



**P.S. 89 – THE WILLIAMSBRIDGE SCHOOL
2008-09
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: DISTRICT 11/ BOROUGH BRONX/11X089
ADDRESS: **980 MACE AVENUE BRONX, NY 10469**
TELEPHONE: **(718) 653-0835**
FAX: **(718) 231-2863****

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 089 **SCHOOL NAME:** The Williamsbridge School

DISTRICT: 11 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** PSO: CEI-PEA

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 980 Mace Avenue Bronx, New York 10469

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (718) 653-0835 **FAX:** (718) 231-2863

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Linda O'Carroll **EMAIL ADDRESS:** locarro@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON Jacqueline Whitelock

PRINCIPAL Ronald Rivera

UFT CHAPTER LEADER Robert Breitenbach

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT** Eleanor Vargas

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools) _____

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT** Elizabeth White

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
Ronald Rivera	*Principal or Designee	
Robert Breitenbach	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Eleanor Vargas	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Fran Palmieri	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Valori Rizzo	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
Linda O’Carroll	Assistant Principal, CSA Representative	
Jacqueline Whitelock	Teacher, UFT Representative	
Donna Stuart	Parent	
Maria Guzzone	Guidance Counselor, UFT Representative	
Angela Hackett	Parent	

* 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.

P.S. 89 has been serving the Williamsbridge community of the Bronx for the past 81 years. Conceived originally as a grammar school, it was truncated in 1953 to a K-5, then in 1994 it returned to its original K – 8 organization. In 2007, a pre-Kindergarten was opened and we are currently set up as a Pre-K to Grade 8 school with a population of 1,322. In March of 2002 the school was officially named "The Williamsbridge School".

The school is organized heterogeneously from Pre-kindergarten through grade 8. Our demographics reflect 275 ELL students, 210 self-contained special education students, and 63 part-time special education students. In terms of ethnicity, we have 15% White students, 27% Black students, 46% Hispanic students, and 10% Asian and others. The male-female comparison is 711 versus 611. 78.5% of our students were eligible for free lunch in the 2007 – 2008 school year.

Our faculty is comprised of 110 teachers of which 100% are fully licensed and permanently assigned to our school.

Parents are encouraged to become involved in their child's learning in various ways. A parent resource library has been established to provide parents access to relevant literature dealing with child development. Additionally, workshops are offered in which parents can become familiar with the various academic programs in place at P.S. 89.

Two literacy staff developers are here to assist teachers in planning and implementing effective instructional practices. Through demonstration lessons, after school workshops, and one-to-one service support, the staff developers provide teachers with assistance in planning and delivering effective instruction.

In 2008-2009 we are using 3 math programs, *Everyday Mathematics (K-5)*, *Impact Mathematics* in Grades 6 – 8 and *Accelerated Algebra* in Grade 8. We have one AIS person per grade to assist at-risk students in ELA and Math. For 2008-2009, we will continue to have the services of two site-based math staff developers for K through 8 to assist teachers in improving the quality of math instruction.

Our eighth graders are involved in preparing science and social studies Exit Projects which serve as criteria for promotion. Students in grades six and seven are also engaged in interdisciplinary learning activities, designed to culminate in mock Exit Projects in preparation for attaining eighth grade goals.

A middle school intramural program, grades 6-8, is offered on an extended day basis for both boys and girls to provide sports on both a recreational and competitive basis. This has been accomplished through several intramural programs including basketball, track and field, soccer, badminton, baseball, football, etc.

Students identified for academic intervention services are given additional time on task tailored to their individual learning styles. The duration of AIS intervention is based on the students' level of need. A

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

supplemental reading intervention model includes smaller grouping and more time on task. *Everyday Mathematics* and *Impact Mathematics* will be used to boost achievement in mathematics. Our extended day and Saturday programs are intended to provide AIS services in reading and mathematics for Level 1 and 2 students in grades 3 through 8. NCLB federal legislation has provided Supplementary Educational Services (SES) to at-risk students in grades K through 8 in ELA and Math. These include IEP, BELL, BRAINFUSE, READ and CHAMPS.

Our growing population of English Language Learners is serviced in self-contained ESL program, as mentioned in our Language Allocation Policy. Presently we have fifteen self-contained English as a Second Language classes (K-8) and one Bilingual CTT class in grade K.

Our special education classes consist of seven collaborative team teaching classes on grades K, 1,2,3,5, and 6 and eight self –contained classes throughout the grades. In addition two SETSS (Special Education Teacher Support Services) teachers will service children that are in general education with a need for resource room. We will continue to have the services of an IEP teacher who will push-in to classrooms to provide instructional services for our IEP students. Related services, including speech, counseling, occupational therapy and physical therapy are provided.

The School Leadership Team, comprised of administrators, teachers, parents, and the UFT Chapter leader, meets monthly to focus on collaborative planning to build upon the school's success in student achievement. *Working together to build futures for tomorrow's leaders* is our mission.

During the 2008-2009 school -year, the fourth and fifth grade students participate in exploratory academies. All students participate in STEM (Science, Technology, Ecology and Mathematics) and in the Arts. In STEM, students are offered the opportunity to explore and develop their thinking and reasoning skills through project based learning and real life scientific and mathematical experiences.

Fifth grade students are also involved in a week long yearly activity on Springbrook Farms. The future farmers continue to participate in community science throughout the year.

The Arts Academy's lens looks towards Social Studies as the driving force behind the integration of literature in visual arts, drama, dance and music. The goal of this Academy is to develop the innate creative potential of the students by offering a diverse curriculum integrating literature, visual and performing arts by the ways of an interdisciplinary curriculum.

Several classes receive instruction from professionals in their respective fields, as well as their own teachers. LEAP is conducting classes that incorporate visual arts with environmental themes. Bronx Arts Ensemble continues to work with our more experienced violin and clarinet players. Teachers have received professional development from Lincoln Center. Several students and parents attended ABT Ballet at City Center . New York University's "Shakespeare to Go" presented "Twelfth Night" to our students in January. Our fifth graders continue to receive ballroom dancing instruction from American Ballroom Dance. Finally, our drama department has continued to perform musicals and will perform "Aladdin" (Disney Junior) in December and "Annie" ((Broadway Junior) in May 2009.

SECTION III – Cont'd

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	P.S. 89				
District:	11	DBN #:	11X089	School BEDS Code #:	321100010089

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	x Pre-K	x K	X 1	x 2	x 3	x 4	x 5	x 6	x 7
	x 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec.		
Enrollment:					Attendance:				
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)			2006	2007	2008
Pre-K	0	0	32				90.0	90.0	90.0
Kindergarten	127	117	128						
Grade 1	129	124	119	Student Mobility:					
Grade 2	124	120	132	(% of Enrollment as of June 30)			2006	2007	2008
Grade 3	148	124	117				93.05	92.3	92.6
Grade 4	159	143	117						
Grade 5	162	144	146	Eligible for Free Lunch:					
Grade 6	212	176	164	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)			2005	2006	2007
Grade 7	183	200	170				80.3	80.3	73.8
Grade 8	201	182	187						
Grade 9				Students in Temporary Housing:					
Grade 10				(Total Number as of June 30)			2006	2007	2008
Grade 11							10	13	18
Grade 12									
Ungraded Elementary				Recent Immigrants:					
Ungraded Secondary				(Total Number as of October 31)			2006	2007	2008
Total	1450	1330	1316				22	14	5
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	117	78	85						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	22	58	45	Principal Suspensions			28	48	12
Number all others	69	56	83	Superintendent Suspensions			12	21	26
<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	42	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	221	265	253	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	4	2	2	(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	97	102	109
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	20	14	21
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	6	TBD	15
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender:				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100	100	100
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.2	0.4	0.6	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	70.1	67.6	71.6
Black or African American	29.0	28.4	28.0	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	49.5	56.9	63.3
Hispanic or Latino	45.6	45.0	45.4				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	9.5	10.6	10.3	Percent Masters Degree or higher	92.0	91.0	89.0
White	14.7	15.6	15.7	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	76.4	78.9	67.5
Multi-racial							
Male	53.2	52.9	52.2				
Female	46.8	47.1	47.8				

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 type="checkbox"/> 2005-06	<input type="checkbox"/> 2006-07	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> 2008-09

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:		
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):	<input type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1	
<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action –	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year	

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

	(SINI) – Year 2	Year 1		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:	CA		ELA:		
	Math:	IGS		Math:		
	Science:	IGS		Grad. Rate:		
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:						
Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	➤	➤	➤			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	➤	➤	➤			
Black or African American	➤	➤	➤			
Hispanic or Latino	➤	➤	➤			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	➤	➤	➤			
White	➤	➤	➤			
Multiracial						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	➤	➤	➤			
Limited English Proficient	➤	➤	➤			
Economically Disadvantaged	➤	➤	➤			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	8	8	8			
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	C	Overall Evaluation:	W
Overall Score	48.7	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	W
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	5.1	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	W
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	13	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	W
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	28.3	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W
Additional Credit	2.3	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	➤

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

An overall analysis of student performance data reveals the relative strengths and weaknesses of our school, as well as the unique challenges we face in a Pre-K-8 setting. We have aligned our goals to help us move forward despite these challenges. We have also identified trends where they exist. Our student attendance rate has declined slightly over the past several years. In part, this can be attributed to an increasing number of students living in homeless shelters and unstable homes. We also have students who leave school to return to their homeland countries in the middle of the school year. We will be addressing our attendance concerns with a new attendance initiative.

Having a Pre-K -8 population presents the challenge of providing instructional facilities which meet the diverse demands of the school. Additionally, overcrowding, particularly in the middle school, continues to be an achievement barrier. This overcrowding is a result of new student enrollment from neighboring Pre-K-8 schools, as well as transfers from traditional middle schools. Because of space limitations, we need to find creative ways to enhance and improve existing facilities. In addition, we must increase ways to take advantage of cultural and academic offerings beyond our school walls. Within our school, we will continue to increase opportunities for our higher achieving students through Advanced Placement High School classes.

An analysis of our English Language Arts data serves as a good tool to monitor progress in English Language Arts, as well as all content areas impacted by literacy. Among all tested students our analysis indicates that between the years 2006 to 2008, there has been a steady decline in level 1 students and a substantial increase in level 3 and 4 students in every grade. This trend is particularly evident among our English Language Learner population, regardless of grade level. Although there was a 30% decline in the number of IEP students who scored in level 1 between 2006 and 2008, there remain a significant percentage that need to be moved into level 3 and 4 in English Language Arts. During the 2008-2009 school -year, our Students with Disabilities failed to meet the Performance AYP for ELA and Science. Clearly, the deficits in science are a reflection of the difficulties these students are experiencing in reading comprehension. In analyzing our student population based on student groups, no consistent performance trend was evident. However, it is apparent that the racial and ethnic achievement gap separating Black and Hispanic students from their white peers is narrowing in most grades. In grades 3 and 5, Black or African American students outperformed their White and Hispanic counterparts while in grades 6, 7, and 8, Whites out-performed both Hispanics and Black students. In grade 4, Hispanics and Whites performed at the same level, with Blacks lagging. An analysis based on gender indicated that females slightly outperformed males in grades 4-8, while in grade 3 male performance exceeded female by 8 percent.

Although our gains between 2006 and 2008 have been substantial, we need to improve our efforts in moving students out of level 2 and into levels that indicate they have met or exceeded grade level

expectations. Currently, between 31% and 58% of our grade 3-5 students have partially met English Language Arts learning standards. In grades 6-8, between 41% and 55% of our middle school students remain at level 2. This has impacted in other content areas as demonstrated by the New York State grade 4 and 8 Science Assessments and the grade 5 and 8 Social Studies State Assessment. In 2008, 47% of our grade 4 and 60% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1 or 2 on the State Science Examination. Similarly, 33% of our grade 5 students and 62% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1 or 2 on the respective State Social Studies Exams. Clearly, we need to focus on improving nonfiction reading skills.

Over the past several years, we have successfully implemented courses and activities designed to meet the needs of our higher achieving students. However, we need to provide more challenging targets for these students, as demonstrated by the declining percentage of students scoring at level 4 throughout the grades. Currently only 10 students across all grades were able to achieve a level 4 on the 2008 NYS ELA assessment. This represents a decline from previous years.

The following data represents an analysis of progress in English Language Arts:

	Level	2008	2007	2006
All Tested Students	1	4.6%	8.0%	15.4%
	3/4	51.7%	42.8%	40.4%
ELL Students	1	5.8%	16.9%	52%
	3/4	42.9%	24.7%	10.7%
IEP Students	1	21.6%	31.6%	51.0%
	3/4	13.1%	9.8%	7.2%
General Ed. Students	1	1.0%	4.0%	8.3%
	3/4	59.8%	48.3%	47.2%

- In 2008, 4.6% of our 3-8 students scored a level 1, as compared to 8.0% and 15.4% respectively in 2007 and 2006.
- In 2008, 51.7% of our 3-8 students were able to achieve a level 3 or 4, as compared to 42.8% in 2007 and 40.4% in 2006.
- In 2008, 5.8% of our third graders scored a level 1, as compared to 11.3% in 2007 and 20.4% in 2006.
- 62.4% of third graders scored level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 50.4% in 2007 and 49.5% in 2006.
- 8.8% of grade four students remained in level 1 in 2008, as compared to 12.6% in 2007 and 16.5% in 2006.
- 53.5% of our grade four students achieved a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 46.7% in 2007 and 44.1% in 2006.
- In 2008, 3.5% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1 as compared to 4.3% in 2007 and 17.4% in 2006.
- In 2008, 58.7% of our grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 52.2% in 2007 and 46.5% in 2006.
- 1.2% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 4.1% in 2007 and 16.5% in 2006.
- 43.9% of grade 6 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 40% in 2007 and 36.8% in 2006.
- In 2008, 0% of our grade 7 students scored level 1, as compared to 8.1% in 2007 and 9.6% in 2006.

- In 2008, 59% of our grade 7 students scored a level 3 or 4, while 40.3% did so in 2007 and 41.4% in 2006.
- In 2008, 8.3% of our grade 8 students achieved a level 1, as compared to 8.7% in 2007 and 14.4% in 2006.
- 38.3% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 32.4% in 2007

Among English Language Learners the data indicates the following:

- School wide, 5.8% of our ELL students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 16.9% in 2007 and 52% in 2006
- School wide, 42.9% of our ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 24.7% in 2007 and 10.7% in 2006.
- In 2008, 14.3% of our grade 3 ELL students scored a level 1, as compared to 15.6% in 2007 and 55.6% in 2006
- 50% of our ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 46.9% in 2007 and 22.2% in 2006
- In grade 4, 6.7% of our students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 17.1% in 2007.
- In 2008, 46.7 of our grade 4 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 37.1% in 2007
- In 2008, 0% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1, as compared to 21.7% and 52.6% in 2007 and 2006, respectively.
- In 2008, 46.4% of our students scored a level 3 or 4, while only 26.1% did so in 2007 and 21.1% in 2006
- 3.5% of our grade 6 ELL students scored a level 1 in 2008, while 8.7% did so in 2007 and 66.7% in 2006.
- 34.5% of our grade 6 students scored level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 21.7% in 2007 and 5.6% in 2006.
- In grade 7, 0% of our students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 17.2% in 2007 and 37.5% in 2006.
- In 2008, 59.1% of our grade 7 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to only 3.4% in 2007 and 6.3% in 2006.
- In 2008, 11.8% of our grade 8 ELL students scored a level 1, as compared to 20.8 in 2007 and 50% in 2006.
- 11.8% of our grade 8 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to only 4.2% in 2007 and 0% in 2006.

The Data for our IEP students indicates the following:

- School wide in 2008, 21.6% of our IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 31.6% in 2007 and 51% in 2006
- School wide in 2008, 13.1% of our IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 9.8% in 2007 and 7.2% in 2006
- In 2008, 33.3% of our grade 3 students scored a level 1, as compared to 47.1% in 2007 and 53.8% in 2006.
- 19.1% of our grade 3 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 0% in 2007 and 11.5% in 2006.
- 31.6% of our grade 4 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 48% in 2007 and 14.3% in 2006.

- In 2008, 10.5% of our grade 4 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 20% in 2007 and 0% in 2006.
- 15.2 % of our grade 5 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 0% in 2007 and 57.9% in 2006.
- 21.2% of our grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008 while 16.7% did so in 2007 and 10.5% in 2006.
- In 2008, 0% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1, as compared to 21.7% in 2007 and 52.6% in 2006.
- In 2008, 7.4% of our grade 6 students scored a level 3 or 4 while 8.7% did so in 2007 and 7.9% in 2006.
- 5 of our grade 7 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 31.3% in 2007 and 40.7% in 2006.
- 14.3% of our grade 7 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 9.4% in 2007 and 7.4% in 2006.
- In 2008, 46.9% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1, as compared to 29.2% in 2007 and 58.3% in 2006.
- In 2008, 6.3% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 4.2% in 2007 and 2.8% in 2006.

Our General Education Students performed as follows:

- School wide, 1% of our students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 4% in 2007 and 8.3% in 2006.
- School wide, 59.8% of our students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 48.3% in 2007 and 47.2% in 2006.
- In 2008, 1% of our grade 3 students scored in level 1 as compared to 5.1% in 2007 and 9.1% in 2006.
- In 2008, 71.9% of our grade 3 students scored in level 3 or 4, as compared to 59.2% in 2007 and 62.3% in 2006.
- 4.2% of our grade 4 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 4.5% in 2007 and 16.5% in 2006.
- 62.1% of our grade 4 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 52.7% in 2007 and 47.1% in 2006.
- In 2008, 0% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1, as compared to 4.8% in 2007 and 11.2% in 2006.
- In 2008, 70% of our grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 55.6% in 2007 and 52% IN 2006.
- 1.5% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 1.4% in 2007 and 7.6% in 2006.
- 51.1% of our grade 6 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 44.9% in 2007 and 44.1% in 2006.
- In 2008, 0% of our grade 7 students scored a level 1, as compared to 3.2% in 2007 and 3.1% in 2006.
- In 2008, 65.7% of our grade 7 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 46.8% in 2007 and 48.5% in 2006.
- 0% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 5.4% in 2007 and 3.9% in 2006.
- 45.3% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 36.9% in 2007 and 37.5% in 2006.

An analysis of mathematics data between the years 2006 and 2008 reveals a school wide decline of more than 50% in level 1 students. Additionally, there was a steady increase in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade level expectations with a 17.9% increase in the percent of students scoring in levels 3 / 4 on the NYS Mathematics assessment. Approximately 75% of our students throughout the grades, with the exception of grade 8, scored in level 3 / 4. Although grade 8 students did not fit in this category, they did enjoy a 15.9% improvement in level 3 / 4 performance. Among our sub-group population, our ELL students made remarkable improvement in all grades. There was a dramatic school wide decline in the percent of ELL students scoring in level 1, declining 22.1% between 2006 and 2008 and a corresponding 36.6% increase in level 3 / 4 school wide student performance during this period. Among our IEP population, there was a 19.1% decline in level 1 performance school wide, and a 12.1% increase in level 3/4 students. An analysis of group performance based on racial and ethnic criteria reveals no consistent trend. In grade 3, Blacks outperformed their Hispanic counterparts, while in grade 5 Hispanics outperformed Blacks, with Whites lagging. In all other grades, with the exception of grade 8, white students were the highest performing group. Although we were able to better than a 50% reduction school wide in the percentage of students scoring at a level 1 between the years 2006 and 2008, there still remain a substantial number of students, particularly in grades 4 and 8 who need to be moved into a higher performance level. It appears that our grade 8 students are experiencing the most difficulty meeting grade level standards in mathematics. 14.1% of our grade 8 students are currently performing at level 1, as compared to between a low of 1.7% in grade 3 and a high of 9.6% in grade 4. In analyzing individual student progress between 2007 and 2008, there was a 6.5% decline in the percent of grade 8 students who scored a level 3/4, as compared to how they scored in 7th grade. Concomitantly, there was a 3.8% increase in level 1 scores. Furthermore, in 2007 as 7th graders, 7.4% of students scored a level 4, as compared to 1% the following year in grade 8. This represents a 6.4% performance decline. This clearly represents a needed focus.

An analysis of our Mathematics performance is as follows:

	Level	2008	2007	2006
All Tested Students	1	6.4%	8.1%	13.9%
	3/4	71.8%	65 %	53.9%
ELL Students	1	4.4%	5.6%	19 %
	3/4	76.1%	63.3%	39.5%
IEP Students	1	22.4%	28.8%	41.5%
	3/4	40.4%	33.1%	28.3%
General Ed. Students	1	3%	4.5%	8.9%
	3/4	78.5%	70.7%	58.6%

Among all tested students results indicate:

- In 2008, 6.4% of all tested students scored level 1 as compared to 8.1% in 2007 and 13.9% in 2006. This represents a 7.5% decline.
- In 2008, 71.8% of our 3-8 students were able to achieve a level 3 or 4, as compared to 65% in 2007 and 53.9% in 2006.

- In 2008, 1.7% of our third graders scored a level 1, as compared to 5% in 2007 and 6.1% in 2006.
- 85.5% of our third graders scored levels 3 /4 in 2008, as compared to 83.2% in 2007 and 71.4% in 2006.
- 9.6% of grade 4 students remained in level 1 in 2008, as compared to 5.3% in 2007 and 14.6% in 2006. This represents a 4.3% increase in the percent of students in level 1 between 2007 and 2008.
- 72.2% of our grade 4 students achieved a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 67.7% in 2007 and 57.3% in 2006.
- In 2008, 4.1% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1, as compared to 7.1% in 2007 and 8.9% in 2006.
- In 2008, 75.3% of our grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 63.6% in 2007 and 57.6% in 2006.
- 2.5% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 7.1% in 2007 and 17% in 2006.
- 72.7% of our grade 6 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 68% in 2007 and 50% in 2006.
- In 2008, 4.9% of our grade 7 students scored level 1, as compared to 10.3% in 2007 and 14.7% in 2006.
- In 2008, 75.3% of grade 7 students scored level 3 or 4, while 62.7% did so in 2007 and 52.4% in 2006.
- In 2008, 6.4% of grade 8 students achieved a level 1, as compared to 8.1% in 2007 and 13.9% in 2006.
- 56.2% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 51.4% in 2007 and 40.3% in 2006.

Our English Language Learners performed as follows:

- School wide, 4.4% of our ELL students scored level 1 in 2008, as compared to 10% in 2007 and 26.5% in 2006.
- School wide, 76.1% of our ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 63.3% in 2007 and 39.5% in 2006.
- In 2008, 3.7% of our grade 3 ELL students scored a level 1, as compared to 5.6% in 2007 and 19% in 2006.
- 77.8% of grade 3 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 83.3% in 2007 and 52.4% in 2006.
- In grade 4, 6.7% of students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 5.7% in 2007, and 25.3% in 2006.
- In 2008, 76.7% of students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 77.1% in 2007 and 45.2% in 2006.
- In 2008, 3.3% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1, as compared to 4% in 2007 and 26.5% in 2006.
- In 2008, 83.3% of students scored a level 3 or 4, while only 64% did so in 2007 and 44.1% in 2006.
- 3.5% of our grade 6 ELL students scored a level 1 in 2008, while 8.7% did so in 2007 and 27% in 2006.
- 69% of our grade 6 ELL students scored level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 60.9% in 2007 and 32.4% in 2006.
- In grade 7, 0% of our students scored level 1 in 2008, as compared to 16.7% in 2007 and 33.3% in 2006.
- In 2008, 78.3% of our grade 7 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to only 51.6% in 2007 and 26.7% in 2006.

- In 2008, 10% of our grade 8 ELL students scored level 1, as compared to 20% in 2007 and 30.8% in 2006.
- 70% of our grade 8 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 36.7% in 2007 and 30.8% in 2006.

IEP Student results indicate:

- School wide in 2008, 22.4% of our IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 28.8% in 2007 and 41.5% in 2006.
- School wide in 2008, 40.4% of IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 33.1% in 2007 and 28.3% in 2006.
- In 2008, 9.5% of our grade 3 students scored a level 1, as compared to 26.3% in 2007 and 13.8% in 2006.
- In 2008, 42.9% of our grade 3 IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 52.6% in 2007 and 65.5% in 2006. This represents a decline in this category.
- In 2008, 36.8% of our grade 4 students scored level 1, as compared to 10.3% in 2007 and 0% in 2006. Although there appears to be an increase in the percent of students scoring a level 1 in 2008 as compared to 2007, because of changes in enrollment, this represents only a slight decline in the actual number.
- In 2008, 26.3% of our grade 4 IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 48.3% in 2007 and 33.3% in 2006.
- 11.8% of our grade 5 IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 8.3% and 25% in 2007 and 2006, respectively.
- 58.8% of grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 41.7% and 40% in 2007 and 2006, respectively.
- In 2008, 3.5% of our grade 6 IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 34.8% in 2007 and 46.2% in 2006.
- In 2008, 62.1% of our IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 26.1% in 2007 and 12.8% in 2006.
- In 2008, 33.3% of our grade 7 IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 37.5% in 2007 and 71.4% in 2006.
- In 2008, 19.1% of our grade 7 IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 21.9% in 2007 and 17.9% in 2006.
- 43.8% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 45.8% in 2007 and 55.9% in 2006.
- 21.9% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 16.7% in 2007 and 14.7% in 2006.

General Education data is as follows:

- School wide, 3% of our General Education students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 4.5% in 2007 and 8.9% in 2006.
- School wide, 78.5% of our students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 70.7% in 2007 and 58.6% in 2006.
- In grade 3, 0% of the students scored level 1 in 2008, as compared to 1% in 2007 and 4.2% in 2006.
- In 2008, 94.8% of students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 89% in 2007 and 72.9% in 2006.
- 4.2% of our grade 4 students scored level 1 in 2008, as compared to 3.8% in 2007 and 15.5% in 2006.

- 81.3% of our grade 4 students scored level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 73.1% in 2007 and 58.8% in 2006.
 - In 2008, 1.8% of our grade 5 students scored level 1, as compared to 7% in 2007 and 6.5% in 2006.
 - In 2008, 80.4% of students scored level 3 or 4, as compared to 65.6% in 2007 and 60.1% in 2006.
 - 2.3% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 2.7% in 2007 and 9.9% in 2006.
 - 75% of our grade 6 students scored level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 74.4% in 2007 and 59% in 2006.
 - In 2008, 0.7% of our grade 7 students scored level 1, as compared to 4.6% in 2007 and 3.5% in 2006.
 - 83.7% of our grade 7 students scored level 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 71.2% in 2007 and 59.2% in 2006.
 - 7.8% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1 in 2008, as compared to 6.6% in 2007 and 11.7% in 2006.
- 63.4% of our grade students scored 3 or 4 in 2008, as compared to 57% in 2007 and 45.7% in 2006.

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.

CEP Goals

1. To improve student attendance by implementing strategies resulting in a 92% student attendance rate.
2. To upgrade the infrastructure and support instruction through the integration of a new mobile science station, the construction of a new science lab, and the renovation of our library/media center and computer lab.
3. To offer and implement a variety of advanced curriculum courses and cultural activities which meet the needs of our level 3 and 4 students.
4. To provide instruction resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students achieving one year or more progress in English Language Arts.
5. To provide instruction resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students achieving one year or more progress in Mathematics.
6. To provide our *Students with Disabilities* appropriate curriculum and specific instructional strategies which will result in at least a 3% increase in the number of students achieving 1 year or more progress in English Language Arts, as demonstrated by the New York State English Language Arts assessment, grades 3-8.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To provide instruction resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students achieving one year or more progress in English Language Arts, as demonstrated on the New York State English Language Arts 2009 Assessment, grades 3-8.</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>	<p>Target populations include 3-8 students including General Education, IEP students, and English Language Learners.</p> <p>Actions, Strategies and Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To continue to provide the foundation for future learning by maintaining a successful Early Childhood program • To further develop teacher effectiveness in all components of a comprehensive literacy model, K-8 • To continue to implement a curriculum map on each grade level which will focus on teaching and provide coherence and consistency across the grades. • Continue using leveled books for guided and independent reading as a tool for differentiating instruction. • Continue to mandate a 90-120 minute literacy block, the use of active word walls to encompass all content areas, independent reading time, and daily read-aloud reading experiences during the instructional day • To increase the amount of time students spend engaged in independent reading during the school day and across all grades. • To stimulate enthusiasm for reading through book talks, literature circles and book clubs • To increase the use of the collaborative team teaching model, where appropriate, as a placement for our Special Education students, funding permitting. • To provide comprehensive, systematic instruction in word study for all students through the ongoing use of Words Their Way program in K-2.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide intensive on-going support for at risk students utilizing Voyager Passport(K-2), Soar to Success (3-5), and AMP (6-8) • Provide additional small group instruction for at-risk students by AIS push-in /pull-out, providers, funding permitting. • Provide Extended Day instructional opportunities for all AIS and at risk students through the 37.5 minute block in the morning and the SES programs in the afternoon. (READ, Bell, and IEP) • To provide additional support for our ELL students through an on-going after school academy, funding permitting. • To use ECLAS 2 and Dibels assessments in K-3 to monitor student growth. • Using Baseline, Acuity, DRA and Wrap assessments to gather relevant data to be used as a diagnostic tool to differentiate and inform instruction. • Administration of practice tests to simulate testing conditions • To focus on teaching strategies for reading nonfiction text during the literacy block in order to improve reading across the content areas. • Continue to provide professional development opportunities to further an understanding of effective comprehensive literacy practices, supported by literacy consultants and inter-visitations to model classrooms. • Continue to work with Literacy Support Services Consultants in grades K-7 to turnkey effective strategies and practices of a Balanced Literacy model. • Expand the use of writers notebook and literature response journals • Train teachers in the interpretation of test data and the implications for instruction. • Provide teachers with training in teaching literacy skills through all content areas, particularly as they impact on instruction in Social Studies and Science. • Communication opportunities for all service providers to articulate and share successes
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Extended Day Per Session for ELA Academies and Professional Development Sessions from ISC services and private outside consultants. Title I money is also spent on two in house Literacy staff developers.</p>

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

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

Intervals of periodic review:

Sept./October- LAB-R K-8
ECLAS 2 Grades 1-3
Dibles assessment, ongoing
Baseline NYS Book 1 Assessment Grades 3-8
DRA / Orbit Wrap Assessment Grades 4-8

October ELA Predictive Assessment Grades 3-8

November ELA ITA Grades 3-8
NYS Social Studies Grade 5

December NYS ELA Simulation Grades 3-8

January ECLAS 2 Grade K
NYS ELA Grades 3-8

March/April ELA ITA 2 Grades 3-8

April/May ECLAS 2 Grades 1-3
NYSESLAT K-8
NYS Science Performance and Written Grades 4 and 8

May E-PAL Grades 2 and 3
ELA ITA 3 Grades 3-8
DRA / Orbit Wrap Assessment Grades 4-8

June NYS Social Studies Assessment Grade 8
ELA Spring Predictive Grades 3-7

Instruments of Measure:

Acuity Assessments
On-going teacher designed assessments and activities
Student portfolios with representative reading/writing pieces
Qualitative assessments including observation, conferencing/checklists
Dibles
NYS ELA assessment, grades, 3-8
NYS Social Studies Test, grades 5 and 8
NYS Science Test, grades 4 and 8

Projected Gains:

- Student achievement on the standardized ELA tests, grades 3-8, will demonstrate a 3-5% increase from level 1 to level 2, and a 2-4% increase from level 2 to level 3, when compared to the previous academic year.

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There will be a 5% increase in the number of students scoring at or above grade level expectations on the NYS Social Studies and Science assessments, grades 5 and 8, and 4 and 8, respectively. |
|--|--|

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): Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To provide instruction resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students achieving one year or more progress in mathematics, as demonstrated on the NYS Mathematics 2009 assessment, grades 3-8.</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>	<p>Target populations include 3-8 students, including general education, IEP student and ELL students.</p> <p>Actions, Strategies and Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate a multi-sensory approach to address the various learning styles and developmental stages of our early childhood learners. • Expand thematic units in PreK-2 to include a mathematics component. • Use of calendars to reinforce concepts such as <i>before and after, more and less, measurement, sequencing, and number concepts.</i> • Provide activities that reinforce mathematical facts, processes and concepts. • Hands-on activities such as math games embedded in the Everyday Math program. • Greater alignment of enrichment teacher instruction to the needs of students as determined through articulation with classroom teachers. • Embed mathematical concepts into instructional centers in K-2 classrooms focusing on skip-counting, recognizing and representing patterns and sequences. • All students targeted for AIS will continue to receive differentiated instruction tailored to specific learning styles, funding permitting. • Extended Day programs for targeted at risk students. Encourage enrollment for after school programs for those students who are in need of extra instructional time. • Connect Math and Writing through the use of Math Journals across the grades. • Continuing analysis of test data to be used to identify areas of need and inform instruction. • Train teachers in the interpretation of test data (i.e. Baseline assessment, Acuity ITAs)

	<p>and Predictives, Chapter/Unit Tests) and the implications for instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing staff development to share effective practices as they relate to the Everyday Math and Impact Math programs. • Provide instructional math blocks to allow sufficient time on task for students to become actively involved in their instruction. • Further integrate technology into math instruction through the use of computer software, Smart Boards, Graphing and Scientific calculators. • Utilize software embedded in the Impact Math program to reinforce skills and provide an interactive opportunity for students. • Adapt the Everyday Math program to the needs of our IEP and ELL students. • Provide SRA program as an alternate tool to address the specific needs of our IEP students in self-contained classrooms. • Provide math specialists to teach curriculum and differentiate instruction. • Provide advanced work for level 3 and 4 students. • Establish a peer tutoring network to assist students. • Administration of practice tests to simulate testing conditions. • Continue to provide a Saturday Academy for students scoring in levels 1 and 2. • Establish new inclusion classes on various grade levels, budget permitting. • Differentiate instruction based on the specific educational needs of our ELL population. • Continue to provide and expand our Integrated Algebra program for our level 3 and 4 students in grade 8.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Extended Day Per Session for Math Academies and Professional Development Sessions from ISC services and private outside consultants. Title I money is also spent on two in house math staff developers.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Intervals of periodic review: Sept/June- Ongoing Everyday Math Unit assessments and Impact Math Chapter tests. Sept./Oct.- Baseline NYS Book 1 assessment, grades 3-8 Nov.- Grade 3-8 Math ITA Integrated Algebra ITA Dec.- Grade 3-8 Math Predictive assessment Feb.- Grades 3-8 NYS Math Simulation March- Integrated Algebra ITA 2 NYS Math exam, grades 3-8 April- Grades 3-8, Math ITA 2</p>

	<p>April- Integrated Algebra Predictive assessment</p> <p>May- Integrated Algebra ITA 3 Grades 3-8, Math ITA 3</p> <p>June- Grades 3-7 Math Predictive 2 NYS Regents exam in Integrated Algebra</p> <p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acuity Assessments Ongoing chapter and unit tests Student Portfolios with representative math work, including tasks Qualitative assessments including observation, conferencing/checklists NYS Mathematics assessments, grades 3-8 NYS Integrated Algebra Regents exam <p>Projected Gains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student achievement on the standardized mathematics assessment, grades 3-8 will demonstrate 3-5% increase from level 1 to level 2, and a 2-4% increase from level 2 to level 3 when compared to the previous academic year. • 85% of those students taking the Integrated Algebra regents will achieve a passing grade.
--	---

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): Library Services, Science Lab, Computer Lab

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To upgrade the infrastructure and support instruction through the integration of a new mobile science station, the construction of a new science lab, and the renovation of our library/media center and computer lab.</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>	<p>Science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of a state of the art science laboratory which will accommodate our large middle school classes and support a constructivist, inquiry-driven approach to science.(50% increase in floor space, electrical upgrade, water and gas lines, air conditioning and computer access.) • To incorporate the added technology to its maximum potential to support the academic success of our students in various content areas. • Bring sufficient equipment on line to meet the needs of students in the lab. • Provide professional development for teachers on fully utilizing the new facility. • Plan a schedule that will provide maximum utilization of the lab throughout the school day. • Expand the science program to allow students to participate in ongoing laboratory experiments. • Provide opportunities for the “scientific method” to become alive. • Inclusion of a mobile science lab, promised by outside political funding sources, to creatively address our building space limitations so that many more students benefit from upgraded science technology. <p>Computer Lab</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade the electrical system to accommodate new hardware • Professional development in the use of new computers and other hardware.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff development in the use of new software embedded in our content area curriculums. • To place a knowledgeable person in the computer room to assist students with their research and exit projects. • To provide a venue to assist those students having difficulties in the traditional classroom learning environment, as well as those students who would benefit from higher level enrichment activities. • Expand the use of the internet web sites to communicate with parents and students. • Integrate the use of Smart Boards in instruction to facilitate a more interactive learning environment. • Develop curriculum to meet the needs of all students, beginner to advanced. <p>Library</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of the physical plant by 30% resulting in a facility that can accommodate 2 classes simultaneously. • Improve the electrical capacity to support new lighting, air conditioning, and computer hardware. • Pending funding, provide a new media center, as well as a collection of reading materials that will support the curriculum across all content areas and grade levels. • Provide high interest materials to motivate students to read and make use of library resources. • Reorganize the physical plant to allow for several concurrent activities. • Provide materials for our auditory learners through listening centers. • Provide a cozy story-time center where students can read a book with their teacher or peers. • Provide an area where several tables will be allocated as research areas for small group work.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Expansion of the science lab with a Department of Education Capital Funding Allocation of \$675,000. A local councilman has also promised funding for a mobile science lab for September, 2009. The electrical system upgrade is also being provided by the Department of Education. The Library renovation is a result of a \$200,000 grant provided by a local City Councilman. We will be working on obtaining grants to defray the costs of new library collections, as well as to create a media center.</p>

**Indicators of Interim Progress
and/or Accomplishment**

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

Intervals of Periodic Review

There will be ongoing review of construction deadlines. Although construction of our library is yet to begin, we anticipate completion by the beginning of the 2009-2010 school year. Additionally, construction of our computer and science labs are scheduled to be completed by May, 2009.

Instruments of Measure

We will monitor library usage in the following ways:

- Utilization patterns (i.e. lending books, research projects, usage of listening centers.
- Students' ability to access information from multi sources (i.e. reference books, documents, computers)
- Increase in the number of students utilizing the *scientific method* to conduct investigations and experiments using the new state of the art science lab.
- Increase in the percent of students able to use computers for testing purposes.

Projected Gains

- Research opportunities will enhance the quality of student work
- Quality of required *Exit Projects* will improve.
- Students' grades will improve.
- Students will become more at ease and proficient in the use of computer technology.
- The science lab will generate enthusiasm for science, resulting in higher student achievement.
- Students will become aware of the multitude of available resources and activities taking place in the new library.

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): Attendance

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To improve student attendance by implementing strategies resulting in a 92% attendance rate.</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"> • Letter initiatives to parents advising them of the importance of good attendance. • Formation of an Attendance Team to monitor progress in achieving good attendance. • Reward system for good and improving attendance. • Public acknowledgment of those students/classes who maintain good attendance. • Automated calls to homes to notify parents of absences. • Attendance Consultant • Attendance teacher to make home visits when necessary. • Follow up of “no shows” and clearing them from attendance rolls by October 31st, as well as clearing additional discharges promptly throughout the school year.
<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>The attendance consultant costs are to be paid by P.S. 89’s PSO – CEI-PEA</p>

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

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

- Attendance Officer will continually strive to clear “no shows” from school registers to minimize the negative impact on attendance data.
- Monthly analysis of attendance patterns to identify patterns of absences.
- By June 2009, there will be a 2% increase in attendance, from 90% in the 2007-8 school year to 92% in the current 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): Instruction of IEP Students

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To provide appropriate curriculum and specific instructional strategies for our <i>students with disabilities</i> which will result in at least a 3% increase in the number of students achieving 1 year or more progress in English Language Arts, as demonstrated by the New York State English Arts assessment, grades 3-8.</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"> • Implement a specific, structured reading program to augment the existing Balanced Literacy Model for our self-contained, inclusion, and SETSS students. The program will be instituted in grades K-8, insuring an element of continuity across grades while allowing teachers access to multiple levels of materials to address the diverse needs of their students within the classroom. • On-going professional development will be available in the use of the program, in differentiating instruction, and in analyzing student gains. • Opportunities for <i>Alternate Assessment</i> when appropriate. • Provide <i>I Openers</i>, a resource library that provides non-fiction science books focusing on teaching science through language arts. • Expansion of Collaborative Team Teaching, budget permitting. • Increase opportunities for mainstreaming. • Provide additional instruction in ELA and science through after school offerings and sessions held during vacation periods.

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Materials and Per Session teacher salaries will be funded by Tax Levy monies.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Indicators of Progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic embedded program assessments. • Qualitative assessment through conferencing. • Monitoring of classroom to insure ongoing progress. • Progress Reports • Report Cards • Students will exhibit greater confidence and participation in class. • Greater number of students will be successfully mainstreamed. • Students will demonstrate a preference for reading during non-instructional times. <p>Instruments of Measure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of Acuity testing • New York State English Language Arts assessment • New York State Science assessment • Checklists • Surveys <p>Projected Gains</p> <p>There will be at least a 3% increase in the number of students achieving one year or more of progress in ELA as demonstrated by the NYS English Language Arts assessment. Also, there will be a corresponding increase in the number of students achieving one year or more progress on the New York State Science assessments, grades 4 and 8.</p>

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): Attendance

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	To improve student attendance by implementing strategies resulting in a 92% attendance rate.
<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"> • Letter initiatives to parents advising them of the importance of good attendance. • Formation of an Attendance Team to monitor progress in achieving good attendance. • Reward system for good and improving attendance. • Public acknowledgment of those students/classes who maintain good attendance. • Automated calls to homes to notify parents of absences. • Attendance Consultant • Attendance teacher to make home visits when necessary. • Follow up of “no shows” and clearing them from attendance rolls by October 31st, as well as clearing additional discharges promptly throughout the school year.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	The attendance consultant costs are to be paid by P.S. 89’s PSO – CEI-PEA

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

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

- Attendance Officer will continually strive to clear “no shows” from school registers to minimize the negative impact on attendance data.
- Monthly analysis of attendance patterns to identify patterns of absences.
- By June 2009, there will be a 2% increase in attendance, from 90% in the 2007-8 school year to 92% in the current year.

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	50	24	N/A	N/A	129		1	
1	63	35	N/A	N/A	116			
2	40	25	N/A	N/A	92	2		
3	63	35	N/A	N/A	112	4	2	
4	55	28	55	55	110	4	1	
5	54	32	18	40	103	6	1	1
6	57	33	25	20	156	5	2	1
7	53	40	25	30	150	7	1	
8	63	35	40	40	21		2	
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

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>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>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p>K-2 Voyager Passport – small group push in/pull out instruction during the school day. 3-5 Soar to Success – small group push-in/pull out instruction during the school day. 6-8 AMP Program – small group push in/pull out instruction during the school day. Test Prep – 3 – 8 –Buckle Down series – small group instruction Friday/Saturday. 37.5 minute AIS morning program – K – 8 –Wilson Foundations (K,1,2) Quick Reads (3-5) Step Up to Reading.</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p>3-5 – Everyday Math- small group push in instruction during the school day including embedded math games, puzzles, and Game of 24. 6-8 Impact Math – small group push in instruction during the school day including use of Math journals. 37.5 minute AIS morning program K-5 – Everyday Math strategies, Math Games, Math Steps, Versatiles. 37.5 minute AIS morning program 6-8-Impact Math Intervention strategies, Differentiated Instruction Handbook for Impact Math, Math Handbook: Hot Words, Hot Topics, and Number Worlds (special ed).</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>Grades 3,4,5 – Harcourt Science including: Skills and Strategies for ELL students Skills and Strategies for Reading Nonfiction text embedded in the program Modules and trade book library to support science instruction Grades 6, 7, 8- Glencoe Science Interactive student textbook focusing on strategies for reading nonfiction text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using charts and graphs ▪ Reading and writing across content areas ▪ Embedded assessment ▪ ELL strategies <p>Reading Essentials-addresses lower level readers and strategies for differentiating instruction. Science Notebook – Skills and Strategies for ELA (Main Idea/Details/Compare and Contrast/Elements of Nonfiction Text) Test Ready Plus-grades 4 and 8</p>

Social Studies:	Strategies for reading non-fiction texts Smart Board for interactive learning experiences Social Studies modules reflecting non-fiction and historical fiction Test Ready Plus Grades 5 and 8 New York State Coach-Document Based Questions – grades 5 and 8 Buckle Down for Social Studies
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	Students are provided with workshops on “good touch”, anger management, making friends, peer mediation, behavior management, self-esteem, conflict resolution and social skills development.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	Children will ask questions regarding various concerns/ directions for implementing therapy
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	Temporary one-to-one counseling and at risk services for students to be picked up by Bronx Lebanon Hospital
At-risk Health-related Services:	Diabetic and asthma assistance



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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP)

**The Williamsbridge School
Public School 89
980 Mace Avenue
Bronx, New York 10469
(718) 653-0835
(718) 231-2863 Fax**

Mr. Ronald Rivera, Principal

**Ms. Linda O'Carroll
Asst. Principal**

**Ms. Caren Shapiro
Asst. Principal**

Language Allocation Policy **2008-2009**

Goals and Program Description

Public School 89 has a student population of 1322 students, of which 275 are ELLs. This number comprises of about 21% of the total population. When an ELL student is admitted into our school, the ESL Coordinator is contacted in order to review the Home Language Information Survey (offered in various languages) to determine eligibility. The Language Assessment Battery – Revised test and/or Spanish LAB are administered and entitlement is determined. The parent and/or guardian are invited to attend a Parent workshop in which a DVD is shown and

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

pamphlets in their native language are distributed explaining the programs that are available for their child. Parents and/or guardians sign the appropriate letters and the child is placed according to their request. If Spanish is their dominant language, the parent is given the option to place their child in a Transitional Bilingual Spanish class offered through the Regional Office at a local school from grades 1 – 8th. However, self-contained ESL classes are offered to all that speak a language other than English from grades K – 8th. We presently have fifteen self-contained ESL classes from grades K thru 8th. We have two Kinder classes with 23 students in one class and 22 in the other. On first grade we have two classes, one with 19 students and 20 in the second. For second grade, we also have two classes, one with 17 and the other with 19 students. Third grade has two classes as well, both with 21 students. Fourth grade has two classes, both with 18 students each. Fifth grade has two classes one with 18 students and the other with 19. One sixth grade class with 31 students, one seventh grade with 27 and one eighth grade with 16 students. We also offer a Bilingual CTT class in Kindergarten. We presently have 18 students, 6 being Bilingual (Spanish). During the past years, parents have been requesting self-contained English as a Second Language classes, due to the large influx of non-Hispanics into the area. Once a student reaches proficiency, the student stays for a duration of one year in the ESL program as a Transitional student. The student is then moved into a monolingual class the following year. These students will be serviced through our Title I Reading program. Students identified as SIFE, newcomers and long-term ELLs are offered the opportunity to participate in additional support programs such as: ELL After-school, Morning school (37 ½ minutes), AIS Intervention, and NYC Chancellor's programs. Student's identified with special needs are offered the same programs with an addition of an Innovative Educational Program for students with IEP. Presently there are 57 students at the Beginning level of language acquisition (this count does not include Kinder), 89 at the Intermediate level, 107 in Advanced and 22 Proficient.

According to the HLIS, the range of languages spoken by our students include, from the most to least: Spanish, Albanian, Arabic, Urdu, Bengali, Chinese, Filipino, Italian, French, Farsi, Korean, Ga, Greek, Macedonian, and Vietnamese.

Each program use small group instruction which is implemented in all content areas. Instruction is carried out in a systematic and structured way in order to achieve comprehensive learning and to develop cognitive skills that will maximize students' English acquisition. Multiple task-oriented assignments are displayed throughout the building. Teachers model and analyze students learning based on the mandated standards.

Members of the staff are provided with copies of the Learning Standards in English as a Second Language (ESL), English Language Arts (ELA) and content areas. The standards are used and are reflected through student portfolios, exams, classroom assessments and curriculum. Copies of the standards are displayed throughout the classroom for student and teacher use.

ESL Model: Self-Contained and Free Standing

In our self contained and free standing ESL model, ELLs that are in the beginning and intermediate levels of language proficiency, are assessed through the LAB-R and NYSESLAT, receive two units of ESL instruction (360 minutes). The advanced students receive one unit of ESL instruction (180 minutes). The classroom and enrichment teachers use ESL methodologies throughout the day in all content areas. All classes are taught in the English language. In addition, all students receive the mandatory 4 periods of ELA instruction.

All classrooms have libraries that are clearly labeled. Every classroom maintains a print-rich room. All instructional materials are easily accessible for students' needs. Teachers keep portfolios for each student with reading and writing materials in them.

ELL Special Education Programs

Students who are serviced through the Special Education Program receive the appropriate amount of units required, base on their language proficiency level. The students' with IEP is reviewed by the IEP, SETSS and ESL teachers to make sure that it is current and up to date. All IEP's are written in English. A Bilingual Spanish guidance counselor, social worker and psychologist are provided when needed. Ample opportunities are provided to our parents of students with special needs through continual workshops provided by our Parent Coordinator.

Quality Teaching for ELL

Instruction is supported with the use of instructional materials that are provided in English for the self-contained and free-standing ESL classes. The series of *English at Your Command* and *On Our Way To English* (K classes) is used for ESL and all classrooms also use *Leapfrog*, and *Taking the High Road* by Hampton Brown, which is used to acquire the English language for SIFE and newcomers. An on-going wish list is provided to educators, allowing them to order material when needed.

Students at P.S. 89 learn through a Balanced Literacy approach in ELA. Multiple task-oriented assignments are displayed throughout the building. All ELL teachers model, monitor and analyze students learning based on the mandated standards.

Classrooms reflect the language of instruction in all materials and resources used for instruction. Unfortunately, not all classrooms are equipped with advanced technological devices.

Students are grouped homogeneously for differentiated instruction in a targeted area based on their levels. This allows our students to perform in their levels of instruction. Our students are challenged to produce work in English, in verbal and written forms. This is accomplished by the use of note taking, following spoken language, group work, creating written projects etc. Through guided instruction, all ELL teachers assist students through process that equip them to perform at their independent levels.

Teachers scaffold academic language and complex content to support students' participation in content areas in an effort to prepare them for linguistic, cultural and conceptual difficulties and to activate and assess prior knowledge. They will use visual aids and realia to support their understanding of the content areas. Every ELL teacher maintains a print rich classroom that will include, but is not limited to graphic organizers, posters, charts, and pictures that are designed to promote English language proficiency.

Teachers will make the student a text participant, in an effort to connect the text with his or her own background knowledge in an attempt to match the text with appropriate content and cultural knowledge. Due to this, students participate in joint productive activities using a variety of instructional scaffolds. They will use strategies such as predicting, sequencing, skimming, scanning and jig sawing etc. in all content areas.

Assessments

An analysis of the 2008 ELA scores for the ELLs revealed the following information: The majority of the students in grades 3, 4 and 5 scored at level 3: however students who have been in the program for 2 + years scored 1's and 2's. No students scored 4's. For students in grades 6, 7 and 8th scored mostly 3's. The majority of these students have been in the program 3+ years. However, no students scored at Level 1. In the 2008 NYS Mathematics scores the following data was revealed: the majority fo the students in grades 3, 4 and 5 scored at level 3. However, 10 students

scored at Level 4. Grades 6, 7 and 8, the majority of the students scored at Level 3 and 11 at Level 4. Only one student scored at Level 1. This analysis reflects that the majority of these students continue to need the exemption (A-11) that was provided by the New York State Department of Education.

At P.S. 89, ongoing assessments are used to determine movement towards content standards. These assessments include, but are not limited to: ELA and MATH Predictive and ITA Assessment, Princeton Review ELA and Math, teacher assessments, E-CLAS, E-PAL, NYSESLAT, NYS Math and ELA, NYS Science and Social Studies, R-LAB, Spanish LAB and DRA. Data will be analyzed and interpreted in order to drive instruction and to determine placement. Teachers, AP's, Literacy Coach, Staff Developers and other school wide teams will meet in a collaborative effort to evaluate student work. The School Leadership Team reviews the data to make informed decisions about student progress.

Upon reviewing assessments and evaluating student results, P.S. 89 will use this information to determine what services need to be provided for the ELLs, especially the SIFE students. Various after school programs, such as BELL, IEP, AIS and After- school ELL Academy provides additional support for the ELLs.

Professional Requirements

The majority of the teachers at P.S. 89 who service the ELLs hold the appropriate teaching certifications. We ensure that all of the ELLs who are placed in monolingual classes will be serviced by teachers who are in compliance with the mandated 10 hours of QTEL (Quality Teaching Training for English Learners) training.

Special Education, Bilingual and ESL teachers will be informed about current research in the fields of special education, bilingual and ESL. They will attend both on and off site workshops reflecting theory-based learning. They are given opportunities to work collaboratively to develop and refine their instructional skills. On-going grade conference keeps staff members abreast of changes or additions that should be included in the LAP document.

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

Type of Program: ___ Bilingual ___ XX ESL ___ Both Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08: 275
(No more than 2 pages)

I. Instructional Program

Public School 89 has a population of 1322 students of which we have identified approximate 275 ELLs. Our ELL population is provided with services in grade K-8, in either a self-contained ESL class or a pull-out model. The majority of the teachers servicing the ELLs are either certified or in the process of being certified. According to the Language Allocation Policy, our students receive the required amount of

units as per Part 154. Beginners and Intermediate ELLs receive a total to 8 periods of ESL instruction (2 units). Our Advanced students receive four periods of ELA and 4 periods of ESL (1 Unit).

English is the language of instruction for our self-contained and free standing ESL program. The instructional strategies implemented in our program supports the language experience approach, total physical response, flexible grouping, cooperative learning, differentiated learning and teaching ESL through the content areas. Ongoing articulation is carried out through grade meetings and staff development to ensure that our Core Curriculum is in alignment with City and State standards. To ensure that our ELL population meets standards and pass the required 4th and 8th grade assessments (NYSESLAT, ELA and Mathematics, etc.), our Bilingual / ESL teachers use strategies within the balanced literacy and math models. The delivery of this type of instructional practice is made possible through Language / Oral experiences, Writing by Teacher's College Units of Study by Lucy Calkins, Words Their Way, Principals of Learning, and using the methodology of visuals, technological support to ensure a differentiated learning environment.

All learning activities take place within the context of setting clear expectations and goals, utilizing data to drive instruction, and developing an effective means of ongoing assessments to monitor student growth both academically and in their second language acquisition. ECLAS 2, DRA, Wireless Generation Palm Pilots, ELA / MATH Predictive and ITA Assessments and /or NYSESLAT scores are used to determine and identify the "at risk" ELL student population, including SIFE students. Intervention services are provided to our ELL and SIFE through extended day programs such as BELL, IEP, ELL After-school, READ, ELA / MATH Saturday Program and our 371/2 Morning Program. Academic Intervention Services are provided throughout the day to those students who are "at risk". Extracurricular activities are also provided to our ELLs through our after school programs such as piano, violin, dance, and drama.

II. Parent / Community Involvement

Parents at P.S. 89 are able to attend two mandated orientation sessions for newly enrolled ELLs to provide them with information about programmatic offerings. Opportunity is available to ask questions regarding Bilingual and English as a Second language programs offered by the Department of Education. Our first meeting was scheduled for September 18th, 2008, in which translators were available to parents. Our multi-lingual staff members include our PTA, Parent Coordinator, Paras, Staff Developers, ESL Coordinator, Assistant Principals and Principal. A great effort is made to ensure parents to participate during and after school meetings. All official communications for the DOE is disseminated in the native languages when made available. Parents as well as students serve as interpreters as the need arise.

In support of our initiative to promote parent involvement, workshops are offered throughout the school year to encourage parent participation as well as keeping them abreast of any new information. The Parent Coordinator offers workshops that inform parents of the State standards, testing and promotional policies.

III. Staff Development

At P.S. 89 professional development is given throughout the grades during the Common Prep period. Additionally, all staff members receive on-site staff development throughout the course of the school year. These services are rendered by our Literacy Coach, Staff Developers, ESL Coordinator, Literacy Support Team Consultants, AIS Team Leaders, School Based Support Team, and Administrators. Our professional development plan is evolving and on-going based on the needs assessment which is collected and analyzed to address the concerns of our staff.

Month	Professional Development
September	Data Sheets, ECLAS 2, DRA, DIBELS
October	Balanced Literacy / Curriculum Map
November	Using Data to Identify Needs
December	Analyzing Appropriate Intervention for Students
January	Differentiating Instruction
February	ESL Methodologies and Strategies
March	Data Driven Instruction
April	Learning Walks
May	Portfolio Assessments
June	Culminating Literacy Celebrations

IV. **Support Services**

Support services that are provided to our LEP students are additional testing accommodations (extended time, special location and third reading in listening passage as well as glossaries when needed).

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

School Building: **P.S. 89** District **11**

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	
1	10	0	5	0	0	16

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

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

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

Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules

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

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 11

School Building: P.S. 89

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:42 To: 9:24	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy Journal Writing	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy Journal Writing	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy Journal Writing	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy Journal Writing	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy Journal Writing
2	From: 9:27 To: 10:09	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy	Subject (Specify) Math Enrichment	Subject (Specify) Physical Education	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy
3	From: 10:12 To: 10:54	Subject (Specify) Writing ESL	Subject (Specify) Writing ESL	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy	Subject (Specify) Balanced Literacy	Subject (Specify) Writing ESL
4	From: 10:57 To: 11:47	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH
5	From: 11:50 To: 12:40	Subject (Specify) Writing ESL	Subject (Specify) Math Block ESL	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) ESL	Subject (Specify) Science
6	From: 12:43 To: 1:33	Subject (Specify) Math Block ESL	Subject (Specify) Math Enrichment	Subject (Specify) Math Block ESL	Subject (Specify) Math Block ESL	Subject (Specify) Math Block ESL
7	From: 1:36 To: 2:17	Subject (Specify) Math Block	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math Block ESL	Subject (Specify) Math Block ESL	Subject (Specify) Math Block ESL
8	From: 2:20 To: 3:00	Subject (Specify) Social Studies ESL	Subject (Specify) Science ESL	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Physical Education

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 11

School Building: P.S. 89

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:42	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 9:24	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing	Physical Education	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing
2	From: 9:27	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 10:09	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing
3	From: 10:12	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 10:54	Math Block ESL	Science ESL	Math Block ESL	Literacy Block ESL Reading & Writing	Math Block ESL
4	From: 10:57	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 11:47	Math Block ESL	Social Studies ESL	Math Block ESL	Social Studies ESL	Math Block ESL
5	From: 11:50	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 12:40	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
6	From: 12:43	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 1:33	Science ESL	Physical Education	Health	Math Block ESL	Science ESL
7	From: 1:36	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 2:17	Social Studies ESL	Math Block ESL	Science ESL	Math Block ESL	Math Enrichment
8	From: 2:20	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
	To: 3:00	Health	Math Block ESL	Social Studies ESL	Science ESL	Social Studies ESL

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (Bilingual - K)

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

School District: 11 School Building: P.S. 89

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:42 To: 9:24	Subject (Specify) Readers Workshop (Spanish) Reading & Writing Block	Subject (Specify) Readers Workshop (Spanish) Reading & Writing Block	Subject (Specify) Readers Workshop (Spanish) Reading & Writing Block	Subject (Specify) Readers Workshop (Spanish) Reading & Writing Block	Subject (Specify) Readers Workshop (Spanish) Reading & Writing Block
2	From: 9:27 To: 10:09	Subject (Specify) Reading & Writing NLA	Subject (Specify) Reading & Writing NLA	Subject (Specify) Reading & Writing NLA	Subject (Specify) Reading & Writing NLA	Subject (Specify) Reading & Writing NLA
3	From: 10:12 To: 10:54	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH	Subject (Specify) LUNCH
4	From: 10:57 To: 11:47	Subject (Specify) Writer's Workshop Spanish / NLA	Subject (Specify) Writer's Workshop Spanish / NLA	Subject (Specify) Physical Education	Subject (Specify) Writer's Workshop Spanish / NLA	Subject (Specify) Writer's Workshop Spanish / NLA
5	From: 11:50 To: 12:40	Subject (Specify) Math NLA	Subject (Specify) Math NLA	Subject (Specify) Writer's Workshop Spanish / NLA	Subject (Specify) Math NLA	Subject (Specify) Math NLA
6	From: 12:43 To: 1:33	Subject (Specify) Science / ESL	Subject (Specify) Math Enrichment / ESL	Subject (Specify) Math NLA	Subject (Specify) Social Studies / ESL	Subject (Specify) ELA / ESL
7	From: 1:36 To: 2:17	Subject (Specify) Music / ESL	Subject (Specify) Dramatic Play	Subject (Specify) Science / ESL	Subject (Specify) Art / ESL	Subject (Specify) Science / ESL
8	From: 2:20 To: 3:00	Subject (Specify) Dramatic Play	Subject (Specify) Social Studies / ESL	Subject (Specify) Dramatic Play	Subject (Specify) Dramatic Play	Subject (Specify) Dramatic Play

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- 8th _____ **Number of Students to be Served:** _____ **75** **LEP** _____ **Non-LEP**

Number of Teachers _____ **6** **Other Staff (Specify)** Assistant Principal

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

Language Instruction Program

Public School 89 will implement an after-school program with the theme of “Going Green”. This program will consist of six certified Bilingual or ESL teachers along with a Supervisor. It will serve approximately 75 ELLs and SIFE students from grades K – 8th. It will run for approximately 20 weeks, meeting twice a week (Mondays and Wednesday). This program will commence on October 20th, 2008. One and a half hour would be for instruction for the students (3:00 – 4:30 pm) and the last half hour for staff development for the teachers. Our instructional model will be conducted in English and will consist of small flexible groups, guided practice using ESL strategies and methodologies as well as using technological support in both mathematics, science, social studies and ELA instruction. Differentiated learning opportunities in the four disciplines of language acquisition will be addressed (listening, speaking, reading and writing), in order for the students to continue to attain English proficiency according to state standards. Parent will be invited to participate in a culminating celebration. Refreshments will be served during the parent meetings.

Professional Development Program

Public School 89 will continue to provide professional development to all 100+ teachers. All bilingual, ESL, Special Education and Monolingual teachers, as well as Supervisors will continue to have the opportunity to attend workshops such as: Q-Tel, NYSABE, NYSTESOL, Fordham University (BETAC), ELL Literacy Institute, In-House Staff Development provided by Literacy Consultants etc...to better inform them of ESL instructional models, policies and activities that will help tailor instructional practices for our ELL population. In-house professional development will focus on the Language Allocation Policy, Principles and Practices, Book Talks and how to incorporate these into content area instruction using methodologies such as scaffolding with emphasis on Academic Rigor. It will be conducted by our licensed ESL staff.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

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

P.S. 89

2008-2009

Allocation: \$42,075		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	\$26,000	Six Certified teachers One Supervisor
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	\$ 9,500	Professional Development for teachers and Supervisors to attend educational workshops such as: NYSABE, Q-TEL, NYSTESOL, In-house SD
Supplies and materials	\$ 6,575	Instructional Materials: <i>Treasure Chest</i> by McGraw-Hill, Picture Dictionary <i>Word by Word</i> by Longman, Supplemental materials for <i>On Our Way to English</i> Consumable Materials Equipment : Lap-tops, printer, replaceable parts for <i>Smart-Boards</i> (bulbs, markers etc...), CD players with headphones
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL	\$42,075	

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.

At Public School 89, 21% of the students are identified as ELLs. Translation and interpretation needs were assessed through the Home Language Informational Survey that parents completed at the beginning of registering their child in school.

Important information is regularly translated into the languages dominant in our school (Spanish and Albanian). The Department of Education's Translation and Interpretation Services, NYC Over –the-phone (718) 752-7373 ext #4), and NYCDOE website provide services in other languages as needed.

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.

Public School 89 dominant languages are Spanish and Albanian. Oral and written translations were made available in Spanish and Albanian thru our multi-lingual staff members, which include ESL coordinator, Staff Developers, Bilingual, ESL, Monolingual and Special Education teachers, Para professionals, Parent volunteer, Parent Coordinator, Assistant Principal and Principal. The Department of Education's Translation and Interpretation Services provide services in other languages, if needed.

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.

At P.S. 89, Spanish is the primary language spoken by parents. Written, oral translation and interpretations are provided to parents by school personnel as needed. The Parent Coordinator will access the Department of Education translation services to ensure that all correspondence will be provided to accommodate all non-English speaking parents.

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.

At P.S. 89, non-English speaking parents are provided oral communication through translations by school personnel and parent volunteers, when needed. This provides non-English speaking parents and guardians increased communication opportunities in order to enhance students' academic success.

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>.

Attachment A of the Chancellor's Regulation A-633, "*Important Notices for Parents Regarding Language Assistance Services*" are posted at the school's main office in various languages for parents to be advised and assisted by the school of how to avail themselves of services provided by the school and the Translation and Interpretation Unit. Every attempt will be made to provide parents with translations and interpretations in their primary language.

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 School wide 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 _____ \$1,150,926.00 _____
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program _____ \$11,509.26 _____
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified _____ \$57,546.00 _____
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year _____ 67.5% _____
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.
We offer professional development workshops to non-highly qualified teachers. The funding helps teachers take courses in preparation for their Master's Degrees in Qualified Areas.

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 School wide 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.
This has been addressed on pages 11-19.
2. School wide reform strategies that:
 - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is

included in the School wide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.

- Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

These services have been addressed in our Action Plan on pages 22-32.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff. *See page 24.*
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the School wide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
See page 24.
5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools. *N/A*
6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
Parent workshops conducted by our parent coordinator.
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs. *N/A*
8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
Through the efforts of our School Leadership Team
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.
See AIS on pages 32-34.
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.
We have SES – Federally funded programs such as I.E.P., BELL, READ, BRAINFUSE and CHAMPS.

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. ***Title I funds –extended day programs, technology.***
2. ***Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning. See CEP Action Plan- technology/extended day- Section VI – Page 28.***
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; ***CEP –Action Plan – Section VI- Extended Day- Pages 22 -27.***
 - b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and - ***Truman Program – CEP – Pages 30-31.***
 - c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours; ***Our AIS team supplements instruction and reduces class size.***
4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program; ***Title I funding will support Extended Day, technology hardware and software needs and our general education supply needs.***
5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers; ***5% Highly Qualified funding has been allocated for teacher tuition reimbursement from Title I money.***
6. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff; ***Title I monies have been used to hire professional development consultants as mentors for all of these groups.***
7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; ***and Title I monies (1% SWP) will be used to pay for parental involvement workshops, materials and outside parental consultants.***
8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs. ***After school and Saturday academies for targeted instruction will be paid for with a combination of SES Federal, State and Tax Levy City monies. The goal is to meet all city, state and Federal academic benchmarks for students.***

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 – Corrective Action 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.
We were cited for non participation (94%) on the ELA – Grade 8
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.
We have created a team of people that monitor the participation rate carefully and to date we have 95% or better. See pages 32-33 of CEP.

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 = \$ 1,150,926; 10% of Title I allocation = \$_115,093__.
 - (b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement. N/A
2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school's strategy for providing high-quality professional development.
We employ Literacy Support Services to provide professional development for our teachers to maintain a highly qualified staff.

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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.

We send out a letter in various languages to parents informing them of our status as a SINI school.

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

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

**APPEND 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. **After a careful review of both *The Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Literacy*, as well as grade level curriculum maps, we worked to ensure that curriculum was aligned with state standards for ELA. Inter-visitations followed by grade level conferences are utilized to monitor continual alignment and progress. Work/study sessions during common preps serve as a reliable way to look at student work. Pre and Post observation conferences with supervisors, checklists and quantitative, as well as qualitative assessments ensure that we remain on task. The progress of our ELL students is monitored by careful review of NYSESLAT data.**

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?

At the initial faculty conference prior to school opening, *The Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Literacy*, as well as the *New York State ELA Standards Manual* is distributed to new staff members along with a menu of staff development options on its use in the classroom. Curriculum Maps are continually being expanded to reflect ongoing changes in curriculum, and pinpoint skills, strategies, and expected outcomes. A writing component is integrated into every aspect in the curriculum map, with a subsequent required work product. Teachers are utilizing *Lucy Calkins Primary Units of Study, K-2* and *Lucy Calkins Units of Study, 3-5* for writing. An ELL on-site coordinator serves to provide staff development and ensures that all aspects of literacy are incorporated in the ELL classroom. She attends the yearly TESOL conference and turn-keys new strategies and materials focusing on language acquisition. Therefore, this finding is not applicable to our school as evidenced by:

- Improving state assessment scores
- Improving NYSESLAT scores
- Published student work found in portfolios, writing folders and displayed work
- Ongoing alignment of curriculum maps
- Alignment of ELA standards are evident across content areas as well, specifically, Social Studies and Science.
- Activities such as Interactive Read Aloud, Partner Reading, Book Clubs, Share-outs, Plays and Performances

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.

One relevant issue we will be addressing is the need to purchase more high interest, low level readers which reflect appropriate grade level curriculum for our IEP population. Additionally, plans to expand our library funded by a grant, will offer students and teachers a broader range of reading materials and media resources spanning all grade levels and content areas.

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

1B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **Math Staff Developers and Math Instructional Specialists undertook a critical analysis of NCTM standards and how they pertain to the Everyday Math and Impact Math programs. Grade level conferences were held to share out practices which incorporate the content and process strands. Grade level math tasks and rubrics were evaluated to ensure that the process strands were well represented in the curriculum. Teachers were given staff development on strategies to expand the “develop” and “explore” components of the lesson, and encouraged to accept different methods if students could support their solutions. Generally, mathematics instruction is strong, supported by two nationally validated programs which emphasize techniques for improving mathematical knowledge and understanding for all students, including ELL and IEP students.**

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

X 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?

We have found that instructional practices within our mathematics classrooms are well developed and adhere closely to the NYS Content and Process strands. The Process strands are embedded within the programs and teachers are becoming more adept at integrating them into lessons. The explorations and investigations have permitted students to become active participants in their own learning: teachers thereby take on the role of instructional facilitators. Making connections and providing opportunities to share and clarify ideas with peers have become an integral part of the lesson. This fosters the acceptance of multiple strategies for problem solving. Math Journals, “share and summarize”, and “in your own words” allow students to communicate mathematical thinking clearly and coherently using appropriate mathematical language. Grade appropriate math tasks encourage students to explain strategies, while rubrics guide students to self assess.

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?

We will differentiate instruction for our IEP students by expanding the use of supplemental programs such as McGraw Hill's SRA Program, as well as further incorporating hands-on math games. Mathematics instruction will also be differentiated by content, process and product according to student readiness, interest and learning style.

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

2A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **Inter-visitations and grade level conferences are used to evaluate instruction and monitor progress. Supervisors meet with staff members in pre and post observation conferences to evaluate the quality of planning and instruction. Data supporting school progress is continually analyzed and used to adjust instructional practices. Looking at student work is the frequent focus of grade level meetings. Successful practices are shared.**

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?

- **Observations**
- **School Progress Report**
- **NYS ELA assessment results**
- **NYSESLAT scores**
- **NYS Social Studies assessment results**
- **NYS Science assessment scores**
- **Displayed student work**
- **Student portfolios**

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.

Although this finding is not applicable to our school, one area in need of improvement is a better alignment of ELA and Social Studies instruction by classroom and cluster teachers. This will be addressed by allotting time for articulation.

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

2B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **Instruction is monitored and evaluated by inter-visitations and grade level conferences. Supervisors meet with staff members in pre and post observation conferences to evaluate the quality of planning and instructional success. Teachers adhere to math planning guides and pacing schedules. Data from chapter and unit tests is submitted and analyzed on a monthly basis to plan for future instruction. Technology such as Smartboards, Scientific and Graphing calculators, and interactive software are integrated into instruction. The increasing percentage of students performing at or above grade level expectations on the NYS Math exam will demonstrate the effectiveness of our instruction, as will the percent of students passing the Integrated Algebra Regents exam.**

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

- **School Progress Report**
- **NYS Math results**

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.

- **NYS Integrated Algebra Regents results**
- **Chapter/Unit tests**
- **Students ease using technology such as Smartboards, Scientific and Graphic Calculators and Interactive software embedded in the math programs.**

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.

In an effort to enhance our technology base, we will be upgrading our science lab to facilitate hands-on activities involving math concepts and processes such as measurement, representation and problem solving utilizing the scientific method. An upgraded computer lab will increase access to online math support for students and parents. We will also be providing further professional development opportunities to increase teacher confidence and proficiency in teaching mathematics through the constructivist approach.

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.

N/A

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.

At P.S. 89 professional development is provided through our cross grades common preparation periods, as described in our Language Allocation Policy. We share best practices and discuss issues pertaining to our ELL population. Staff members receive on-site staff development through our Literacy Support Team Consultants. Book clubs, in which our ELL staff members participated discussed the book *Balancing Reading and Language Learning* by: Mary Cappellini. Teachers are also given the opportunity to attend various workshops provided by BETAC, TESOL, Q-TEL, and NYSABE. The teacher will then turnkey pertinent information to all staff members and administrators.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Teachers at P.S. 89 participate in professional development provided by the Board of Education, BETAC, NYSABE and Q-TEL either during or off work hours. Information is turn-keyed to staff members during our common prep periods. Teacher observation, inter-visitations, and lesson planning reflects evidence of instruction for ELLs. ESL standards are displayed throughout the classrooms. Our ESL self-contained classrooms participate in a cross-cultural event during the end of the year.

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.

Additional staff development during low periods of the school year (not during testing or vacation) will support the staff at P.S. 89. They should also provide more Q-Tel workshops.

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.

At P.S. 89 we have self-contained ESL classes from grades K-8th with licensed and stable teachers as well as a Bilingual CTT program in Kinder servicing 6 ELLs. Two self-contained ESL classes each in grades K – 5 and one each from grades 6 – 8th. In June, pupil placement card are filled out for each student. Teachers receive cards on the first day of school with all pertinent information on it. NYSESLAT, LAB-R, Spanish LAB, Years of service, NYS ELA and Math, Science and Social Studies, Dibels and E-CLAS scores are entered onto the cards. In September, teachers also receive a Data Analysis sheet which includes scores provided to us by ARIS and in-house data collection.

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?

Teachers make periodic updates on the Data Analysis sheet. Our Data specialist inputs the information and updates ARIS reports. Teachers then utilize data to drive instruction.

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.

Additional support provided by central could be to have the ARIS available on the first day of school.

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

accommodations and modifications that would help support the students with disabilities in their classrooms, and are not knowledgeable regarding behavioral support plans for these students.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

Results of formal and informal observations, surveys, checking student portfolios and notebooks/workbooks, engaging teachers in accountable talk, talking with parents of special education students, looking at test data to get a quantitative view of what's happening, and talking to students to assess their outlook on special education services and its relevance to the school in general.

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

X 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?

This evidence is relevant to this school's educational program because very few children are decertified from special education and our test scores show that although our special education population has made some gains in English Language Arts and Mathematics, there is still room for growth and improvement.

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.

This school will address the relevant issues by developing an action plan with the help of the administration, SBST, related service providers, and special education teaching staff which will generate a set of goals and objectives that everyone agrees is important in meeting student needs and increasing academic performance. The plan will also generate teaching strategies such as curriculum mapping which will also incorporate the use of modifications and accommodations. A teacher center will be formed to house books and videos on teaching strategies. Added support is necessary from Central in terms of resources such as time, materials and monies. Demonstration lessons will also be conducted by experienced teachers.

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

The process which this school will use to assess whether this finding is relevant to this school's educational program will include monitoring and reviewing the IEP as well as the development of the child's IEP, informal and formal observations of instruction to assess whether the short term goals are being met, informal conversations with teachers of students with disabilities, monitoring child's progress report on page 6 of the IEP, completing surveys, grade group meetings, the degree that related service providers are servicing children, and taking a look at the test data to gather information as to where progress is being made and where help is needed.

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?

Observations-formal and informal, informal conversations and test results support the relevance of this finding.

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.

The school will address the relevant issues cited in Key Finding 7 by establishing an IEP committee comprised of teachers, administration, SBST, auxiliary staff such as literacy and math coaches who will meet frequently to discuss, monitor and review students IEP's, as well as looking carefully at the learning environment to determine if modifications and accommodations are being implemented per IEP recommendations. Support is need from Central in terms of supplying resources such as time, materials and monies to address this issue. Workshops on writing IEP's with a special focus on behavioral plans as well as demonstration lessons.

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

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

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

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

Submit date: **Jul 15, 2008** Email address: **rrivera25@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	11X089
School Name	Williamsbridge School
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 462,914
Principal Name	Ronald Rivera
Principal Email	rrivera25@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7186530835

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	\$ 34,971
Summer School Programs	\$ 0
Dedicated Instructional Time	\$ 427,943
Individualized Tutoring	\$ 0

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

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

Grade 8 Specialized H.S program initiative to ready students for specialized high school examinations.

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 (e.g., increase in the number of after-school program hours, increase in the number of students served, etc.)

Total number of students to be included are to be doubled, to approximately 60 students. Time on task will also be increased to include Saturday classes. Grade 7 students will likely be included this year.

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence