



**PUBLIC SCHOOL 72
DR. WILLIAM DORNEY**

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

SCHOOL: 08X072

ADDRESS: 2951 DEWEY AVENUE BRONX, NEW YORK 10465

TELEPHONE:(718) 822-5311

FAX: (718) 828-4459

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: 72 **SCHOOL NAME:** Dr. William Dorney

DISTRICT: 08 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** Leadership LSO Network #5

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 2951 Dewey Avenue, Bronx, NY 10465

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (718) 822-5311 **FAX:** (718) 828-4459

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Margarita Colon **EMAIL ADDRESS** MColon@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON Ms. Lucia Mariani

PRINCIPAL Ms. Margarita Colon

UFT CHAPTER LEADER Ms. Elizabeth Ramos

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT** Ms. Candice Carbajal

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools) _____

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT** Mr. Dov Rokeach

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
Ms. Margarita Colon	*Principal or Designee	
Ms. Elizabeth Ramos	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Ms. Candice Carbajal	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Ms. Alisha Robinson	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Ms. Cynthia Lebron	Parent	
Ms. Rose Bambach	Parent	
Ms. Mary Jo Cvorovic	Parent	
Ms. Shareen Branch	Parent	
Ms. Lucia Mariani	SLT Chairperson	
Ms. Debbie Wilson	Teacher	
Ms. Naomi Boyd	SLT Secretary – Teacher	
Ms. Lauren Sichler	Teacher	

* 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 72 is a Pre K – 5 elementary school located in the Throggs Neck section of the Bronx. The school and its community are ethnically and socio-economically diverse. PS 72 qualifies as a Title I school, and serves as the zoned school for the majority of the Throggs Neck Houses public housing development. At the same time, a fair percentage of students come from middle class homes. The most distinctive feature of the PS 72 community is that we are barrier-free. In 1999, construction on a new wing to the school building was completed. It was built to accommodate students with special needs, i.e. students using wheelchairs, walkers... As a result, PS 72 is considered the district's placement center for barrier-free students. These features contribute to a very diverse student body.

During the past two years and under the current administration, our focus has been to strengthen our Balanced Literacy program. In September 2007, we purchased and implemented the 100 Book Challenge to enable teachers to approach independent reading in a systematic way. Everyday, students read at their independent reading level, set goals for themselves and engage in one-on-one reading conferences with their classroom teachers. Parents are also very excited about this initiative and report that their children are reading much more at home. We have continued our investment in the program through the 2008-2009 school year.

In an effort to build upon our focus on independent reading, this school year, we have purchased and implemented the MONDO Publishing reading materials. These resources put a wealth of literacy resources in the hands of classroom teachers, and supplies students with leveled reading books. On-going professional development is a large component of this effort, and will take place throughout the school year. In an effort to strengthen the Writer's Workshop portion of the literacy block, PS 72 has hired Writing Matters to provide staff development, and organized workshops through our LLSO in launching Writer's Notebooks in our classrooms. We have also implemented Headsprout, an early intervention reading resource. Headsprout is computer-based, and teachers can access continuously updated data. These resources target underperforming, Special Education, and ELL students. This is a phonics based approach to strengthen reading readiness and expose students to reading texts at their own level.

Several other highlights over the past two years have been the creation and inauguration of a Student Council, and instituting the OST and Celebrate Learning afterschool/weekend programs. Under the guidance of two 5th grade classroom teachers, campaigns and elections are held in November for the student council. Nomination and balloting mimic the actual processes. Out of School Time, or OST, is a community based organization that provides a recreational afterschool program five days a week, as well as during school vacations. Celebrate Learning meets twice during the week and once during the weekend and focuses on preparation for the NYS ELA and Math tests. PS 72 also boasts an active PTA, and in collaboration with the Parent Coordinator, they provide numerous workshops and events for parents and families, i.e. the annual Pre-Thanksgiving dinner, parent-child book club, Family Science Night, and cross-curricula activities.

Together, parents, guardians, students, staff and community, we can ensure that our children will achieve their personal best, develop into lifelong learners, and become contributing members to society.

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	PS 072 Dr. William Dorney				
District:	8	DBN #:	08X072	School BEDS Code #:	320800010072

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec.		
Enrollment:					Attendance:				
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)	2006	2007	2008		
Pre-K	70	71	72		90.1	90.8	90.8		
Kindergarten	121	110	95						
Grade 1	145	144	123						
Grade 2	144	137	153	Student Mobility: (% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	166	154	136		90.6	88.3	91.9		
Grade 4	161	167	137						
Grade 5	159	141	162						
Grade 6	0	0	0	Eligible for Free Lunch: (% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7	0	0	0		70.5	70.4	74.0		
Grade 8	0	0	0						
Grade 9	0	0	0						
Grade 10	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing: (Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11	0	0	0		8	5	9		
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded Elementary	32	7	26						
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants: (Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	998	931	904		0	4	0		
Special Education Enrollment:					Suspensions:				
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	102	104	93						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	58	49	62	Principal Suspensions	53	41	71		
Number all others	64	65	57	Superintendent Suspensions	10	6	16		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									
Special High School Programs:									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	55	56	55	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	16	18	14	(As of October 31; includes all full and part-time staff)	2006	2007	2008
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	71	73	79
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	31	9	32
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	26	TBD	18
	0	0	0				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender:				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	98.6	98.6	98.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2	0.1	0.3	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	69.0	68.5	73.4
Black or African American	26.6	27.7	27.2	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	46.5	58.9	63.3
Hispanic or Latino	58.6	59.1	61.1				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	4.3	4.4	4.3	Percent Masters Degree or higher	86.0	93.0	90.0
White	10.2	8.7	7.1	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	91.5	51.2	99.2
Multi-racial							
Male	50.8	52.0	51.9				
Female	49.2	48.0	48.1				

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

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

	Math:	IGS		Math:		
	Science:	IGS		Grad. Rate:		
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:						
Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	√	√	√			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-			
Black or African American	√	√	√			
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	√			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-			
White	√	√	-			
Multiracial						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	√ ^{SH}	√	√			
Limited English Proficient	√ ^{SH}	√	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	7	7	5			
Key: AYP Status						
√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only	
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status			
<i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i>						

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08	
Overall Letter Grade	B	Overall Evaluation:	√
Overall Score	56.4	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	√
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	8	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	√
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	13.9	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	√
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	30.7	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	√
Additional Credit	3.8	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	√
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

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?

PS 72 has made considerable gains and exhibited growth over the past two years. In February 2007, Margarita Colón assumed the position of principal, immediately conducted a needs assessment, and implemented a program of change. As a result increases are evidenced throughout the NYS ELA and Math test data, Progress Reports, Quality Reviews and Learning Environment Surveys. It is the beginning of a necessary trend of positive change at PS 72.

PS 72 made positive gains in its 2008 NYS ELA test data. As a Whole School, students scoring levels 3 and 4 increased from 45.4% to 53.1%, and students scoring level 1 decreased from 18.1% to 12.7%. Grade level data followed a similar course except for the performance of grade 3 on the 2007 test. Despite following a positive trend prior to this year, 3rd grade students scoring levels 3 and 4 dropped to 29.6% and, even more distressingly, 31.7% scored a level 1. In addition, PS 72 was identified as a SINI Year 1 school as a result of its performance in ELA in the Students with Disabilities subgroup. Administration responded to the immediacy of this data, by reorganizing classroom assignments to create grade level hallways and programming two weekly, grade-level common preps. We also identified a need for strengthening our Balanced Literacy program, and professional support for our staff. For the 2007-2008 school year, PS 72 implemented the 100 Book Challenge independent reading program. For the 2008-2009 school year, we have built upon the emphasis on independent reading, by purchasing the MONDO publishing resources for literacy development. As a result, the 3rd grade data on the 2008 NYS ELA test jumped dramatically. PS 72 went from 29.6% to 51.5% of grade 3 students scoring levels 3 and 4, and from 31.7% to 18.9% of grade 3 students scoring level 1. Additionally, within the 3rd grade cohort students who scored levels 3 and 4 increased from 29.6% to 43.5%, and saw the amount of level 1s nearly cut in half. On the 2008 ELA test, the 4th grade experienced a drop in grade-to-grade data due to the poor performance in 3rd grade. However, grade 5 saw increases from 48.9% to 65.8% of students scoring levels 3 and 4 in year-to-year comparisons, and from 56.7% to 65.8% within their cohort. With the exception of the 2007 grade 3 cohort, students scoring level 1 decreased in all areas of grade data.

In our Special Education subgroup, the NYS ELA data has been more erratic, despite overall increases of students scoring levels 3 and 4. In 2007 18.9% of Special Education students scored a level 3 or 4, which increased to 20.8% of students in 2008. There was also a decrease in level 1s from 38.5% to 37.2%. In grade 3, data for Special Education followed the dramatic increase made within the grade as a whole. In 2007, only 6.8% of Special Education students scored a level 3 or 4, compared to 25% in 2008. However, the year-to-year data in grades 4 and 5 showed decreases of 12.7% and 4%, respectively. Conversely, cohort data for grades 4 and 5 showed increases of 4.9% and 1.6%, respectively. Students scoring level 1 followed a similar trend of decreases in year-to-year comparisons and increases within their cohorts. Recognizing the need illustrated by the data, PS 72 implemented the Headsprout Early Reading that specifically targets under-performing, ELL and Special Education students.

ELL students at PS 72 made dramatic gains. In 2007, grade 4 ELL students scoring levels 3 and 4 increased from 18.8% to 66.7% in year-to-year data, and within their cohort from 16.7% to 66.7%. Grade 5 ELL students followed a similar trend with students scoring levels 3 and 4 increasing from 9.1% to 50% in year-to-year data and from 18.8% to 50% within their cohort. The only drop within this subgroup was in grade 3, when considering year-to-year data, which dropped from 16.7% to 0%.

PS 72 also showed positive gains in its 2008 NYS Math test data. As a Whole School, students scoring levels 3 and 4 has increased from 28.3% in 2006 to 44.3% in 2007 and to 45.2% in 2008. However, we witnessed an increase in students scoring a level 1 from 17.2% in 2007 to 23.9% in 2008. Grade 3 made dramatic gains in students scoring levels 3 and 4 from 63.6% in 2007 to 84% in 2008 in year-to-year data. In grade 4, we saw a decrease from 74.2% to 68.7%, but there was an increase in their cohort data of 5.1%. The trend continued with students scoring a level 1 decreasing in 3rd grade from 8.4% in 2007 to 2.2% in 2008. However, grades 4 and 5 increased their levels from 8.8% to 11.7% and 4.5% to 10.6%, respectively, in year-to-year data. Cohort data for each showed increases of 3.3% for 4th grade and 1.8% for 5th grade.

Despite meeting the state AYP for Math in all subgroups, students with disabilities did not demonstrate yearly progress as measured by New York City's accountability measure, the Progress report. As a Whole School, the percentage of Special Education students scoring levels 3 and 4 increased 0.9% to 45.2% in 2008. Grade 3 scores remained well-above grade 4 and 5, although dropping from 59.1% in 2007 to 58.8% in 2008. The number of Special Education students scoring levels 3 and 4 in 4th grade in year-to-year comparisons increased from 34.8% to 36.3% over the past two years. In grade 5, the percentage dropped from 37.5 to 36.3. Cohort data also headed in different directions with a decrease in 4th grade from 59.1% in 2007 and 43.5% in 2008, and an increase in 5th grade from 34.8% to 36.3%.

Again, considering that much fewer numbers creates a greater flux in the data, ELL data was generally positive. As a Whole School, PS 72 increased the percentage of ELL students scoring levels 3 and 4 from 42.5% in 2007 to 55.1% in 2008, but the percentage of students scoring level 1 also increased from 22.5 to 24.1. By grade, 3rd grade continued to do well among its ELL population with 38.5% scoring levels 3 and 4 in 2007 to 85.7% in 2008. In grade 4, there was a decrease in the year-to-year comparison of data from 50% in 2007 to 40% in 2008, but the data still showed an increase of 1.5% within their cohort. ELL students in grade 5 showed positive gains in year-to-year comparisons of 13.6% to 50% in 2008, but within their cohort, data remained constant.

For the 2007-2008 school year, PS 72 opted to use the EDM 3rd Edition and continues to align all of the data in a positive trend. The largest difference between the 3rd and previous editions is the addition of a component in the curriculum that specifically focuses on differentiated instruction. We trust that we will begin to see positive gains.

Overall, PS 72 NYS ELA and Math test data reveals several common trends. The first is that the 3rd grade saw positive gains in nearly all aspects of the data. We recognize a number of factors that worked together to cause this effect in the data. After the 2007 performance of the 3rd grade, many changes were made, the most effective being a change in staffing of 3rd grade and how we observed the 3rd grade taking advantage of their newly scheduled 2 weekly common preps. This proves the adage that good teaching is good teaching. The staff combines best practices with teamwork and a collegial environment on all grades. Although this also took place on grades 4 and 5, it was not to the same extent. Another trend in the data is same 3rd group in 2007 is "handicapped". Despite making gains within their cohort, those gains were not enough to measure up to previous 4th grade years. Additionally, this aspect of the data also affected their performance in Mathematics. As administrators at PS 72, we need to work to encourage and support the practices that led to success in grade 3 to the other grades, and we need to focus on initiating a similar trend in the data we saw in ELA for Mathematics.

The Progress Report is a direct reflection of the NYS ELA and Math test scores and the Learning Environment Survey, and PS 72 saw its grade of a low B increase to a high B in 2007-2008. We

received a B in each of the three categories: School Environment, Student Performance, and Student Progress, and 3.8 in additional credit. We also saw increases in our calculated score for each. In ELA, we increased the percentage of exemplary proficiency gains in all in all four of our student groups. English Language Learners registered 60% on the 2007-2008 report. Special Education students increased their exemplary gains from 23.7% in 2006-2007 to 47.1% in 2007-2008. Hispanic students in the lowest third increased from 33.3% to 49.4%, and black students in the lowest third increased from 22.0% to 42.5%. In Mathematics, all four student subgroups registered decreases in exemplary proficiency gains, and we did not receive extra credit. In response, we are going to balance the focus on strengthening our literacy program with strengthening our Math program. Considerable gains were evidenced in School Environment, which will be discussed in greater detail in the review of the Learning Environment Surveys. In the 2006-2007 Progress report, School Environment scored 3.4 out of 15, and in 2007-2008, it 8.0 out of 15.

In terms of the annual Quality Review reports, PS 72 showed positive growth from being rated as an "Undeveloped" school in 2007 to being "Proficient" in 2008. This is an increase of two levels on the five point rubric that was used. Each of the Quality Reviews presents a snapshot at two very different points in the recent growth at PS 72. In May 2007, the new administration had been in place for just four months, and in May 2008, a year had passed, time to allow reflection on measures that this administration has initiated. On the 2007 review, we received "Undeveloped" for each of the five Quality Statements with a handful of performance indicators being rated "Proficient". A year later, PS 72 was rated "Proficient" in each of the Quality Statements, and did not receive a single rating of "Undeveloped" on any performance indicator. On the 2007 Quality Review, much of the positive feedback revolved around the administration, the systems that were now being put in place to improve instruction and the professional culture of the staff, and the many staff members who were supporting the program for change. Our areas of improvement focused on data collection and using data to inform and differentiate instruction. In response, throughout the 2007-2008 school year, many professional development opportunities in differentiated instruction were afforded to the staff. As a result, the 2008 Quality Review feedback presented a different picture. Many of the citations of what the school did well were connected to data, including comments such as "data is used well to identify where students need support or changes in instructional approach or setting" and "the school has a clear picture of student performance and progress through clearly presented analyses of data". The school, again, scored well in maintaining a focus on goals and improving instruction. On the 2008 report, the areas that were cited as areas in need of improvement reflected the progress made as well. We have made much progress in data collection and differentiated instruction, the suggestion was made that it must be consistent across all grades. We also need to focus on how teachers and students set and monitor their goals. In response, a school-wide initiative has streamlined goal-setting amongst the staff. At the beginning of the school year, all staff members completed a "Professional Goals for School Year 2008-2009" form that was a part of their staff handbook. Then, staff met with their immediate supervisors to discuss these goals with the emphasis being to ensure that these goals are attainable. Feedback sheets were generated from these meetings as well. Progress has been made in improving the school climate and culture. After piloting it in the Spring 2008, we fully implemented the Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) program and the distribution of "Bee Bucks". We trust that this effort will result in celebrating and encouraging positive behavior patterns.

PS 72 also saw improvement throughout its 2007-2008 Learning Environment Survey Report. Increases were evident in all four survey categories. On a ten point scale, Academic Expectations increased by 1.4, Communication 0.6, Engagement 1.8, and Safety and Respect 1.1. This is further evidence of an improvement in the overall culture of the PS 72 community that had been cited in our Quality Reviews. Specifically on the Parent Survey, an increase of 0.9 was seen in each of the four categories. The increases were even greater on the Teacher Survey: Academic Expectations +1.9, Communication +0.5, Engagement +2.5, and Safety and Respect +1.7. As a result of the promotion of the survey and providing professional development for both staff and parents, participation increased dramatically. In 2007, only 20% of parents completed the survey, which was fifteen percentage points below the city average. In 2008, 40% of parents completed the survey, which was equal to the city average. Even greater increases were witnessed in the completion of the Teacher

Survey. In 2007, 24% of teachers completed the survey compared with 48% citywide. In 2008, 68% of teachers completed the survey, which was seven percentage points above the city average. In response to the data collected from the Learning Environment Survey, an intervisitation program was implemented for the 2007-2008 school year, where staff was to view and reflect upon a colleague's lesson. A visit was required in the Fall and the Spring. Intervisitations to view best practices at similar schools were also organized. Additionally, two, weekly common preps were scheduled for each grade in the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 programs. Classroom locations were also reorganized to create grade-level hallways with the integration of Special Education classrooms. Although the data is not where we eventually like to see it, this effected a positive change in school culture. On the 2008 survey, teachers responded that 51% agreed that teachers trust each other at this school, and 67% agreed that teachers respected their most effective colleagues. These increases are considerable.

Despite our successes, we, at PS 72, also recognize the challenges that we face. Improving school culture is being addressed by a PBIS program that was piloted in the Spring 2007, and is being implemented school-wide for the 2008-2009 school year. This program consists of establishing matrices for positive behavior, and rewarding individual students and classes with "Bee Bucks". These "Bee Bucks" are redeemable at a school store that is open on Mondays during the lunch periods. The purpose of this program is to shift the focus from punishing negative behavior to promoting positive behavior. PBIS also encourages staff to use positive and constructive language and approaches to discipline. Another challenge we face is closing the achievement gap in Mathematics. To address this concern, we are using the 3rd Edition of Everyday Math, which comes with a specific component for differentiated instruction. This will assist us in addressing individual student needs. Additionally, we are monitoring student progress on pre and post EDM assessments, as well as on interim assessments on Acuity. ELA within our Special Education student group has also proven to be a challenge. For the 2008-2009 school year, we will continue to implement the Headsprout Early Reading program, which is a computer-based program that targets under-performing, ELL and Special Education students. Individual students progress at their own pace, and data is regularly generated for teachers to use to inform instruction. We also continue to implement the 100 Book Challenge independent reading program throughout all Special Education classes. This is a systematic program than focuses on independent reading levels, one-on-one conferencing with the teacher, and reading stamina. We are confident that we will overcome these challenges with the measures we have put in place.

Data gathered from NYS test scores, the Progress Report, Quality Review and Learning Environment Surveys have allowed us to have a clearer picture of where PS 72 is at and where we need to go. Change has occurred at PS 72. The school has taken important steps to improve instruction, professional development, and reaching out to parents. This is by no means the end of a process, but merely the first step. Our data has indicated areas that we need to improve. We will continue to involve parents and staff in school-wide decision making. We will create a positive culture where all stake-holders are invested in the success of our students. PS 72 will reach new and greater heights.

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.*

Goal 1: To enhance procedures within the Independent Reading portion of the Balanced Literacy Block, to assure that 80% of students in grades Kindergarten through Five are completing and tracking 30 minutes of independent reading each day as evidenced by their reading logs.

Goal 2: A plan for student progress monitoring will be implemented by all classroom and AIS teachers for the 2008-2009 school year. 80% of teachers will participate in data dialogues and use data analysis to monitor student progress.

Goal 3: To increase the level of safety and respect of students, as evidenced by the Learning Environment Survey. The 2009 Learning Environment Survey Report will indicate 50% of staff and parents either agree or strongly agree that order and discipline are addressed at the school.

Goal 4: The number of learning environment surveys returned by parents and teachers alike will increase to show a more comprehensive picture of the school's learning environment. The number of parents who complete and return the Learning Environment Survey (LES) will increase from 40% returned to 55% returned. The number of teachers who complete and return the LES will increase from 68% returned to 78% returned.

Goal 5: To ensure that teachers' goals are precise, with time-related interim benchmarks that provide a structure for yearlong monitoring, as addressed by the School Quality Review. 80% of the staff will have SMART goals written for their professional growth, which are monitored and revised three times during the year.

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 (ELA)
Goal 1

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>To enhance procedures within the Independent Reading portion of the Balanced Literacy Block, to assure that 80% of students in grades Kindergarten through Five are completing and tracking 30 minutes of independent reading each day as evidenced by their reading logs.</p>
<p>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></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A word of the day for grades 3-5 and a word of the week for Pre-K through 2 are announced by the Principal to increase vocabulary and support comprehension. • Principal meets with the literacy coach and outside staff developers from Mondo and 100 Book Challenge/iRead to set goals and instructional benchmarks. • Teachers use Acuity interim assessment results to monitor student progress, inform instruction and provide flexible grouping based on student need. • Students in grades 3, 4 and 5 give simulation assessments in ELA and use the item skills analysis to drive instruction and differentiate for individual student needs. • Teachers keep data binders with individual and class data to inform teaching and identify patterns and trends. Both formal and informal sources of data are included. Teachers will also track time spent reading, rate of progress and independent reading levels. • Comparative data analysis of the progress of individual students as well as classes on time spent during independent reading will be conducted. • Use of 100 Book Challenge/iRead Resources, including coaching skill cards at each reading level will be used for conferencing and differentiating instruction. • Teachers on all grades use the balanced literacy approach of instruction (whole group, small group, whole group share). • The Mondo Literacy program is used by all teachers. Professional development is provided by a consultant from the company. • 100 Book Challenge is used to build stamina and supports teachers in providing critical feedback to students during individual conferences. • Curriculum nights are held by the staff developers, literacy coach and Parent coordinator to encourage parent involvement and increase awareness of literacy. • Monthly book clubs held by the Parent Coordinator will foster comprehension skills while encouraging a partnership between the home and school.

Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule

Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.

- Mondo was purchased as a school-wide initiative to support teachers in the advancement of Balanced literacy and to increase student comprehension.
- The Data Inquiry team has identified students in the lowest 1/3 of grade four to identify a change strategy and replicate it school wide, moving more students into the “sphere of success”.
- Classes exchange 100 Book Challenge book baskets in a systematic way.
- Students are awarded with 100 Book Challenge medals to honor their success in reading and documenting their work.

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

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

- 100 Book Challenge/iRead Student Reading Logs that show a minimum of 11 steps per week
- 100 Book Challenge/iRead Conference Logs
- 100 Book Challenge/iRead bulletin boards and displays
- 100 Book Challenge/iRead classroom charts which track independent student progress
- 100 Book Challenge/iRead award ceremonies
- Fountas and Pinnell Reading Levels are used as benchmarks based on the table below:

Grade Level	October Benchmark	January Benchmark	June Benchmark
Kindergarten	Pre-Primer	Level A	Level B
First Grade	Level C	Level F	Level I
Second Grade	Level J	Level K	Level L
Third Grade	Level M	Level N	Level O
Fourth Grade	Level P	Level Q	Level R
Fifth Grade	Level S	Level T	Level V

- Agendas of conferencing professional development opportunities
- The development and maintenance of assessment spreadsheets that include text levels and running records.
- The further development and maintenance of Mondo focus sheets that contain specific data driven foci as well as qualitative data from the teacher’s conferencing notes.
- Agendas, sign-in sheets, classroom intervisitation documentation and observations for evidence of professional development and implementation based on teacher, grade and school data.
- Classroom libraries with accessible leveled guided and independent reading materials.
- During grade specific common planning time embedded into the school program, teachers engage in data dialogues around student work.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Math Goal 2

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>A plan for student progress monitoring will be implemented by all classroom and AIS teachers for the 2008-2009 school year. 80% of teachers will participate in data dialogues and use data analysis to monitor student progress.</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"> • Principal blocks time three days per week to observe teaching and learning during Math instruction. • Principal, Administrative Cabinet and the Math coach meet to collaborate and discuss school wide mission and goals in mathematics. • Principal shares weekly math challenges that are created by the Math coach with the school during morning announcements so that teachers can encourage students to work on them throughout the day. • Collect, record, analyze and document math assessment results in a timely manner • Use benchmark and interim assessment data to group students during math instruction in order to meet their individual needs • Item skills analysis of EDM pre and post assessments based on state standards will be discussed at the data dialogues with classroom teachers • Use the EDM differentiation options to support students in the lowest third to scaffold mathematic instruction. • Teachers will provide small group instruction during their mathematic block. • Principal has scheduled a consistent math block into teachers' schedules with the appropriate time mandates accounted for. • Curriculum nights, specifically in the content area of math will be held to inform parents of the state and city standards. • Teachers send home the notices from EDM Homelinks to inform the parents of current math instruction.
<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"> • Use Acuity to train teachers to access and disaggregate data that will help them to inform mathematics instruction and flexible grouping. • Math coach will model EDM lessons that focus on differentiated instruction for teachers.
<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"> • Monitoring Interim Assessment results on Acuity. • Principal and assistant principals will observe stronger math instruction that focus more on differentiation with consideration of those students in the lowest 1/3 of the population, and students in the specified subgroups. • Data binders will be reviewed by administration and the math coach to identify patterns and trends on the EDM item skills analysis

Subject/Area (where relevant): _____

Goal 3

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase the level of safety and respect of students, as evidenced by the Learning Environment Survey. The 2009 Learning Environment Survey Report will indicate 50% of staff and parents either agree or strongly agree that order and discipline are addressed at the school.</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"> • Principal will model positive behavior by conducting student conferences, encouraging an open-door policy and praising correct choices. • Principal will provide “Bee-bucks” as part of the Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) to individual students as well as classes who show exemplar behavior. • Suspensions and reported incidents are tracked to monitor how PBIS has influenced our character development initiative. • Establishing a “check-in”/“check-out” mentorship program has been established to give students an adult to confide in and promote an additional positive relationship with. • Pre and Post PBIS surveys are administered to gather student feedback. • The PBIS initiative was launched through a school-wide assembly program. • Classes can earn “bee-bucks” for being safe, respectful and responsible in class and around the school. • Establishing a schedule for school counselors to provide workshops for students on character education. • Professional development on community building will be provided throughout the year. • During PTA conferences PBIS will be introduced and supported. • School incentives will be linked to attendance (i.e.- Monday which is our lowest attendance day will be the day of the week the PBIS store will be open)
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>A PBIS site supervisor is assigned to our school to support the school site coach in the implementation of the program. A school based coach (teacher) is in the school to provide on-going support to the staff. A PBIS committee comprised of teachers, paraprofessionals and school aides meet bi-monthly to make additions to the program and modify the existing program.</p>
<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"> • PBIS liaisons visit the school to provide us with feedback and inform next steps. • Number of “bee-bucks” for both individuals and classes increase. • All staff uses a common language when speaking to students. • The number of suspensions and incidents decreases. • Attendance increases on Mondays.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Goal 4

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>The number of learning environment surveys returned by parents and teachers alike will increase to show a more comprehensive picture of the school's learning environment The number of parents who complete and return the Learning Environment Survey (LES) will increase from 40% returned to 55% returned. The number of teachers who complete and return the LES will increase from 68% returned to 78% returned.</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"> • A school wide incentive will be launched by the principal in conjunction with the PTA president to encourage a higher return. • Teachers will be afforded the time to complete the survey online to encourage a higher return. • The ITT modeler will be used to exemplify how the change in percentage of the Learning Environment Surveys that are returned will affect the Progress Report score. • The parents will be supported by the parent coordinator to complete the LES in their native language during Parent Teacher Conferences if the dates align. • A workshop will be provided for parents in the community to help them understand the survey and its impact on the school.
<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"> • Incentives will be provided for classes who return 100% of the surveys. • Teachers will be supported in completing the LES during common planning times.
<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"> • Parent attendance at the informational workshop will be taken. • Common planning time in the computer lab will be ensured. • Teachers will collect data on the number of students who returned surveys to school

Subject/Area (where relevant): Goal 5

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To ensure that teachers' goals are precise, with time-related interim benchmarks that provide a structure for yearlong monitoring, as addressed by the School Quality Review. 80% of the staff will have SMART goals written for their professional growth, which are monitored and revised three times during the year.</p>
--	---

<p>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></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal is transparent in sharing her own learning goals with the school community. • Teachers will review data of their current students to help them formulate SMART goals. • Data binders will help teachers to track student progress and therefore adjust professional goals. • Teachers will use their professional goals and outlined action plan to inform instruction. • Administrators and coaches will support teachers in accomplishing their SMART goals. • Administration will observe instruction and provide teachers with feedback specific to their identified goals. • Teachers will meet with administrators on an individual basis three times throughout the year to set, monitor and evaluate the success of their SMART goals.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Staff handbook includes a goal setting sheet for the teachers to use in completing their goals. • The LSO (Network 5) has supported us in creating SMART goals and assisted us in putting interim plans into effect.
<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"> • 80% of the staff will have completed SMART goal worksheets. • 80% of the staff will meet with the administrative team to set goals, monitor goals and measure the success of their goals. • Teacher observations will reflect evidence of implementation of their professional goals.

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	32	21	N/A	N/A	2	2	3	18
1	50	28	N/A	N/A	8	1	2	15
2	53	40	N/A	N/A	14	2	5	21
3	63	33	N/A	N/A	12	4	6	13
4	68	23	43	54	26	10	1	17
5	76	42	59	52	15	6	1	12
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson Reading Program • Foundations • Head Sprout • Rigby PM Guided Reading • Scott Foresman • Kaplan Advantage • Ladders to Success • Buckle Down • Writing Matters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Phonics program that teaches students decode and read with fluency. This program is provided to all special education classes (Grades 3-5) and as a pull-out intervention service by an AIS provider.</i> • <i>Phonics program that teaches students the systems and structures of the English language. This is provided as a whole class intervention during the literacy block in grades Kindergarten-Second Grade. AIS pull-out teachers provide small group support with this program as well.</i> • <i>This is a computer based supplemental emergent reading program that teaches phonics and other necessary pre-reading skills. The students interact with this program individually. The program is provided on all computers from Kindergarten – Grade 2 and is part of in class intervention. The ESL and AIS providers also use it during pull-out sessions for those students most at-risk.</i> • <i>Guided reading that is provided in grades 3-5 by out of class AIS teachers in a small group setting determined by data.</i> • <i>Test prep material used in grades 3-5 to prepare students for the ELA assessment. This is provided during the 37.5 minute instructional time for small group instruction.</i> • <i>A reader’s workshop approach to test readiness. This material is used during small group instruction during the day, as well as during 37.5 minute targeted instruction.</i> • <i>This test prep material is used to provide support with skills and strategies for our at-risk students. This instruction happens during the day as part of small group, data-driven instruction.</i> • <i>Test preparation materials that scaffolds the skills and strategies presented on the ELA tests in grades 3-5. On third grade teachers use this as part of their daily instruction as a support for at risk students. On fourth and fifth grade the teachers are using this as a supplement during the 37.5 minute instruction for at-risk students.</i> • <i>A systematic approach to teaching Writer’s Workshop, specifically in the genre of “Response to Literature.” Targeted students who need support with writing are instructed during the regular school day with this program.</i>

<p>Mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiation Options from Everyday Math • Everyday Math Games • Kaplan Foundations • Ladders to Success • Buckle Down 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Small group curriculum for differentiating instruction based on previously assessed skills. This happens within the math block during the regular school day. It is targeted small group instruction.</i> • <i>Application of previously taught skills in mathematics occurs during the small group use of games. These games help students to practice and master basic math skills.</i> • <i>Test preparation materials that help to unlock the New York State Math Assessment. This is a March-March curriculum that supports students during the 37.5 minute targeted intervention.</i> • <i>This test prep material is used by AIS providers with small groups during push-in or pull-out instruction.</i> • <i>Test preparation material that provides an intervention to the math standards on a March-March continuum. This is offered during small group math instruction during the school day.</i>
<p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigby PM Guided Reading (Non-Fiction in Content Area) • Hands-on, Inquiry Based Science Instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Establishing a system for those students who have been identified as at-risk in Science are in small groups with the AIS providers to read more non-fiction based literature to increase their knowledge of scientific concepts.</i> • <i>Students are given an opportunity to explore scientific concepts through the use of inquiry based, hands-on experiments. This is provided as a push-in service by the cluster teachers.</i>
<p>Social Studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safari Guided Reading (Non-fiction in content area) • Classroom Jeopardy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Implementing a program for students who have been identified as at-risk in Social Studies are in small groups with the AIS providers to read more non-fiction based literature to increase their knowledge of Social Studies concepts. Students are given time to explore DBQ's and compare and contrast documents during this small group instruction.</i> • <i>This computer based Jeopardy system allows students to interact with Social Studies content through a fun-filled game. This is provided for fourth and fifth grade students during 37.5 small group targeted instruction.</i>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Small group and individual counseling sessions to provide support for students.</i> • <i>Lunch groups to support students in transitioning into a larger, more social setting such as the cafeteria. Games and role-play of social behavior.</i>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therapeutic games and discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>One on one meeting with students to provide additional social-emotional support. Support is provided in terms of discussions regarding feelings about school issues and personal behavior.</i>

<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therapeutic games and group discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>At-risk counseling is provided by the social worker in either individually or in small groups. Tools used during at-risk counseling are relevant books, art work and therapeutic games. The goal is to communicate in a positive manner to express feelings, develop positive peer relationships and reduce anxiety. Groups are arranged according to similar needs.</i>
<p>At-risk Health-related Services:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Occupational and Physical Therapists provide one on one mobility training for students who have both gross and fine motor impairments.</i>

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.

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: 61 students
(No more than 2 pages)

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

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

PS 72 has a free-standing ESL program currently servicing 61 LEP students in grades Kindergarten to Five. Student's who receive Special Education services are also served by the ESL provider. The children are serviced in the English language. Our ESL program supports students from multicultural facets. Our mandated services are provided as a pull-out model based on the student's required minutes. However, all of our English Language Learners also receive quality instruction from their classroom teacher that incorporates ESL strategies. At PS 72 we have designed our instruction around the workshop model. Our teachers use the architect of a mini-lesson to craft their instruction and provide whole class instruction, followed by small group targeted instruction and a summary of instruction during a whole class share. This model of instruction provides structure for all of our students, but more specifically it helps us to support our ESL learners. Classroom teachers have embraced the Balanced Literacy Approach for instructing in literacy. This approach supports all students in developing their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. School-wide we have introduced the Mondo literacy program to enhance the Balanced Literacy Approach to teaching and increase learning outcomes. The Mondo program provides an Oral Language Component that has been another way for ELL students to access the learning in their class. In addition, the students read independently to increase stamina and fluency during the allotted period of 100 Book Challenge. Based on benchmark assessments in 100 Book Challenge, Mondo and Fountas and Pinnell running records, students are reading on their appropriate level which is another support from which the ELL students benefit. This year we have focused on launching the Writer's Workshop as a systematic approach to writing for all our students. We have put in place professional development to support our teachers in using total physical response (TPR) and more concrete teaching tools, such as photographs, picture cards and the use of SMART boards. In math we follow both the state and city mandates. Our school uses the Everyday Math (EDM) curriculum to instruct in mathematics. Our classroom teachers provide support for ELL students by using visual representations and hands-on manipulatives to make an abstract concept more concrete. In all areas we are conscious of the vocabulary that we teach our students especially our English Language Learners. The teachers have print rich environments where they

label objects in their classrooms. Teachers in grades K-2 use the Foundations curriculum to teach phonemic awareness and phonics. This program has supported our early emergent readers, our students with special needs and our English language learners. Social Studies and Science are taught as interdisciplinary subjects to literacy and math. We incorporate non-fiction reading into our literacy instruction, and apply all of our ESL teaching strategies to these subjects as well. Our teachers use interim progress monitoring to assess all of their students; however they are particularly aware of the needs of our students who fall into the ELL and Special Education subgroups.

In addition to classroom instruction and pull-out instruction provided by the ESL teacher, our English Language Learners receive Academic Intervention Services based on need. AIS is provided both as a push-in or pull-out program. Students are also afforded the opportunity to take part in the ESL after school program, which prepares them for the NYSESLAT as well as to become more proficient in the English Language. Additionally, a computer based program that teaches students the essential skills and strategies required for reading success (Head Sprout) is used as an intervention during the regular school day as well as during the 37.5 minute intervention program. ESL students are also invited to participate in Celebrate Learning (an after-school program to prepare students for State assessments.) Invitations for this program are based on individual needs.

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

OST (Out of School Time) which is housed at PS 72 offers homework help, as well as recreational time for any child whose parent has requested the after school care. This program offers dramatic experiences for the students to engage in and other family based events. This year, our new parent coordinator has offered many workshops and activities for students, including but not limited to our ELL population, to participate in (i.e. - Book Club, story night, and curriculum fairs). Additionally, this year we have implemented a school chorus for upper grade students. Students auditioned to be part of the chorus if they were interested in joining this extracurricular group.

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

Parents of ELL students are invited to a parent orientation which is conducted by the ESL teacher in both the spring and the fall. At this orientation the ESL teacher gives an overview of the services she provides through the ESL program. The workshop is also translated into their native language. A video is shown which explains the various programs offered throughout the New York City Department of Education for both bilingual and ESL students. Following the video the parents are supported in filling out a parent survey and program selection form. As we are committed to making this a partnership with our parents, the ESL teacher clarifies any questions the parents may have. Workshops are provided as the NYSESLAT testing dates approach to support parents in better understanding this process.

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

To support our ELL/LEP students prior to their transition on the first day of school, the ESL teacher will review the current PreK HLIS forms to assess future Kindergarten ELLs, as well as new arrivals. The ESL teacher will reach out to the families whose child will be eligible for testing in the fall. To get an early start, those students will be invited in August to participate in early LAB-R testing.

- 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.

As part of our professional development sessions through MONDO literacy instruction, which are conducted by outside consultants, and tailored specifically for K-2 teachers and 3-5 teachers, teachers receive professional development in literacy instruction. This incorporates best practices in ESL strategies. Oral language development, language acquisition approaches and questioning techniques are focused on during these Professional trainings. These workshops are offered on a bi-monthly basis beginning in September and running throughout the school year (dates are assigned based on consultant availability). At the November 4, 2008 (Election Day PD) teachers were provided with questioning strategies that can be used to scaffold instruction for ELL students. As an entire faculty we were introduced to the Progress report. Currently we have been exploring the implications of the Progress report at grade level conferences and during data dialogues. These data dialogues encourage teachers and administrators to engage in conversation focused on student work and the implications for instruction. At these meetings we always discuss adaptive strategies for our sub groups of Special Education students and ELLs. All of this professional development is ongoing and is based on the needs assessments.

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

Support services provided to our P.S.72 LEP students that are in place in our school are Academic Intervention Services (AIS), Extended Day Services (37.5 min.). ELL's are also offered an after school and Saturday program called Celebrate Learning. Implementing In 2009 there will be an ESL after School Support Program. The program is designed to prepare students for the NYSESLAT State exam as well as the challenges he or she may experience in and out of the classroom.

- 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 to PS 72, as we do not have a bilingual program.

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

School Building: Public School 72 Dr. William Downey **District** 08

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			
0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 08

School Building: 072

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 To: 8:30	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
2	From: 8:30 To: 9:20	Subject (Specify) COMPUTER	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA
3	From: 9:20 To: 10:10	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) MUSIC
4	From: 10:10 To: 10:40	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
5	From: 10:40 To: 11:30	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH
6	From: 11:30 To: 12:15	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA
7	From: 12:15 To: 1:00	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH
8	From: 1:00 To: 1:45	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES/ESL	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH
9	From: 1:45 To: 2:20	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE
10	From: 2:20 To: 2:57	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 08

School Building: 072

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 To: 8:30	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
2	From: 8:30 To: 9:20	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) COMPUTER	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) ELA
3	From: 9:20 To: 10:10	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA
4	From: 10:10 To: 10:40	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH
5	From: 10:40 To: 11:30	Subject (Specify) LUCH	Subject (Specify) LUCH	Subject (Specify) LUCH	Subject (Specify) LUCH	Subject (Specify) LUCH
6	From: 11:30 To: 12:15	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH
7	From: 12:15 To: 1:00	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MUSIC	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH
8	From: 1:00 To: 1:45	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION
9	From: 1:45 To: 2:20	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE
10	From: 2:20 To: 2:57	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 08

School Building: 072

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 To: 8:30	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
2	From: 8:30 To: 9:20	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) ENRICHMENT
3	From: 9:20 To: 10:10	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
4	From: 10:10 To: 11:00	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA
5	From: 11:00 To: 11:50	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH
6	From: 11:50 To: 12:30	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH
7	From: 12:30 To: 1:20	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH
8	From: 1:20 To: 1:35	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH
9	From: 1:35 To: 2:20	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE
10	From: 2:20 To: 2:57.5	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 08

School Building: 072

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 To: 8:30	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
2	From: 8:30 To: 9:20	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
3	From: 9:20 To: 10:10	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
4	From: 10:10 To: 11:00	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION
5	From: 11:00 To: 11:50	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH
6	From: 11:50 To: 12:30	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH
7	From: 12:30 To: 1:20	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH
8	From: 1:20 To: 1:35	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) MATH
9	From: 1:35 To: 2:20	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Subject (Specify) MUSIC
10	From: 2:20 To: 2:57.5	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 08

School Building: 072

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 To: 8:30	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
2	From: 8:30 To: 9:20	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA
3	From: 9:20 To: 10:10	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) ELA
4	From: 10:10 To: 11:00	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE
5	From: 11:00 To: 11:50	Subject (Specify) PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES/ ENRICHMENT	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH
6	From: 11:50 To: 12:30	Subject (Specify) MATH/ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA/ESL	Subject (Specify) MATH
7	From: 12:30 To: 1:20	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH
8	From: 1:20 To: 1:35	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) ELA	Subject (Specify) MATH	Subject (Specify) MATH
9	From: 1:35 To: 2:20	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify) COMPUTER	Subject (Specify) SCIENCE	Subject (Specify) SOCIAL STUDIES/ESL
10	From: 2:20 To: 2:57.5	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY	Subject (Specify) EXTENDED DAY

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: 55 LEP _____ Non-LEP _____

Number of Teachers 1 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

Our ESL program supports students from multicultural facets, the children are serviced solely in the English language PS 72 has a free-standing ESL program, there are 69 ELL's in the school 55 of which are being served through the program; the remaining 14 students have IEP's specifying monolingual services without ESL.. Our mandated services are provided as a pull-out model based on the student's required minutes. However, all of our English Language Learners also receive quality instruction from their classroom teacher who incorporates ESL strategies. At PS 72 we have designed our instruction around the workshop model. Our teachers use the architect of a mini-lesson to craft their instruction and provide whole class instruction, followed by small group targeted instruction and a summary of the instruction during a whole class share. This model of instruction provides structure for all of our students, but more specifically it helps us to support our ESL learners. Classroom teachers have embraced the Balanced Literacy Approach for instruction in literacy. This approach supports all students in developing their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. We have introduced the Mondo literacy program school-wide to enhance the Balanced Literacy Approach to teaching and increase learning outcomes. The Mondo program provides an Oral Language Component that has become another way for ELL students to access learning in their class. In addition, the students read independently to increase stamina and fluency during the period allotted for 100 Book Challenge. Based on benchmark assessments in the 100 Book Challenge, Mondo and Fountas and Pinnell running records, students are reading at their appropriate level adding to the support from which the ELL students benefit. This year we have focused on launching the Writer's Matters as a systematic approach to writing for all our students. We have put in place professional development to support our teachers in using total physical response (TPR) and more concrete teaching tools, such as photographs, picture cards and the use of SMART boards. In math we follow both the state and city mandates. Our school uses the Everyday Math (EDM) curriculum to instruct in mathematics. Our classroom teachers provide support for ELL students by using visual representations and hands-on manipulative to make an abstract concept more concrete. In all areas we are

conscious of the vocabulary that we teach our students especially our English Language Learners. The teachers have print rich environments where they label objects in their classrooms. Teachers in grades K-2 use the Foundations curriculum to teach phonemic awareness and phonics. This program has supported our early emergent readers, our students with special needs and our English language learners. Social Studies and Science are taught as interdisciplinary subjects to literacy and math. We incorporate non-fiction reading into our literacy instruction, and apply all of our ESL teaching strategies to these subjects as well. Our teachers use interim progress monitoring to assess all of their students; however they are particularly aware of the needs of our students who fall into the ELL and Special Education subgroups.

In addition to classroom instruction and pull-out instruction provided by the ESL teacher, our English Language Learners receive Academic Intervention Services based on need. AIS is provided both as a push-in or pull-out program. Students are also afforded the opportunity to take part in the ESL after school program, which prepares them for the NYSESLAT as well as to become more proficient in the English Language. Additionally, a computer based program that teaches students the essential skills and strategies required for reading success (Head Sprout) is used as an intervention during the regular school day as well as during the 37.5 minute intervention program. ESL students are also invited to participate in Celebrate Learning (an after-school program to prepare students for State assessments.) Invitations for this program are based on individual needs.

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.

As part of our professional development sessions through MONDO literacy instruction, which are conducted by outside consultants, and tailored specifically for K-2 teachers and 3-5 teachers, teachers receive professional development in literacy instruction which incorporates best practices in ESL strategies. Oral language development, language acquisition approaches and questioning techniques are focused on during these Professional trainings. These workshops are offered on a bi-monthly basis beginning in September and running throughout the school year (dates are assigned based on consultant availability). At the November 4, 2008 (Election Day PD) teachers were provided with questioning strategies that can be used to scaffold instruction for ELL students. As an entire faculty we were introduced to the Progress report. Currently we have been exploring the implications of the Progress report at grade level conferences and during data dialogues. These data dialogues encourage teachers and administrators to engage in conversation focused on student work and the implications for instruction. At these meetings we always discuss adaptive strategies for our sub groups of Special Education students and ELLs. All of this professional development is ongoing and is based on the needs assessments.

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)	\$80,682	Full-time ESL teacher for \$77,682 After-school program for ELL students for \$3,000
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	\$10,500	Provided professional development in literacy to staff servicing ELL students
Supplies and materials	\$5,000	For instructional materials
Travel		
Other	\$1,480	Provide translation services for parents
TOTAL	\$97,662	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

The initial analysis of the Home Language Survey provided us an opportunity to review the language needs of enrolling students. P.S. 72 studies the school demographic and students ethnic backgrounds. These findings show that Spanish is widely spoken by more than 85% of the ELL population. On a smaller scale, others speak Chinese Urdu, Portuguese, and Filipino. Written translation for these languages is provided by the Department of Education and ensures that parents get appropriate and timely information. In house oral interpretation is provided by the staff during parent conferences as well as on Parent Teacher Conferences. Parents also receive written notification in their native language when necessary.

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.

The need for oral interpretation during PTA meetings and Parent Workshops has increased. Staff members are hired to be available to assist with translation during Parent Teacher Conferences. The Principal of P.S. 72 is bilingual, as is the Parent Coordinator; therefore they are able to conduct parent conferences in Spanish when necessary.

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.

To guarantee delivery of information, written translation of parent letters and other vital documents are done in-house by a bilingual paraprofessional. If necessary to provide information in languages other than English and Spanish we contact the office of Translation and Interpretation through the Department of Education. We ensure that these documents are submitted to this office at least two weeks in advance of date of distribution.

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.

Every effort will be made to provide a translator when needed, such as during Parent Teacher Conferences and PTA meetings. These services are provided by staff within the school.

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>.

P.S. 72 will offer Parents who require language assistance, services with written notification of their rights regarding translation and interpretation, in their native language with detailed instructions on how these services can be obtained. Our safety plan addresses a protocol for Parents in need of language assistance to follow procedures to get in contact with school personnel in the event of an emergency.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

1. Enter the anticipated Title I allocation for the school for 2008-2009: \$710,764
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program: \$7,108
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified: \$35,540
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year: 99.2%
5. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2007-2008 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year.
Money has been allocated in Galaxy to provide Professional Development opportunities for the one teacher who is not considered highly qualified.

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

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

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

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

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

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

There is a comprehensive needs assessment in section IV of this document.

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:

- a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.

Over the past two years, PS 72 has implemented many procedural, organizational, and instructional changes to enhance the success for all of its students. New curriculums, materials, and resources have been purchased and put into classrooms. Changes have been made to support a more collaborative work environment, and professional development for staff. The needs of specific student groups have been identified and addressed

- b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:

- o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.

PS 72 has instituted two afterschool and one Saturday program to meet the needs of identified students. In September 2007, we established an afterschool program through the CBO, Out of School Time (OST). This program is Monday – Friday from dismissal to 6 pm, and provides a much needed place for students to go during the afternoon hours. OST provides

homework help and recreational activities. On Wednesday and Thursday, PS 72 offers the Celebrate Learning afterschool program to assist those students who need extra support in ELA and Math in preparation for the NYS assessments.

- Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
In September 2007, PS 72 implemented the 100 Book Challenge independent reading program. This is a systematic program that allows students to read on their independent reading level and to progress at their own pace. Individual progress is monitored and supported through leveled skill cards and one-on-one conferencing with their teacher. The program also focuses on increasing reading stamina by recording “steps” (1 step=15 minutes of “eyes on the page” reading) and incentives. PS 72 also continues to support a professional development program that focuses on differentiated instruction of students with identified needs and those students that are advanced.
 - Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
PS 72 has a large Special Education population. When we purchased the 100 Book Challenge that is mentioned in the previous bullet, our focus was on grades K – 3, and all Special Education classes. We have also implemented the Headsprout Early Reading program, which targets under-performing, Special Education and ELL students. This is a computer based program that allows the student to progress at his/her individual pace, and provides the teacher with continuous data source that can be used to inform instruction.
 - Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
As mentioned in the previous bullets, PS 72 has implemented the Headsprout Early Reading and 100 Book Challenge independent reading programs. After piloting a PBIS program in the Spring 2008, we have implemented school-wide for the 2008-2009 school year. This is a positive behavior intervention program that emphasizes and rewards exemplary behavior through matrices and the distribution of “Bee Bucks”. “Bee Bucks” can be awarded a class or an individual, and can be redeemed for prizes at the “Bee Buck” store. To address oppositional behavior, PS 72 has formed a Crisis Intervention Team.
 - Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.
3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
During the 2007-2008 school year PS 72 had one staff member who is considered not “highly qualified”, and has been offered professional support to ensure that 100% of our staff are highly qualified.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State’s student academic standards.
As part of our 2007-2008 Professional Development Plan, we provided for over 60 professional development opportunities for our staff. We are following a similar course for the 2008-2009 school year.

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

Although we are not currently in need of staff, PS 72 has worked hard to create a positive work environment for its staff. Collaboration among colleagues is strongly encouraged and supported. We have also embarked on an ambitious professional development plan to ensure that our teachers have the tools and practices to address the needs of all students. Over the past two years, we have implemented the 100 Book Challenge as part of the independent reading component of our Balanced Literacy Block. This year we have implemented the MONDO shared and guided reading programs. PS 72 has contracted for professional development through Writing Matters, and our LLSO for implementation of Writer's Notebook to enhance the Writers Workshop. We have the firm belief that creating a committed staff of educators and a positive school culture will further attract staff to PS 72.

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

Parental involvement at PS 72 has increased dramatically over the past two years. This year we have hired a new parent coordinator, and regularly hold workshops and family events at the school: i.e. Family Science Night, a parent-child book club, Pre-Thanksgiving meal... The administration has also worked closely with the PTA in joining Attendance Award ceremonies with their monthly meetings to increase attendance.

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

At PS 72 we offer pre-schoolers and their families with opportunities to smoothly transition into an Elementary school setting. We offer a parent orientation to inform parents of the instructional program. We invite the outside early childhood programs to view our school site. During the pre-registration students are invited to meet the teachers and get acquainted with the new school environment. We also stagger the first week of school so that students have the opportunity to gradually separate from their parents or guardians.

8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.

PS 72 has numerous committees that are represented by administration, out-of-classroom staff and classroom teachers. The Data Inquiry Team, Professional Development Team, and School Leadership Team are three examples. The inquiry team identifies a target population and monitors this group in order to inform school-wide decision making and classroom instruction. The PD Team is responsible for school-wide goal-setting and organizing professional development

9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.

In September 2007, PS 72 implemented the Headsprout Early Reading program. This computer-based program targets under-performing, ELL and Special Education students. Students progress at their own pace, and data is continuously produced for the teacher to inform instruction. PS 72 also has the Celebrate Learning afterschool program that meets on Wednesdays and Thursdays. Students have been identified based on their NYS ELA and Math test scores, and individual needs are addressed.

10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

PS 72 employs two outside agencies to organize violence programs. For the 2007-2008 school year, the Periwinkle Theater project worked with all 3rd grade classes, and this year, they will work with all 1st grade classes. Additionally, this school year, we are sending six teachers for professional development through Creative Responses to Conflict. CRC will also provide an in-class follow-up to the training, and one teacher will be trained further so that they can turn-key for the rest of the PS 72 staff.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and
8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

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

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

NCLB/SED Status: SINI – Year 1 **SURR¹ Phase/Group (If applicable):** _____

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

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

PS 72 was designated as a School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 based on its 2006-2007 performance. Although we made our AYP targets in all student groups, in Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient, we made the AYP using the Safe Harbor Targets.

In February 2007, PS 72 experienced a change in administration. As of February 1, 2007, Margarita Colón assumed the position of Principal, Interim Acting, and on March 12, 2008, Malcolm McDowell, assumed the position of Assistant Principal. Joyce Wolf, Assistant Principal, continued as part of the previous administration. During the Spring 2007, the administration made an assessment of the status of current programs, procedures, and practice. A myriad of areas in need of improvement were identified, and Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient students were two such areas. Action plans were put in place for September 2007.

Under the previous administration, the organization and assignment of classrooms followed no logic. On a single hallway, you could find a number of different grades. For the 2007-2008 school year, grades were grouped together on the same hallways. The location of Special Education classrooms were integrated with their assigned grade. In addition, two common preps each week were introduced and scheduled for each grade. Special Education classes were again integrated with their assigned grade.

The condition of the Balanced Literacy program at PS 72 was another concern. For the 2007-2008 school year, we decided to focus on the independent reading component, and purchased the 100 Book Challenge program for grades K – 3. Budget constraints may have excluded the inclusion of grades 4 and 5, but all Special Education classes in the building were included. (The iRead program was developed in-house for 4th and 5th grade. iRead mirrored the 100 Book Challenge.) Additionally, PS 72 purchased the Headsprout Early Reading program specifically for at-risk students, Special Education classrooms and LEP students.

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

For the 2008-2009 school year, we decided to focus on the shared and guided reading components of our Balanced Literacy program, and purchased the MONDO program. This was a \$128,000 expenditure that supplied the classroom teachers with teacher guides, a binder of shared reading resources, and leveled guided reading books. Professional development is a large part of this program. We will have MONDO consultants provide thirty (30) full-days of professional development throughout this school year. In addition, we strengthened the Writer's Workshop, and purchased professional development through Writing Matters. Our staff is also receiving professional development in creating and implementing a Writer's Notebook through our LLSO.

In order to improve the Literacy program at PS 72, and many other programs, increasing the amount and quality of professional development for staff was a necessity. In the past, they received little support. Over 60 professional development opportunities were provided on and off-site. PS 72 has a high number of paraprofessionals in the classrooms, due to its high percentage of Students with Special Needs. As a result, the role of paraprofessionals was recognized, and they were included in professional development days: Election Day and June 7, 2008. They were also trained to use the Great Leaps Reading Program. The following workshops were specifically provided for teachers and staff that served Students with Disabilities.

- Collaborative Team Teaching: Partnerships that Work
- Creating a Quality IEP
- Therapeutic Crisis Intervention
- Sensory Processing
- Suspension and MDR Training
- Planning for Student Success: Moving from a Most Restrictive Environment MRE to a Least Restrictive Environment LRE
- Great Leaps Reading Program
- Headsprout Early Reading program

Thus far, in the 2008-2009 school year, we have sent staff who serve students with disabilities to professional development in collaborative team-teaching, academic intervention, and testing modifications.

In terms of materials and resources, five Smart Boards were purchased during the 2007-2008 school year, and four more were acquired for a total of nine. This technology was utilized in general education, collaborative team-teaching, and Special Education classrooms. High-interest classroom libraries were purchased for Special Education classrooms, and the implementation of the 100 Book Challenge increased the amount of classroom library books. For the 2008-2009 school year, we have created a data-base in conjunction with our LLSO that will directly serve special needs population by making IEPs and testing modifications more user-friendly.

PS 72's LEP students account for a much lesser percentage of the school population, and do not require a bilingual program. The English as a Second Language program specifically targets meeting the needs of the LEP student group. Throughout the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 school years, the ESL provider attended regular professional development meetings at the Bilingual Education Technical Assistance Center BETAC at Fordham University.

2. Describe the focused intervention(s) the school will implement to support improved achievement in the grade and subject areas for which the school was identified. Be sure to include strategies to address the needs of all disaggregated groups that failed to meet the AMO, Safe Harbor, and/or 95% participation rate requirement. Note: If this question was already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

PS 72 was designated as SINI – Year 1 School, despite meeting all AYP targets and Safe Harbors. The focused interventions are discussed in the previous question on this page.

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

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified.

(a) Provide the following information: 2008-09 anticipated Title I allocation = \$710,764; 10% of Title I allocation = \$71,076.40.

(b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement.

The following professional development was provided to staff, and funded with Title I funds.

- 100 Book Challenge and iRead independent reading programs-The 100 Book Challenge provides a structured system of assessing and monitoring reading stamina on the student's independent reading level. Teacher-student conferencing is large part of this program. iRead mirrors this program. Professional development for staff continues to be a component of implementing the 100 Book Challenge and iRead.
- Headsprout Early Reading program-Headsprout is computer-based early reading intervention that provides the teacher with continuously updated data in which to inform instruction. This program specifically targets under-performing, Special Education, and ELL students. Professional development for staff continues to be a component of implementing Headsprout.
- MONDO Publishing-MONDO is a literacy program that serves as the shared and guided reading components of our literacy block. Shared reading resources and leveled guided reading books have been provided to each classroom teacher. On-going professional development is a large part of MONDO.

2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school's strategy for providing high-quality professional development.

PS 72 has three types of teacher-mentoring programs. First, PS 72 is a part of the LLSO School Based Mentoring Program, where experienced teachers are paired up with new teachers. Second, we have established an in-house Buddy Teacher system, where experienced teachers buddy with a new teacher or a teacher that we have identified as being in need of extra support. Third, all staff are required to participate in the intervisitation program. Each staff member is required to intervisit with a colleague. This visit consists of a pre-visit meeting to articulate a targeted practice, viewing the lesson, and a written reflection.

3. Describe how the school will notify parents about the school's identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.

The parents at PS 72 will be informed of the school's SINI – Year 1 status by letter, and at a monthly PTA meeting.

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

Not Applicable

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

1A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. PS 72 will form a committee to assess our ESL program, and will develop an action plan if necessary.

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?

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

New York State assessments measure conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem solving. In the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, these are represented as *process strands* and *content strands*. These strands help to define what students should know and be able to do as a result of their engagement in the study of mathematics. The critical nature of the process strands in the teaching and learning of mathematics has been identified in the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, revised by NYS Board of Regents on March 15, 2005: The process strands (Problem Solving, Reasoning and Proof, Communication, Connections, and Representation) highlight ways of acquiring and using content knowledge. These process strands help to give meaning to mathematics and help students to see mathematics as a discipline rather than a set of isolated skills. Student engagement in mathematical content is accomplished through these process strands. Students will gain a better understanding of mathematics and have longer retention of mathematical knowledge as

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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. PS 72 will form a committee to assess our Mathematics program, and develop an action plan if necessary.

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?

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

Overall: Multiple data sources indicate that direct instruction and individual seatwork are the predominant instructional strategies used by teachers in audited districts; there is indication of limited use of best practices and research-based practices, including differentiated instruction. A number of schools in audited districts further evidenced a lack of student engagement in classrooms, particularly at the

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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.
PS 72 will form a committee to assess our ELA program, and develop an action plan if necessary.

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?

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (SOM³) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

2B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.
PS 72 will form a committee to assess our Mathematics program, and develop an action plan if necessary.

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?

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

PS 72 will form a committee to assess teacher turnover, and develop an action plan if necessary.

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

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?

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

4.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.
PS 72 has a committee to assess our professional development plan, and makes on-going adjustments to meet the needs of our students.

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?

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

5.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.
PS 72 will form a committee to assess our ELL program, and develop an action plan if necessary.

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?

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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.
PS 72 will form a committee to assess our Special Education program, and develop an action plan if necessary.

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?

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

7.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.
PS 72 has a CST committee who assess the IEP process, and continually adjusts the action plan where necessary.

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?

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

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

This electronic version of the CEP Appendix 8 allows you to submit details about your proposed 2008-09 Contracts 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 Galaxy.
3. Please provide all of the information requested for each of the program strategies to which you've allocated fund requirements.

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

Submit date: **Jul 2, 2008** Email address: **mcolon@schools.nyc.gov**

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

School DBN	PS7208X
School Name	Dr. William P. Dorney
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 287,222
Principal Name	Margarita Colon
Principal Email	mcolon@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7188225311

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

Before- and After-School Programs	
Summer School Programs	
Dedicated Instructional Time	\$ 287,222
Individualized Tutoring	

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

Academic Intervention program with a Push In/Pull Out Model

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.

We will be expanding the Academic Intervention program as an extension of the core curriculum program to provide "Time on Task"

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No