



**THE AMPARK NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL
10X344**

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

SCHOOL: 10X344 AMPARK NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL
ADDRESS: 3990 HILLMAN AVE.
TELEPHONE: 718-548-3451
FAX:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

SECTION 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 |
|-------------------|--|-----------|
| Betty Lopez-Towey | *Principal or Designee | |
| Josh Joffee | *UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee | |
| Tina Carolei | *PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President | |
| NA | Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i> | |
| NA | DC 37 Representative, if applicable | |
| NA | Student Representative, if applicable | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

* 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.

Our school underwent a modified Quality Review on June 4th 2008 as a first year school. The Overall Quality Review score was "Exceeded Expected Progress." The following are some notes from the reviewer presented at the exit interview that reflect some of our important characteristics:

- **Through observation of classroom teaching and other available information (DYO notes, conference notes) a constant updated understanding of the performance of sub-groups of students is maintained by Administration, teachers and other staff.**
- **Budget and staffing decisions are made strategically based on data to meet the academic needs of students.**
- **Teachers are held accountable for the continued progress and learning of students within the school.**
- **School leaders and staff use interim data and final school outcomes to set and evaluate goals.**
- **School leaders and staff use interim data to modify practices to differentiate instruction and improve student outcomes.**

NB: we have not received a formal report re. Modified Quality Review to date.

Mission Statement

AmPark believes that all children come to school with a desire to make sense of the world. Our school creates a safe, nurturing environment in which all children can experiment, reflect, develop understandings, make connections and become active participants in their own learning. They work to accomplish this on a daily basis by engaging in their environment, by interacting with people and educational materials, through their own inquiry and by following their own innate curiosity towards becoming lifelong learners. The focus of the school is on the learner, both adult and child, as we encourage everyone to use their minds well. The adults in our community (educators and parents) develop and celebrate each person's strengths and talents. The AmPark Neighborhood School is committed to mirroring the diversity of the community within our classrooms, both in our student population and teaching staff. We believe this combination of emphasis on the individual and responsibility to the families of Van Cortlandt Village brings together the most positive aspects of a community based school of choice.

AmPark has developed a collaborative professional environment that fosters clear communication in order to maintain and sustain the instructional visions and values of the school. We have built Staff Development practices which support teachers as they learn to work with colleagues on themes and studies that enhance learning and which build community.

Ours is a project/materials based learning environment. Much of the work that children do is consumable or “disposable” – what some might call “undocumentable” through use of a number or rubric. We wish our teachers to develop strong skills in looking carefully at the whole child, each individual child’s approach to learning, varied learning styles, and needs. We also wish teachers to look deeply at work whether quantitative or qualitative in order to clearly articulate for themselves what the instructional needs and next steps should be. Our work with the Long Island University DY0 provides a way for teachers to describe what they see, notice and define in children’s work in order to plan appropriate instruction. This kind of thinking deepens the understanding of each child’s qualitative level, (number and rubric) in all academic areas as well as gives language to the more quantitative types of work one may want to assess.

In our staff meetings, we utilize collections of children’s work and both quantitative and qualitative assessments to plan and set goals for individual students as well as goals for each grade or for our school as a whole. The math unit assessments (TERC) provide a “road map” for teachers to guide instruction at various levels. Goals sheets allow students to set their own goals alongside those of their teachers and parents. From these stated goals, teachers have developed curriculum that meets the needs and interests of their students. Oftentimes the goals address long term needs of students as well as immediate areas of support. The use of the DY0 documentation sheets have supported teachers in deepening their understanding of the individual child’s approach to learning (as well as clarifying each child’s strengths) and build on the areas of need. With this understanding teachers are able to provision children with appropriate classroom structures and materials.

As a staff we have been open to exploring a variety of ways to document and gather data that support our already established practices, both quantitative (TERC, DRA2, etc.) and qualitative (Descriptive Reviews, narrative reports, etc.). We are particularly involved in developing descriptive practices in our use of the DY0 Documentation Sheet in our partnership with Long Island University. This has allowed our teachers to articulate the work of the classroom through collection of student work, aligning instructional practices based on individual student needs (small groups, individualizing instructional materials, individualized instruction with other support staff, etc.) Our Math and Literacy Coaches have acted as a strong support to teachers and students in aligning the data information to the individual learning needs of students.

Our school collected data based on our twice yearly narrative reports which includes a basic checklist in Math, Literacy, Social/Emotional Growth and a Home-School Connection. We created graphs based on information provided by these checklists and are able to see growth across grades in the abovementioned areas. We used our DY0 cover sheets to help us examine the data and to determine further instructional needs for students as well as further support for individual teachers.

Together, teachers and support staff work continuously both in and out of the classroom to improve instruction. Teachers and support staff participate in a variety of forums for Professional Development to cultivate collaboration across grades and disciplines as well as

articulate and implement strategies for differentiated instruction. In this way teachers are able to address the diverse needs of all children in our school.

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) will be available for download by each school on the NYCDOE website. Schools are encouraged to download the pre-populated version for insertion here in place of the blank format provided. (The URL for download will be posted in the May 20th edition of “Principals’ Weekly.”)

| SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------|--------|----------------------------|
| School Name: | AmPark Neighborhood School | | | |
| District: | 10 | DBN #: | 10X344 | School BEDS Code #: |

| DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Grades Served in 2008-09: | <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> 11 | <input type="checkbox"/> 12 | <input 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 | | | | | NA | 94% | | | |
| Kindergarten | 40 | 20 | 22 | | | | | | |
| Grade 1 | 20 | 40 | 24 | | | | | | |
| Grade 2 | NA | 20 | 32 | Student Mobility: (% of Enrollment as of June 30) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Grade 3 | NA | NA | 13 | | NA | NA | 93.5 | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 6 | | | | Eligible for Free Lunch: (% of Enrollment as of October 31) | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | | |
| Grade 7 | | | | | NA | NA | 31.25% | | |
| Grade 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 9 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 10 | | | | Students in Temporary Housing: (Total Number as of June 30) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Grade 11 | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Grade 12 | | | | | | | | | |
| Ungraded Elementary | | | | | | | | | |
| Ungraded Secondary | | | | Recent Immigrants: (Total Number as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Total | 60 | 80 | 91 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Special Education Enrollment: | | | | | Suspensions: | | | | |
| (October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | (Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Number in Self-Contained Classes | 0 | 0 | 0 | Principal Suspensions | NA | 0 | 1 | | |
| No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes | 0 | 0 | 0 | Superintendent Suspensions | NA | 0 | 0 | | |
| Number all others | 0 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | |

DEMOGRAPHICS

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|
| <i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i> | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Special High School Programs: | | | |
| English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: | | | | (Total Number) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| (October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | CTE Program Participants | | | |
| # in Trans. Bilingual Classes | | | | Early College HS Participants | | | |
| # in Dual Lang. Programs | | | | | | | |
| # receiving ESL services only | | 5 | 4 | Number of Staff: | | | |
| # ELLs with IEPs | | | | (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 | | 7 | 8 |
| | | | | Number of Administrators and Other Professionals | | 1 | 1 |
| Overage Students: | | | | Number of Educational Paraprofessionals | | 3 | 1 |
| (# entering students overage for grade as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | Teacher Qualifications: | | | |
| Ethnicity and Gender: | | | | (As of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| (% of Enrollment as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | % fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school | | 100% | 100% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | 0 | 0 | Percent more than two years teaching in this school | | NA | NA |
| Black or African American | | 19 | 18.3 | Percent more than five years teaching anywhere | | NA | NA |
| Hispanic or Latino | | 43 | 43.9 | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl. | | 13 | 13.4 | Percent Masters Degree or higher | | 88% | 88% |
| White | | 24 | 24.4 | Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition) | | 100% | 100% |
| Multi-racial | | | | | | | |
| Male | | 44 | 45.1 | | | | |
| Female | | 56 | 54.9 | | | | |

2008-09 TITLE I STATUS

| | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> 2007-08 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2008-09 |

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|------|---|-----------------|---|------------|
| Progress (SRAP) – Year ____ | | | | | | |
| Individual Subject/Area Ratings | Elementary/Middle Level | | | Secondary Level | | |
| | ELA: | | | ELA: | | |
| | Math: | | | Math: | | |
| | Science: | | | 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 | | | | | | |
| 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 | NA | Overall Evaluation: | See AmPark Profile |
| Overall Score | NA | Quality Statement Scores: | |
| Category Scores: | | Quality Statement 1: Gather Data | |
| School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score) | NA | Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals | |
| School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score) | NA | Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals | |
| Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score) | NA | Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals | |
| Additional Credit | NA | Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise | |
| <i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i> | | | |

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

Our analysis of data has allowed us to target the lowest performing students who are at risk and intervene on their behalf with a variety of supports. Lowest performing students were identified as requiring support in literacy or as special needs students. Extended day one-on-one and small group support was provided to these students. We are finding that these students are benefiting by the interventions provided and will approach expectations for their grades. Special needs students are making slower progress reflecting the need for other services which will be provided through their IEP's. IEP's were initiated based on a number of criteria including analysis of quantitative and qualitative assessment, Team Meetings with the Principal, School Psychologist, Social Worker and families. We were able to establish a specific protocol for intervention. We were also able to begin conversations about literacy that would expand oral language development based on our ethnic demographic. (In 2007-08 school year data confirmed that 12 languages are spoken by the student community in our school though only three students receive ELL services.) Another area of value to us that was reflected in our data was the Home-School connection. It was determined that a poor Home-School connection impacts on the academic and often social/emotional growth of students.

In our first official year as a school we have laid an excellent foundation for future longitudinal study of our growing student population. At the same time we have been vigilant in archiving our process of growth as systems and structures have gradually been put in place. Archiving our process of growth will allow us to identify areas of strength and needs, modify our systems where needed and continue to develop best practices across all areas of school life. The Principal's placement of talented and competent staff as well as well-developed supplemental programs contributed to the excellent progress we made in our first year. Challenges this year (08-09) will be to maintain excellence in staffing and programs that support our core curriculum as budget constraints continue to grow. "A craftsman is only as good as his tools." This adage speaks to future challenges. These challenges will be to continue to provide rich instruction to our students as budgetary issues continue to threaten the maintenance of programs and instructional personnel.

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 NCLB/SED improvement (SURR, SINI, and SRAP) must identify a goal and complete an action plan for each subject/area of identification. (3) When developed, Principal's Performance Review (PPR) goals should presumably be aligned to the school's annual goals described in this section.

Goal 1: To increase literacy achievement levels of all students at AmPark. By June 2009, 65-70% of students will improve DRA2 performance by 4 levels from their baseline level in grades 2 and 3. By June 2009, 65-70% of students in the Kindergarten and 1st Grade will improve their DRA2 performance by 3 levels from their DRA2 baseline level.

Goal 2: To increase math achievement through continued work with the TERC math program and through supplementing instruction with other constructivist programs across grades. 30% of students in the 3rd grade will score 3 or 4 on the standardized math test. K-2 students will meet a minimum of 50% of math Standards for their grade.

Goal 3: To further support instruction through consistent Professional Development of teachers and staff in-house and through other outside programs. Continuing and enhancing a peer support system among staff so as to evaluate student needs and progress in all academic areas. We expect 100% teacher participation for all in-house P.D.'s. (See Action Plan)

Goal 4: To continue to develop our existing music program to extend from vocal training to instrumental training across grades. By June 2009, every child in the school will play a variety of rhythm instruments, sing in concert with others, learn rudimentary music notation, and understand basic structure of song (patterns in music etc). Kindergarten students will play Mediterranean drums. Students in Grades 1-3 will play the recorder and the Mediterranean drums.

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 NCLB/SED improvement (SURR, SINI, and SRAP) must identify a goal and complete an action plan for each subject/area of identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Literacy

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p> | <p>Goal 1. To increase literacy achievement levels of all students at AmPark. By June 2009, 65-70% of students will improve DRA2 performance by 4 levels from their baseline level in grades 2 and 3. By June 2009, 65-70% of students in the Kindergarten and 1st Grade will improve their DRA2 performance by 3 levels from their DRA2 baseline level.</p> |
| <p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p> | <p>Teachers will implement the DRA 2 in the fall to all students across grades as a baseline assessment of children’s literacy understandings. Teachers will use DYO assessment documentation to more deeply interpret quantitative data provided by DRA 2 as a means to more carefully target strengths and needs of children. This will allow for more effective differentiated instruction in the classroom as well as differentiated homework. To improve teacher student ratio in 2nd grade through reduced class size as well as further instruction from support staff. To implement an effective Guided Reading program in grades K-2. To implement Literature Circles and/or Author Study Groups in the 3rd grade class to develop comprehension, vocabulary, and oral expression in students. Literacy Nights across grades to support Parent/family understanding of literacy Standards and practices at AmPark. Literacy gains will be focused on all students equally.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p> | <p>Teachers will be trained on site in the appropriate use of DRA 2 Assessment by Literacy Coach. Reduced class size will allow for 2 smaller 2nd grade classes. This will allow for more direct differentiated instruction and preparation of students for entrance in the 3rd grade testing year. The on-site literacy coach will continue to support teachers in developing best practices in all areas of the classroom that support reading, writing, listening and speaking.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p> | <p>Continue to use DYO documentation periodically to assess children’s progress throughout the year. Teachers will implement DRA 2 in the fall as a baseline and in the spring to monitor growth and progress for all students. Periodic running records will be implemented to track progress in decoding and comprehension. Use assessment to target children at risk and to provide extended day support, initiate IEP’s where indicated and differentiate instruction based on skill needs. Improve reading of children in Grades 1 and 2 who are at pre-reading or level 1 through specific instruction based on DYO assessment and DRA 2 results. Improvement of expressive language and narrative writing in varied forms in the 3rd Grade class will be determined through DYO assessment of authentic pieces of writing in the context of thematic studies.</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 NCLB/SED improvement (SURR, SINI, and SRAP) must identify a goal and complete an action plan for each subject/area of identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Math

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p> | <p>Goal 2: To increase math achievement through continued work with the TERC math program and through supplementing instruction with other constructivist programs across grades. 30% of students in the 3rd grade will score 3 or 4 on the standardized math test. K-2 students will meet a minimum of 50% of math Standards for their grade.</p> |
| <p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff</i></p> | <p>With support of our Math Coach (NYC Math Project, Lehman College) the TERC Investigations will continue to be implemented across grades. The Salvadori Architecture Program will provide supplemental Math learning and support to all classes. The Salvadori Architecture Program provides a standards based framework in</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>members; and implementation timelines.</i></p> | <p>numeration, algebra, geometry, measurement, data analysis, problem solving etc. with a constructivist approach for all grades. Classroom teachers meet periodically with Math Coach and Salvadori facilitator to determine progress and needs of students to better differentiate instruction. Math coach will provide individualized support to 3rd grade teacher and students in preparation for 3rd grade standardized math test. Base line assessments have been implemented in all grades. Interim and endline assessments will be implemented in grades K-2. Simulations will be implemented in Grade 3 in January and February. “Math Nights” to support Parent understanding of math standards and practices at AmPark.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p> | <p>Hiring of Math Coach for at least 20 visits during school year. Reduced class size in Grade 2 so as to better prepare children for their first testing year (3rd grade ‘09-‘10). Participation in Math In The City DY0 at City College in order to train 3rd grade teacher in deeper and more thorough understanding of Math Standards. AmPark has been selected as a “Globe School” by the Salvadori Project. Though at a reduced cost, funding is still required to continue our participation in this program which includes weekly lessons and development of student projects over 3 school years. Teachers will be trained by Salvadori facilitators as part of the 3 year project.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i> | Teachers implement TERC Unit Assessments in all grades after completion of each unit of study. Teachers use Long Island University DYO documentation periodically and as a tool to deepen understanding of information provided by TERC quantitative assessments and other work in Grades K-2. 3rd Grade teacher participates in Math in the City DYO which provides specific rubrics with which to assess student progress. |
|---|--|

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 NCLB/SED improvement (SURR, SINI, and SRAP) must identify a goal and complete an action plan for each subject/area of identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Professional Development

| | |
|---|---|
| Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i> | Goal 3: To further support instruction through consistent Professional Development of teachers and staff in-house and through other outside programs. Continuing and enhancing a peer support system among staff so as to evaluate student needs and progress in all academic areas. We expect 100% teacher participation for all in-house P.D.'s. (See Action Plan) |
| Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation</i> | Weekly Monday after school PD sessions which will address a variety of topics including: Balanced Literacy strategies, Constructivist mathematics, Salvadori Architecture, Literacy DYO assessment practices, Math DYO assessment practices, DRA 2 training, best practices in observation and documentation of students and their work et.al. Weekly Cohort teacher meetings. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>timelines.</i></p> | <p>Weekly Wednesday after school business meetings Interclass visitation for all staff at least twice a year. Inter-school visitation for all teachers twice a year Individualized Professional Development based on needs and/or subject area for each teacher. Teachers attend 2 staff retreats a year: All Staff Summer Retreat, Lake George, NY and Prospect Fall Conference, Litchfield CT. Prospect Fall Conference will be mandatory for teachers new to our school to support their learning of descriptive practices. Periodic Principal informal observations alongside Formal Observations. Parent Information Nights which will include such topics as: Homework Policy, DYO Assessment practices et.al.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p> | <p>Teacher retreats support and train teachers in descriptive processes and in developing skills as observers of students' work and students' approaches to learning. C4E funding will support our Teacher Quality program. To support participation in the DYO Literacy and Math Assessment network groups, we expect to receive specialized funding from the department of Education. The number of off-site P.D. opportunities will greatly depend on budget considerations. Opportunities will be provided to individual teachers based on particular teacher needs and available funding.</p> |
| <p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p> | <p>Professional Development measures will include: Principal observations in the classroom Reflective responses from each teacher assessing ways in which they have implemented practices in their classrooms Outcomes in student performance (Progress Reports, ongoing assessments) which reflect teachers' effective implementation of teaching practices provided through P.D. Survey responses to PD workshops. Teachers successfully share thinking and establish goals for all students through cohort meetings. Teachers prepare and participate in Descriptive Reviews of student work, classroom activities and/or practice. Ongoing student assessment and acquisition of data across grades and disciplines.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Through PD and weekly meetings teacher will grow as reflective practitioners and learners. Reflective interactions and collaboration will support teachers in developing best practices. Attendance Sign-in at every PD meeting.</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 NCLB/SED improvement (SURR, SINI, and SRAP) must identify a goal and complete an action plan for each subject/area of identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Music

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p> | <p>Goal 4: To continue to develop our existing music program to extend from vocal training to instrumental training across grades. By June 2009, every child in the school will play a variety of rhythm instruments, sing in concert with others, learn rudimentary music notation, and understand basic structure of song (patterns in music etc). Kindergarten students will play Mediterranean drums. Students in Grades 1-3 will play the recorder and the Mediterranean drums.</p> |
| <p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p> | <p>Children will continue to develop ear training skills as they work on learning new vocal music. Children build on their growing understanding of rhythms and counting through specific activities that target developing skills in both ear training and rhythm. We will expand our existing music program through use of rhythm instruments which will help develop listening, rhythm, and collaborative skills in children. Children will perform at weekly Monday Morning Sing and at The</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>AmPark Arts festival in the spring Children continue to grow in skill as instrumentalists in our collaboration with the American Orchestra playing Mediterranean Drums and Recorders. This program supplements our existing music program. Parents participate in All-School Monday Morning Sings and will attend Arts Festival at end of school year. All of the above will be taught by our school music teacher and will be supported by the facilitator of the American Orchestra.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p> | <p>American Orchestra is a significant supplemental program to our core music curriculum and will be funded by our galaxy budget.</p> |
| <p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p> | <p>Students will learn specific mathematical concepts while developing musicianship. Students grow as listeners and develop skills in memorization as they learn many songs. Assessment is reflected through the weekly Morning Sings where children demonstrate their abilities to sing in tune, memorize new material, and demonstrate proficiency in creating complex rhythms either vocally or on instruments. Music teacher will also utilize DYO assessment documentation sheets to record student progress. Children will develop proficiency in reading rhythmic and musical notation. Build vocabulary through learning and exploring lyrics of songs. Children learn about diverse cultures and histories. Children will perform at weekly Monday Morning Sing and at The AmPark Arts Festival in the spring. Weekly Sings reflect the growth and progress in musicianship of all children across grades. Principal observations and Music teachers' use of DYO documentation will also reflect growth and progress over time.</p> |

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACT 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 | NA | NA | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| 1 | 8 | 8 | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| 2 | 13 | 13 | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| 3 | 13 | 13 | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | |

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

| Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS) | Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.). |
|--|--|
| ELA: | <p>Tier II AIS provided through mandated extended day, three times a week for 50 minutes. Students identified as “at risk” are given support in small groups and one-on-one tutoring. Teachers utilize data provided by DRA2 and DYO assessments to provide individualized instruction in specific reading/writing strategies and skills including the mechanics of reading/writing, reading comprehension and genre specific writing at grade appropriate levels.</p> <p>Tier I differentiated instruction is implemented in the classroom at reading and writing times as well as through homework activities.</p> |
| Mathematics: | <p>As above, students are provided Tier II support through extended day classes. Tier I and Tier II individualized instruction is driven by TERC math assessment in Grades K-2 as well as DYO established rubrics for the 3rd Grade. Assessments provide data which support teachers in identifying skill needs in numeration, problem solving, data collection and analysis et.al.</p> <p>Instructional needs will be differentiated in classroom and in homework.</p> |
| Science: | |
| Social Studies: | |
| At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor: | |
| At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist: | |
| At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker: | |
| At-risk Health-related Services: | |

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP)

**Language Allocation Policy
AmPark Neighborhood School
X10344**

LAP Team Members

The LAP Team Members at AmPark Neighborhood School are: Betty Lopez-Towey, Principal, Mandy Ehrlich Testing Coordinator, Kathleen Collins ESL Teacher, and Francesca Weiss, Literacy Coach.

ESL Certifications

There is one teacher with ESL Certification, Kathleen Collins – her paperwork and certification are on file with the Board Of Education.

ELL Demographics

In the 2008/09 academic year, AmPark Neighborhood School is a 2nd year Public School with grades K-3. We have just added our third grade.

As of the end of the 07/08 academic year our school demographics were:

- 43% Hispanic
- 24% Caucasian
- 19% African American
- 13% Asian
- 1% Other

As of April 27, 2009 the total number of ELL Students and the languages that they speak are:

| | # of students | Language spoken | ELL Level |
|---|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| K | 0 | | |
| 1 | 1 | Albanian | B |
| 3 | 3 | Spanish | B(2) I (1) |

Parent Program Choice

At the beginning of each academic year parents are provided with an Entitlement Letter, in both English and in the family's Native Language, informing them that their child has qualified for ESL based on their NYSESLAT scores. Notification Letters are distributed to families whose children did not pass the LAB-R test. AmPark offers parents an informational session at the beginning of each academic year, or as needed for new admits who qualify for ESL, on the different types of ESL programs offered by the New York City Department of Education. We utilize the EPIC kits to facilitate these sessions. Parents are made aware that AmPark has always offered a free standing ESL program. All four of our returning ELL parents understand and accept that this is the type of program that is offered at our school. Should a student new to the DOE arrive at AmPark a certified pedagogue works with the family to complete the Home Language Survey. If it is determined that a student has a home language other than English, within ten days of enrollment, the LAB-R is administered in order to determine ELL Eligibility

Assessment Analysis

Part A

The NYSESLAT results which indicate by grade the number of students scoring at the Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced Proficiencies Levels are:

| | B | I | A |
|---|---|---|---|
| K | | | |
| 1 | 1 | | |
| 2 | 0 | | |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | |

The patterns in the students' results in the four modalities across proficiency levels indicate that our students have a higher speaking and listening ability than reading and writing.

We have found that there is a direct correlation between children's level of literacy and language use in their home language and their language abilities in English. Every classroom at AmPark is language and print rich. Children are encouraged to listen and speak as active participants in full class Meeting times. Children will conference with teachers weekly around their written work and are supported in writing in a number of genres in all curricula areas. Instruction targeting phonemic skills is embedded in the work of the classroom which supports children's understanding and development as readers and writers. Word work and studies in diverse subject areas help build vocabulary and develop language acquisition skills.

| | DRA 2 gr. level | TERC Math |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| ELLS 3 rd gr | 2.8 | 70.0% |
| Non ELLS 3 rd gr | 4.3 | 82.8% |

This is the first year that AmPark students have taken the State mandated ELA and Math tests; at this time the scores for the tests have not been released. The data that we have collected is based on the on-going quantitative assessments (DRA2 and TERC mathematics assessments) that we administer as a part of our DY0 assessments.

DRAFT – MAY 12, 2008

Planning for ELLS

The ESL support teacher is the only ESL program at our school, given that there are five classrooms. This program consists of both pull-out and push-in model, depending on the subject area and student needs. Both models are conducted in English. All of our ELL students are given 360 minutes of ESL instruction. The planning of the hours and location of the ESL program are a product of collaboration between the classroom teacher and the ESL support teacher. Teachers meet every two weeks for cohort meetings. The program is designed to fully comply with ELL-mandates and this is supervised by the school principal. The classroom and ESL support teacher both conduct initial and periodic assessments in order to track student progress and inform instructional strategies and planning. All of our assessments allow for targeted differentiated instruction in all curricular areas. Our ELL's language needs are consistently addressed and documented. At this time two of our ELLs have special needs and IEP's are pending.

ELL students fully participate in all of the school's literacy and math programs and receive additional support, scaffolding, and differentiated instruction, so that they are able to participate successfully. The school uses the TERC math program. Teachers receive weekly support in and out of the classroom from a math coach. This program emphasizes project based learning through investigations and encourages students to learn and be connected to their work through thoughtful explorations, while adhering to NYS academic standards. Our school follows the balanced literacy model and this is supported by a full time literacy coach. This program offers students a variety of learning experiences in literacy through different contexts, such as: read aloud, shared/modeled writing, word work, shared reading, guided reading, literacy center, and independent reading and writing. Students also participate in programs that teach the arts and science through out of classroom teachers and supplemental programs. Students are actively engaged in studio art, music (choral and instrumental), architecture, theater, physical education and environmental science. The school provides supplemental programs for ELL students through AIS services and extended day. All mandated ELL test accommodations were adhered to.

Resources and Support

Professional Development will be provided to our teachers in house by our learning specialist and Literacy and Math Coach. Given the small number of ELL's and because of severe budget cuts, we feel we are better able to provide PD with our own expert staff until such time as budgetary issues for our schools are alleviated. The ESL teacher collaborates with all teachers, both classroom and support staff, in offering suggestions for effective ELL instruction. Our commitment to and growing expertise in authentic assessment practices has allowed us to more clearly identify students' individual needs. We are providing Professional development that will support teachers in understanding and provisioning for the needs of ELL students alongside their classmates.

Part B: CR Part 154 (A-6) Bilingual/ESL Program Description

Type of Program: ___ Bilingual X ESL ___ Both **Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2006-07: 5**

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

All families are given the language survey prior to entering our school, X344. The school receives these surveys during a Meet-and-Greet and this takes place on the Saturday before school starts, so that the parents and teachers can get to know each other and become familiar with the school's educational mission. If a parent needs assistance filling out the language survey teachers will assist and translate when necessary. These surveys are looked at prior to the students entering the school and students are identified as needing LAB-R, and a schedule is made to expedite testing.

The ESL teacher tested approximately 15 students and only 5 students qualified for ESL services. The ESL teachers support services is the only ESL program at our school, given that there are four classrooms. This program consists of both pull-out and push-in model, depending on the subject area and student needs. The push-in model is conducted in English and the pull-out services are conducted in both English and Spanish. The planning of the hours and location of the ESL program are a product of collaboration between the classroom teacher and the ESL support teacher. The program is designed to fully comply with ELL-mandates and this is supervised by the school principal and ESL teacher. The classroom and ESL teacher both conduct initial and periodic assessments in order to track student progress and inform instructional strategies and planning.

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

ELL students full participate in all of the school's literacy and math programs and receive additional support, scaffolding, and differentiated instruction, so that they are able to participate successfully. The school uses the TURC math program. Teachers receive weekly support in and out of the classroom from a math coach. This program emphasizes project based learning through investigations and encourages students to learn and be connected to their work through thoughtful explorations, while adhering to NYS academic standards. Our school follows the balanced literacy model and this is supported by a full time literacy coach. This program offers students a variety of learning experiences in literacy through different contexts, such as: read a-louds, shared/modeled writing, word work, shared reading, guided reading, literacy center, and independent reading and writing. Students also participate in programs that teach the arts and science through out of classroom teachers and supplemental programs. Students are actively engaged in studio art, music (choral and instrumental), architecture, theater, physical education and environmental science. The school provides supplemental programs for ELL students through AIS services and extended day.

B. Extracurricular: Briefly describe extracurricular activities available in your school, and the extent to which ELLs participate. Such programs may include art, music, sports, clubs, etc.

Our school provides after school extracurricular activities through the OASIS program. This program has professionals in theater, art, conflict management, physical education, and math and literacy support for students. The curriculum of the school supports these content areas

on a daily or weekly basis during the normal school day. ELL students fully participate in all extracurricular activities and these programs help support the academic work that is done both in and out of the classroom.

II. Parent/community: Describe parent/community involvement activities planned to meaningfully involve parents in their children's education and to inform them about the state standards and assessments. Activities might include parent orientations, homework help, leadership development, ESL and/or math/literacy.

Our school holds parent literacy, math and art nights. The school community (teachers and families) comes together to discuss all of these content areas. The teachers inform parents on the pedagogical practices that take place in the classroom, so that they are able to understand and extend these practices in the home. Parents, children, and teachers all work together during this process. Our school also has family Saturday programs, field trips, and in school gatherings that all encourage community. Parents and families are encouraged to come to the school to participate in their children's education on a weekly basis.

III. Staff Development (2007-2008 activities—tentative dates and ELL-related topics): Describe how staff will participate in ongoing, long-term staff development with a strong emphasis on the State learning standards and high impact differentiated and academic language development strategies.

The entire staff attends Monday and Wednesday staff developments, for a total of three hours a week.

Teachers are also afforded many other professional development opportunities through out the year. This time is spent enforcing pedagogical practices for teachers and focusing on children through the descriptive review process. The needs of ELL students are addressed during these meetings and discussing our held on how to adapt and differentiate instruction to meet these students unique educational needs.

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

LEP students are supported by the paraprofessionals and out of classroom teachers on a daily basis, in addition to AIS, ESL, and extended day programs.

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

This is not applicable to our school because we do not have bilingual programs.

Number of Teachers and Support Personnel for 2006-07

School Building: X344 AmPark Neighborhood School **District** 10

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

| School Building | Number of Teachers 2008-2009 | | | | Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals*** | | Sub- Total |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|------------------|
| | Appropriately Certified* | | Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers** | | Bilingual Program | ESL Program | |
| Building Name | Bilingual Program | ESL Program | Bilingual Program | ESL Program | Bilingual Program | ESL Program | |
| | | | | | | | |
| AmPark 10X344 | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | | | | | | Grand Total 1 |

* The number of teachers reported must represent the number of teachers holding an appropriate license for the subject area being taught (i.e., language arts and content area.)

Note: The Office of Bilingual Education and Foreign Language Studies will conduct a random review of the 2006-2007 teacher reported data. Districts randomly selected will be asked to electronically submit to the Department, the name of the teacher(s), social security number and type of license or certificate issued by the NYSED.

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

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

Include schedules for three different students 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 NYSESLAT/LAB-R). The schedules must reflect ESL, Native Language Art and content area instruction through use of both languages. Use attached Bilingual Schedule Template.

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL

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

School District: AmPark Neighborhood School School Building: X344

| Period | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
|----------|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | Subject (Specify) Whole School Sing | Subject (Specify) Literacy Book Clubs | Subject (Specify) Literacy Book Clubs | Subject (Specify) Literacy Book Clubs | Subject (Specify) All School Sing |
| 2 | Subject (Specify) Math ESL | Subject (Specify) Math ESL | Subject (Specify) Math ESL | Subject (Specify) Math | Subject (Specify) Literacy Book Clubs ESL |
| 3 | Subject (Specify) Art | Subject (Specify) Writing | Subject (Specify) Literacy | Subject (Specify) Music | Subject (Specify) Music |
| 4 | Subject (Specify) Literacy Book Clubs | Subject (Specify) Literacy: Writing | Subject (Specify) Art | Subject (Specify) Writing | Subject (Specify) Math |
| 5 | Subject (Specify) Lunch/ Recess | Subject (Specify) Lunch/ Recess | Subject (Specify) Lunch/ Recess | Subject (Specify) Lunch/ Recess | Subject (Specify) Lunch/ Recess |
| 6 | Subject (Specify) Read Aloud Response ESL | Subject (Specify) Read Aloud Salvadori | Subject (Specify) Read Aloud Response | Subject (Specify) Read Aloud Buddy/K | Subject (Specify) Read Aloud Response ESL |
| 7 | Subject (Specify) Work Choice | Subject (Specify) Read Aloud Buddy/K | Subject (Specify) Work Choice | Subject (Specify) Work Choice | Subject (Specify) Work Choice |
| 8 | Subject (Specify) Extended Day (AIS) | Subject (Specify) Extended Day (AIS) | Subject (Specify) Extended Day (AIS) | Subject (Specify) Extended Day (AIS) | Subject (Specify) Extended Day (AIS) |

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.

AmPark uses the information about Parent Preferred Language provided in the Home Language Survey and on the Blue Cards to determine the school's written and oral translation needs.

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.

Summarize the major findings of your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs. Describe how the findings were reported to the school community. AmPark has 9 languages represented in our school; none of our families have stated a language other than English as a preference on the Blue Cards. AmPark reported this information at to our staff at our staff meetings, to our SLT, and to the parent constituency through our PTSA.

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.

AmPark employs a school aide that provides written translation in Spanish for the families who have requested it. If there are parents who request that written communication with the school be in a language other than Spanish, Ampark will work with the Translation and Interpretation Unit in our Region in order to meet our families' needs.

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.

AmPark employs a school aide who provides oral translation in Spanish for the families who have requested it. If there are parents who request that oral communication with the school be in a language other than Spanish, Ampark will work with the Translation and Interpretation Unit in our Region in order to meet our families' needs.

3. 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>.

In order to fulfill Parental Notification Requirements (A-663 Sect.VII) AmPark provides families whose language of preference is other than English a copy The Bill of Parent Rights and Responsibilities in their language of preference. All parent letters and notifications are also translated this includes copies of our School Safety Plan. These notices are sent home and posted on our Parent Bulletin board in the front entrance of our school. Spanish interpretation is provided for all family meetings if needed.

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

3. 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.
4. Summarize the major findings of your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs. Describe how the findings were reported to the school community.

Part B: Strategies and Activities

4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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>.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

1. Enter the anticipated Title I allocation for the school for 2008-2009_____
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program_____
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified_____
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year_____
5. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2007-2008 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year.

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

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

Explanation: In support of strengthening student academic achievement, each school that receives Title I, Part A funds must develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents of participating children a written parental involvement policy that contains information required by section 1118(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The policy establishes the school’s expectations for parental involvement and describes how the school will implement a number of specific parental involvement activities. It is **strongly recommended** that schools, in consultation with parents, use a sample template as a framework for the information to be included in their parental involvement policy. The template is available in the eight major languages on the NYCDOE website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Parents/NewsInformation/TitleIPIG.htm>. 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.

DRAFT – MAY 12, 2008

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 at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Parents/NewsInformation/TitleIPIG.htm> as a framework for the information to be included in the compact. Schools and parents, in consultation with students, are encouraged to include other relevant and agreed upon activities and actions as well that will support effective parental involvement and strengthen student academic achievement. The school-parent compact must be provided and disseminated in the major languages spoken by the majority of parents in the school. For additional information, please refer to the 2008-09 Title I Parent Involvement Guidelines available at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
2. Schoolwide 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 Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
 - o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
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.
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.
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.
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.

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.

DRAFT – MAY 12, 2008

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

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

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

NCLB/SED Status: _____ **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 Data Profile, downloadable from the NYCDOE website at <http://www.schools.nyc.gov>), describe the school's findings of the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified.
2. Describe the focused intervention(s) the school will implement to support improved achievement in the grade and subject areas for which the school was identified. Be sure to include strategies to address the needs of all disaggregated groups that failed to meet the AMO, Safe Harbor, and/or 95% participation rate requirement. Note: If this question was already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

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

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified.
 - (a) Provide the following information: 2008-09 anticipated Title I allocation = \$_____ ; 10% of Title I allocation = \$_____.
 - (b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement.
2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school's strategy for providing high-quality professional development.
3. Describe how the school will notify parents about the school's identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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 |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

**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

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.

learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.

– **English Language Learners**

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

Meetings with teachers

Meetings with Cabinet

Meetings with Support network Team

Meetings with Literacy Coach

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? **We are attempting to align what is taught in every classroom to the NY State Standards. In addition, we are attempting to address skill needs as indicated in the New York City Scope and Sequence. Placing both documents and expectations alongside each other better informs teachers' practices in supporting instruction of content and skills. Teachers have access to leveled books and other appropriate materials for Grades K-3.**

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.

We have not yet determined if this finding is applicable as we are still in the process of examining all strands. We have a very small ELL population but as this population increases as the school grows, we will continue to educate staff as well as incorporate ELL standards.

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.

Meetings with teachers

Meetings with Cabinet

Meetings with Math Coach

Meetings with Network Support team

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Our school is using the TERC Math Program to provide substantive instruction. TERC Investigations is an open-ended process assessment.

Embedded in the curriculum are at least 3 assessments per unit for 9 units.

DYO assessment tool further supports teacher understanding of how standards are aligned with process strands and how process strands are aligned with content strands.

Our problem solving rubrics address:

Understanding

Strategies

Communication

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

DRAFT – MAY 12, 2008

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.

Meetings with Literacy Coach

Formal/informal teacher conversations

Peer/principal observations

Staff meetings

Walk-throughs

Room shares

ELA Professional Development

Cohort meetings

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?

Teachers know and understand when they are employed that this is a project/materials based model of education. Principal/Peer observations indicate that teachers are engaging children in materials based/experiential learning. Teachers provision for student needs through differentiation of instruction and materials in flexibly grouped work times.

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (SOM³) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in

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.

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.

Formal/informal teacher conversations

Peer/principal observations

Staff meetings

Walk-throughs

Room shares

Math Professional Development

Cohort meetings

Meetings with Math Coach

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Teachers know and understand when they are employed that this is a project/materials based model of education. Teacher observations indicate that teachers are engaging children in materials based/experiential learning. At the same time, direct instruction and teacher modeling drives and supports project based/experiential work for all students.

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

Compared organization sheet from 07-08.

DRAFT – MAY 12, 2008

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

We are a second year school and are still growing. New teachers added to our staff are as a result of continuous growth of our school community not due to a lack of stability.

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.

Meetings with cabinet

Meeting with ELL Compliance and Performance Officer of ISC (Discussions with Compliance Officer to address strategies)

Meetings with Literacy Coach/Learning Specialists

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?

We do not have an ESL teacher due to our small population. General Ed. Teachers do not have a thorough understanding of the Learning standards and strategies for ELL's.

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.

In an effort to secure an ESL provider, we will attempt to collaborate with area schools

We will also:

Engage with our Network Support Team

Engage with our ISC ELL Compliance and Performance Officer

Provide ESL certification (Q-Tel) to AmPark Literacy Coach

ESL workshop for one other AmPark Staff member regarding classroom learning strategies.

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.

Meetings with:

Cabinet

Cohort groups

Formal and Informal conversations

ELL service provider

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?

Scores are shared with teachers. Teachers have intimate knowledge of the progress of children through periodic assessment (DRA2), running records, classroom observations, as well as through the descriptive model that defines our school (DYO, description of individual pieces of student work.) All of the above evidence is reflected in school tri-annual reports.

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.

DRAFT – MAY 12, 2008

Teachers attending workshops and training will provide in-house P.D. to full staff (including arts teachers) on how to read, define and utilize data generated by NYSESLAT and LAB-R tests.

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. Team meetings to address student needs with:

Cabinet

Cohort groups

SPED teacher

Coaches

Families

Arts Teachers

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Scores are shared with teachers. Teachers have intimate knowledge of the progress of children through periodic assessment (DRA2), running records, classroom observations, as well as through the descriptive model that defines our school (DYO, description of individual pieces of student work.) All of the above evidence is reflected in school tri-annual reports.

We have also implemented the following:

Differentiation of Instruction in classroom

Differentiation of materials

Differentiation of Homework

Flexible grouping

Teachers in possession of IEP's for SPED children

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

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

We have reviewed IEP's and have determined that goals are not always aligned with students present levels of performance.

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.

Will review IEP's with current SPED teacher to determine discrepancies which will be addressed at next review/conference for each student.

SPED teacher will align goals to skill needs.

Classroom teachers will be included in reviews of IEP's and will have input as to present student performance levels as well as skill needs for each student.

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 23, 2008** Email address: **ELopezT@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 | 10X344 |
| School Name | AmPark Neighborhood School |
| Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy | \$ 12,281 |
| Principal Name | Betty Lopez Towey |
| Principal Email | elopezt@schools.nyc.gov |
| Principal Phone | 7185483451 |

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

- Yes
 No

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

Creation of additional classrooms \$ 0
 Reducing teacher-student ratio through team teaching strategies \$ 0

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to reduce class size via the creation of additional classrooms?

- Yes
- No

What grade(s), subject(s), and/or special populations are being targeted using C4E resources in school year 2008-09? How many new classrooms/class sections will be created for school year 2008-09?

* If you plan to use C4E funds to target more than one grade, please fill out one row per grade.

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 25 - 1 -24
 C4E Target #2: 8 - Math - Students with Disabilities - 26 - 1 -25

* If you plan to target more than one special population in a single grade, please fill out a separate row for each subgroup.

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 25 - 1 -24
 C4E Target #2: 6 - ELA- Students with Disabilities - 25 - 1 -24

* If you plan to target more than one subject area in a single grade, please fill out a separate row for each subject area.

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 25 - 1 -24
 C4E Target #2: 6 - Math - ELLs - 25 - 1 -24

| | Targeted Grade | Targeted Subject | Targeted Population | Average Class Size 2007-08 | # New Classrooms / New Sections | Projected Average Class Size 2008-09 |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| C4E Target #1 | 2 | All (ES only) | Students with Low Academic Achievement | 18.0 | 1 | 18 |
| C4E Target #2 | 2 | All (ES only) | Students with Low Academic Achievement | 18.0 | 1 | 18 |
| C4E Target #3 | 2 | All (ES only) | Students with Low Academic Achievement | 18.0 | 1 | 18 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---------------|--|------|---|----|
| C4E Target #4 | 2 | All (ES only) | Students with Low Academic Achievement | 18.0 | 1 | 18 |
| C4E Target #5 | 2 | All (ES only) | Students with Low Academic Achievement | 18.0 | 1 | 18 |
| C4E Target #6 | 2 | All (ES only) | Students with Low Academic Achievement | 18.0 | 1 | 18 |

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to reduce class size by reducing teacher-student ratios in existing classrooms (e.g., team teaching models, creation of additional CTT classes, etc.)?

- Yes
- No

What grade(s), subject(s), and/or special populations are being targeted using C4E resources in school year 2008-09? How many existing classrooms will be targeted for school year 2008-09?

* If you plan to use C4E funds to target more than one grade, please fill out one row per grade.

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14
 C4E Target #2: 8 - Math - Students with Disabilities - 18 - 1 - 17

* If you plan to target more than one special population in a single grade, please fill out a separate row for each subgroup.

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14
 C4E Target #2: 6 - ELA- Students with Disabilities - 16 - 1 -14

* If you plan to target more than one subject area in a single grade, please fill out a separate row for each subject area.

For example:

C4E Target #1: 6 - ELA - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14
 C4E Target #2: 6 - Math - ELLs - 16 - 1 -14

| | Targeted Grade | Targeted Subject | Targeted Population | Students per Teacher 2007-08 | # Classrooms / Sections Targeted | Projected Students per Teacher 2008-09 |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| C4E Target #1 | 2 | All (ES only) | | | | |
| C4E Target #2 | 2 | All (ES only) | | | | |
| C4E Target #3 | 2 | All (ES only) | | | | |
| C4E Target #4 | 2 | All (ES only) | | | | |

| | | |
|---------------|---|---------------|
| C4E Target #5 | 2 | All (ES only) |
| C4E Target #6 | 2 | All (ES only) |

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 | \$ 0 |
| Summer School Programs | \$ 0 |
| Dedicated Instructional Time | \$ 12,281 |
| Individualized Tutoring | \$ 0 |

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

asdfgh

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.

wertyui

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

Please describe the program.

qwertyu

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

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

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

- New implementation

Program Expansion

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

Yes

No

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

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

Professional mentoring for beginning teachers and principals \$ 0

Instructional coaches for teachers \$ 0

School leadership coaches for principals \$ 0

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

Please describe the program.

wertyu

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.

qwerty

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

Yes

No

Please describe the program.

qwerty

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.

qwerty

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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