pull Out *1 st Grade Pull Out	*2 nd Grade Pull Out *1 st Grade Pull Out	*2 nd Grade Pull Out *1 st Grade Pull Out	*2 nd Grade Pull Out
7	From: 1:40 To: 2:20	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out		*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: _____ **25** _____ School Building: _____ **107Q** _____

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:10 To: 9:00	*Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out	
2	From: 9:05 To: 9:55	*1 st Grade Push In *Kindergarten Pull Out	*1 st Grade Push In *Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out	*1 st Grade Push In	*1 st Grade Push In *Kindergarten Pull Out
3	From: 10:00 To: 10:50	*2 nd Grade Push In	*3 rd Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Push In	*3 rd Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Push In	*3 rd Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Push In	*3 rd Grade Pull Out
4	From: 10:55 To: 11:45	*Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out		*Kindergarten Pull Out	*Kindergarten Pull Out
5	From: 11:55 To: 12:45					
6	From: 12:50 To: 1:40	*1 st Grade Pull Out	*1 st Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Pull Out	*1 st Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Pull Out	*1 st Grade Pull Out *2 nd Grade Pull Out	*2 nd Grade Pull Out
7	From: 1:40 To: 2:20	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out	*4 th /5 th Grade Pull Out

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) K-5 **Number of Students to be Served:** 100 **LEP** _____ **Non-LEP**

Number of Teachers 2 **Other Staff (Specify)** Parent Coordinator, Literacy Coach, Math Coach, Administrators,
Bilingual Staff members (Spanish, Korean, Chinese)

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.

PS 107 will hold an English Language morning program for ELL enrichment. The program will run Monday through Friday beginning November and running through June. The program will be conducted by two licensed ESL teachers and will service 3rd, 4th and 5th grade ELLs in groups of approximately 10 students per grade. This program will enhance language development and will prepared ELLs to take standardized NYS and NYC tests. Activities will benefit the four modalities of language (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and will focus on academic language and rigor in a small group, targeted setting.

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.

Professional development activities will be provided to teachers by ESL teachers during grade meetings and faculty conferences. ESL teachers will link with classroom teachers on an on-going basis to provide suggestions and strategies to enable teachers to provide instruction to the ELLs in their classrooms. ESL teachers will meet on a regular basis with ESL-certified 1st grade teachers to share, plan and implement latest best practices to be used with the ELLs in their classrooms. ESL teachers will utilize and share teacher resource literature that provides all classroom teachers with the latest research-based instructional strategies for working with ELLs.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

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

Allocation:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	10,915	Morning Programs for ELL Enrichment; Bilingual Parent Workshops Teacher Per Session: 260 hours @ \$41.98/hr
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	0	
Supplies and materials	7,117	Rourke's ELL Intervention Kits for grades 3, 4, 5 TIME for Kids Nonfiction Readers/Emergent TIME for Kids Nonfiction Readers/Upper Emergent Building Fluency through Reader's Theater Start Exploring Non-Fiction Reading Oxford Picture Dictionary English/Korean
Travel	0	
Other	0	
TOTAL	18,032	

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.

PS 107 assesses the written translation and oral interpretation needs of the school community through a variety of sources. School personnel, including the Parent Coordinator, Guidance Counselor, classroom teachers and service providers (including ESL, SETSS, and speech teachers) identify the need for oral and print interpretation support in communicating with non-English speaking parents. Non-English speaking parents often request the assistance of a bilingual translator to facilitate communications at parent/teacher conferences/meetings and telephone communications with the school.

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 assessment of the translation needs of our school population was determined by input from classroom teachers, parents, students, PTA, and the Parent Coordinator. We shared our findings with the STL, PTA and all staff members.

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.

The Parent Coordinator has implemented a very successful outreach plan to have major documents, informational notices, and flyers translated by the Translation Unit of the DOE. Many of the documents were translated during the summer so as to provide the timely delivery of these key documents. Most of the documents are translated by the Translation Unit. Some are translated by our in-house staff.

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.

In addition to providing translated print materials, we have a program set in place where non-English speaking parents can call into the school after 4 pm and leave messages for staff members; these messages are translated by in-house staff and directed to the appropriate staff members. We use the Translation Unit for oral translation assistance when our in-house staff is not available. Parent volunteers are also ready to assist with translating when the need arises. We also use in-house staff for oral interpretation of curriculum-based parent workshops. Our in-house translators are provided with an overview of the workshop content by the facilitator prior to each parent workshop.

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>.

See

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

N/A for PS 107

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

N/A for PS 107

Appendix 6: SED Requirements for Schools Under Registration Review (SURRE)

N/A for PS 107

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

- **Gaps in the Written Curriculum.** Data show that the written curriculum in use by many schools is not aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required. All reviewed curricula had gaps relative to the New York State ELA standards. The fewest gaps were found at Grade 2, but the gaps increased as the grade levels increased. Interviewed staff in a number of the schools that were audited reported less consistent and effective curriculum and instruction at the secondary level. These data further indicated that curricula were not adequately articulated—less articulated in secondary than elementary schools.
- **Curriculum Maps.** The curriculum alignment analyses noted that although a number of curriculum maps had been developed, the mapping has been done at a topical level only and does not drill down to an expected level of cognitive demand that will indicate to teachers what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. These curriculum maps addressed only content topics—not skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, or student outcomes to be attained.
- **Taught Curriculum.** The *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)*¹ data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

Core school-wide committees will meet to review these findings and determine how they align with the work being done at PS 107. The Cabinet, Inquiry Team, study groups, and the SLT will meet to discuss the findings, and plan for instructional program and delivery modifications to provide students with opportunities they need to meet or exceed the NYS ELA standards. We are constantly reviewing and redesigning our curriculum mapping.

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?

PS 107's ELA curriculum is based on a Balanced Literacy approach and incorporates the best practices and components from a variety of literacy programs. The standards-based instructional delivery in all grades is continuously reviewed and revised to ensure that it not only matches the NYS standards, but that student learning is standard bearing for all students, particularly ELLs, special education, and academic intervention services students.

Most teachers have a solid background and clear understanding of the core curriculum and what students should know and be able to achieve at each level based on the NYS standards. Teachers refer to the standards when developing their curriculum maps and instructional plans. They refer back to the standards when setting individual student goals and when assessing their students' progress. Staff members refer to the standards in their ongoing conversations with parents. Students are encouraged to speak often and listen actively in all content areas, in addition to strengthening their reading, writing, and critical thinking skills and strategies. Oral language development has been stressed as part of the literacy curriculum at PS 107. In fact, outside professional development support (MONDO) has been provided to our early childhood grades as has in-house support to all of our grades. More work will continue to focus on the needs of ELLs, AIS, special education and enrichment students.

Teachers and support staff constantly re-evaluate and redesign (fine tune) the literacy program, continuously incorporating revisions into curriculum mapping to deepen student understanding and support student learning. Strengthening and scaffolding writing skills for all students is a noted area of concern for teachers, and additional attention will be given to this curriculum area.

Our reading maps go beyond listing topics; all maps have skills and strategies included as well as materials/books and projects for the unit. Literacy maps are currently being redesigned to include essential questions and activities to deepen student understanding of skills and strategies, moving beyond surface knowledge of unit topics.

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.

Additional time, materials, and professional development support are still needed to move along our thinking in reestablishing a more unified, direct connection to the standards across all the grades, and to continue our work of scaffolding the skills and strategies needed to meet or exceed the standards at each grade level for all student sub-groups. Time for professional development, data analysis, planning, inter-visitations, debriefing meetings, and material reviews would expedite this work. Additional resources are required in some classrooms, content area rooms, and support staff rooms to provide a variety of differentiated reading (e.g. “Just Right” books, assorted genres) and writing materials.

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.
Core school-wide committees will meet to review these findings and determine how they match up with the work being done at PS 107. The Cabinet, Inquiry team, study groups, and the SLT will meet to discuss the findings and plan for instructional program and delivery modifications to provide students with opportunities they need to meet or exceed the NYS Math standards

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?

Everyday Mathematics is a standards-based program that is used to teach the curriculum. However, in going through the process of aligning the NYS Standards to Everyday Mathematics, gaps found in the EM program prevented all content and process strands from being addressed. A committee was formed to review supplemental programs. Additional resource books were ordered and intervention/enrichment programs were implemented. We now have in place a balanced mathematics program that addresses all content and process standards in grades K-5.

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.

N/A for PS 107

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.

Conversations with teachers, informal and formal observations, walkthroughs, staff-self assessments, and grade and faculty meetings will serve as forums to look at and evaluate these findings and their correlation to our instructional delivery.

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?

At PS 107 we follow a balanced literacy approach to instruction, incorporating the reading and writing workshop models into the instructional delivery. Worksheet “busy work” is discouraged as it does not add value to the students’ learning experience. Seatwork may involve independent reading, writing, or word work and/or small group discussions or activities. Students are encouraged to think through the process steps of their independent or group work and note their progress in age-appropriate ways. Teachers actively engage students in the lesson and very little direct lecturing occurs in the literacy block. Teachers facilitate shared reading and writing activities especially in the early childhood grades. Most teachers model strategies for children to try independently or with partners while teachers confer with individuals or small groups.

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.

If this finding is applicable, staff members will be offered professional support including that of grade leaders, colleagues on the grade, and the literacy coach.

2B – Mathematics Instruction

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol (SOM²)* and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

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.

Conversations with teachers, informal and formal observations, walkthroughs, staff-self assessments, and grade and faculty meetings will serve as forums to look at and evaluate these findings and their correlation to our instructional delivery.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

At PS107 we follow a balanced mathematics approach to instruction. During math workshop, a child-centered learning environment is fostered. A brief mini-lesson is followed by differentiated activities whereby students are engaged in working with compatible partners. The math workshop concludes with eliciting strategies and culminating thoughts as part of the “share.” Conferencing, periodic and product assessments as well as daily kid watching provide teachers with the specific hard and soft data needed to drive instruction.

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.

Where this finding is applicable, staff members will be offered professional support including that of grade leaders, colleagues on the grade, and the math coach.

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

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.

This finding is not applicable to our school. Most teachers have been at PS 107 for at least three years, some as many as twenty eight years. We have an extremely low turnover.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

By having a stable staff we have continuity in our educational program. The staff members have a strong sense of community and have established strong relationships on and across grades. Colleagues share information and resources for all content areas, often planning together. Our low turnover allows teachers to notice trends in student performance, know the curriculum well, and make informed decisions on instructional plans to meet the needs of all students.

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

N/A for PS 107

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

Conversations with teachers, informal and formal observations, walkthroughs, staff self-assessments, and grade and faculty meetings will serve as forums to look at and evaluate these findings and their correlation to our instructional delivery.

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?

Professional development activities are provided to teachers by ESL teachers during grade meetings and faculty conferences. ESL teachers link with classroom teachers on an on-going basis to provide suggestions and strategies to enable teachers to provide instruction to the ELLs in their classrooms. ESL teachers utilize and share teacher resource literature and materials that provide all classroom and content area teachers with the latest research-based instructional strategies for working with ELLs. In addition, our ESL teachers are currently involved in an ICI Comprehension study group: *Making Bold Changes: Closing the Opportunity Gap for ELLs* and they are turn-keying the strategies they are practicing with the staff. Also, we have some classroom teachers who are ESL certified; they too, provide support to their colleagues on an ongoing basis.

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.

N/A for PS 107

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.

Conversations with classroom and ESL teachers, and grade, faculty, and SLT meetings have served as forums to look at and evaluate these findings and their correlation to our instructional delivery.

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?

At the beginning of the school year, and routinely throughout the year, ESL teachers meet with classroom teachers to discuss their ELL students, proficiency levels and disaggregated data (scaled scores from NYSESLAT,) as well as other student information such as date of arrival in US, SIFE status if applicable, and other factors that would impact individual student progress. ESL teachers provide strategies, recommend materials, and provide support to all classroom teachers and service providers who work with ELLs.

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.

N/A for PS 107

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

The administrators, Health Coordinator, SBST, and PPT have reviewed these findings and found they are not applicable to our school.

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?

Our health coordinator routinely facilitates meetings with all service providers and teachers on an ongoing basis to review, evaluate, and discuss the professional development needs of all service providers and classroom teachers working with children with IEPs. In addition, our PPT meets bi-monthly as does our SBST to address concerns and/or needs of our IEP students and for the service providers meeting the children's needs.

The culture of our school is that of an inclusionary model for all our students including self-contained students and students with disabilities. We include our students in all instructional and extracurricular activities. All staff members are supported in providing children with valuable experiences throughout the daily programs offered in the school. Special education teachers actively help in writing IEPs. IEPs are shared with all faculty members.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

At PS 107 some of our self-contained classes are using the ADL model and a community/family approach to meeting the needs of our targeted IEP children. We look for changes in behavior through the ADL activities, and our support providers (including the paraprofessionals) give immediate feedback (encouragement, praise) for positive behaviors. Other self-contained classes utilize a more standardized approach. These teachers are included in general education, grade-level appropriate PD to assist their students in achieving grade level standards. All service providers receive ongoing PD and best practice strategies to meet the needs of all children. PD is constantly reviewed and redesigned to meet the needs of the service providers so that they may meet the needs of the students.

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.

N/A for PS 107

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.

Our health coordinator routinely facilitates meetings with all service providers and teachers on an ongoing basis to review, evaluate, and discuss IEPs and instructional planning to meet the needs of all students with IEPs. In addition, our PPT meets monthly to address concerns and/or needs of our IEP students. The administrators, Health Coordinator, SBST, and PPT have reviewed these findings and found they are not applicable to our school.

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 PS 107 we have an effective system in place to keep staff members informed of IEP content. Support includes an IEP teacher, health coordinator, and support staff. Special education teachers and paraprofessionals, support service providers, and AIS teachers are highly aware of children's IEP goals and objectives, and work closely with the general education teachers to share special education strategies to meet the children's needs. General education teachers are also knowledgeable about the individual goals and objectives of their children with IEPs.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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.

N/A for PS 107

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

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

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

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

Submit date: **Jun 25, 2008**

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

School DBN	25Q107
School Name	Dr. Thomas Dooley School
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 77,012
Principal Name	James Phair
Principal Email	jphair@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7187625995

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

Programs to recruit/retain Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)	\$ 0
--	------

Professional mentoring for beginning teachers and principals	\$ 0
Instructional coaches for teachers	\$ 77,012
School leadership coaches for principals	\$ 0

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

The Literacy Coach will implement the core curriculum in literacy and provide support and staff development.

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

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

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

- New implementation
- Program Expansion

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

The duties and responsibilities of the Literacy Coach will include coaching teachers, modeling lessons, and providing feedback to colleagues to implement Core Curriculum in literacy and other approved programs in the school. The Literacy Coach will also attend various workshops in the Core Curriculum initiatives to enable and provide staff development. The Literacy Coach will also assist teachers to embed assessment instructional activities and to analyze student data. Responsibilities will also include facilitating workshops for teachers and supervisors, providing support to members of the instructional and guidance staffs.

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No