



**EMMA LAZARUS SCHOOL
PUBLIC SCHOOL 268**

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

**SCHOOL: DISTRICT-18/ BROOKLYN/ 18K268
ADDRESS: 133 EAST 53RD STREET BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11203
TELEPHONE: 718-773-5332
FAX: 718-493-7448**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 268 **SCHOOL NAME:** Emma Lazarus School

DISTRICT: 18 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** Empowerment/ network 16

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 133 East 53rd Street Brooklyn New York 11203

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-773-5332 **FAX:** 718-493-7448

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Ms. Moszetta F. Overby **EMAIL ADDRESS:** moverby@school
s.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON

Ms. Judy Lorde

PRINCIPAL

Ms. Moszetta Overby

UFT CHAPTER LEADER

Ms. Judy Lorde

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT**

Mr. Roger Francis

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools)

NA

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT**

Ms. Beverly Wilkins

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position/Constituency Represented	Signature
Ms. Mosezetta F. Overby	*Principal or Designee	
Ms. Judy Lorde	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Mr. Roger Francis	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Ms. Rose J. LaFrance	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
NA	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
NA	Student Representative, if applicable	
Ms. Avril Brown	Parent	
Ms. Ronda Johnson	Parent	
Mr. Kieren McFarlane	Parent	
Ms. Pamela Anderson	Teacher	
Mrs. Alexander Frank	Teacher	
Ms. Elizabeth Larson	Teacher	

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

The Emma Lazarus School (P.S. 268) is located at 133 East 53rd Street in the East Flatbush Section of Brooklyn, New York. Emma Lazarus is an elementary school with 624 students from pre-kindergarten through Grade 5. The school population is comprised of 94.88% Black, 4.09% Hispanic and 0.34% White. The student body includes 3.8% English Language Learners and 27% Special Education students. The average attendance rate for the school year 2006-2007 was 93.26%. The school is in receipt of Title 1 funding with 91% eligibility.

Emma Lazarus School is a safe student centered community where students and parents rightly acknowledge that learning is the priority.

Vision:

We envision P.S. 268 – Emma Lazarus Elementary School as a global learning environment that nurtures learners of all ages, promotes literacy, mathematics, life, and communication skills which will produce responsible and respectful citizens.

Mission:

The mission of P.S. 268 is to create a school culture that fosters student's success in academic and personal growth... that promotes a community of problem solvers and creative reflective thinkers.

For the school year 2008-2009 the schools focus is "Differentiating Instruction by Utilizing Data." The school theme is "Failure is Not an Option."

This school is well developed according to the New York City Department of Education Quality Review Report, June 9-10, 2008 (Lead Reviewer: Ada L. Orlando). The school has been successful in using a highly sophisticated management system to track all students' progress and performance in the content areas and across all grades. Each teacher has a computerized data spreadsheet which is updated monthly, tracking student's academic performance in the content areas. Additionally, it provides teachers with valuable student information concerning attendance, support services, and social history.

Align Instructional Strategy to Goals: The school aligns its academic work, strategic decisions and resources, and effectively engages students around its plans and goals for accelerating student learning. The core curriculum programs in English Language Arts (E.L.A), Math, Science, and Social Studies are aligned with the City and State Standards. The preliminary analysis of the E.L.A. data has demonstrated an overall 10% increases when compared to last year's data. The school provides a Visual Arts Program that enhances learning in the Arts in all grades.

Academic Support for At-Risk Students: A.I.S. providers, coaches and assistant principals provide adequate support in helping students to meet their academic goals. Excellent quality intervention programs are provided for at-risk students during the school day, after school and Saturday which have a positive impact on student achievement according the school's data sheets.

Core Curriculum Programs: At P.S. 268, Storytown (Harcourt Brace) has been implemented in Grades K-4. Making Meaning and S.T.A.R.S. has been incorporated in Grade 5. Everyday Mathematics (Chicago...) and Science (Harcourt Brace) is taught in Grades K-5.

SECTION III – Cont’d

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT				
School Name:				
District:		DBN #:		School BEDS Code #:

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input 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	35	28	26		93%	93%	93%		
Kindergarten	84	92	71						
Grade 1	92	112	111						
Grade 2	103	91	104	Student Mobility: (% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	107	102	95						
Grade 4	121	104	106						
Grade 5	121	125	107	Eligible for Free Lunch:					
Grade 6	0	0	0	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7	0	0	0		78.6	78.6	78.6		
Grade 8	0	0	0						
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing:					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11	0	0	0		7	7	7		
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded Elementary	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants:					
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0	(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	663	662	TBD		7	4	5		
Special Education Enrollment:					Suspensions:				
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	42	26	36						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	4	4	Principal Suspensions	3	6	8		
Number all others	0	0	0	Superintendent Suspensions	9	24	25		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
				Special High School Programs:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants	TBD	TBD	TBD
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	TBD	TBD	TBD
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	23	26	24	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	0	0	0	(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	46	44	47
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	14	7	13
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	5	8	12
	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	97.1	90.9	88.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.	0.5	0.0	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	97.0	94.0	97.0
Black or African American	96.5	96.0	96.1	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	82.0	80.0	85.0
Hispanic or Latino	2.0	30	3 0				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.0	0.0	0.0	Percent Masters Degree or higher	94.0	91.0	96.0
White	0	0	0	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	94.0	91.0	96.0
Multi-racial							
Male	53.5	54.4	56.1				
Female	46.5	45.6	43.9				

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

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Individual Subject/Area Ratings	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA:			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	0	0	0			
Black or African American	√	√	√			
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	√			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0			
White	0	0	0			
Multiracial	√	√	√			
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	√	√	√			
Limited English Proficient	√	√	√			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	6	6	6	0	0	0

Key: AYP Status

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

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

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08	
Overall Letter Grade	B	Overall Evaluation:	B
Overall Score	52.5%	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Well Developed
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	8.3%	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Well Developed
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	14.1%	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well Developed
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	28.6%	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Well Developed
Additional Credit	TBD	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Well Developed

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

What student performance trends can you identify?

English Language Arts (E.L.A) Yearly Comparisons for the years 2006-2008

Grades 3-5 Levels 3 & 4

Grade 3 recorded 13.4% growth moving from 53.0% to 63.4%.

Grade 4 recorded 2.6% growth moving from 58.6% to 60.2%.

Grade 5 recorded 10.2% growth moving from 45.8% to 61.4%.

Grades 3-5 Level 1

Grade 3 - 8.5% growth moving from 16.0%

Grade 4 - 9.6% decline moving from 7.8%

Grade 5 - 2.0% growth moving from 14.4%

Contributions to Student Academic Growth Grades 3-5

- Reduction in class sizes (teacher- pupil ratio)
- Emphasis on Kaplan, Making Meaning, STARS (ELA Programs)
- Refocus on Student Writing (2000 words per month)
- Small Group Instruction (PUSH-IN, EXTENDED DAY)
- D.E.A.R (Drop Everything and Read for 10 minutes daily)
- Book Of The Month
- One-on -One Tutoring (Classroom Teachers, Inquiry Team)
- After- School/ Saturday Tutorial Sessions
- All teachers having at least 2 years teaching experience
- Differentiated Instruction school wide
- Introduction of Data Sheets School wide

What have been the greatest accomplishments over the last couple of years?

- Move from school in Need of Improvement in the year of 2001 (Mathematics) to proficiency

- Met Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements for the last 3 consecutive years
- Met requirements for School Wide Program (SWP)
- Improved attendance among teaching staff (positive impact on scores)
- Approximately 1% teaching staff having less than 2 years experience (positive impact on E.L.A scores)
- Outstanding Science scores for the last 3 consecutive years
- School involvement in Project Arts for the last 3 consecutive years
- Introduction of the school's Data Sheet school wide (positive impact on E.L.A. scores)
- Introduction of Storytown Program (Harcourt-Brace) to address literacy needs (Grades K-4)
- Excellent Social Studies scores for the last 3 consecutive years due to Saturday School Tutorial Program, Updated materials, and Professional Development

What are the most significant aids or barriers to the school's continuous improvement?

- Shifting immigrant population
- Extended absences (parent holidays, immigration issues)
- Student lateness
- Behavior
- Lack of significant Parental Involvement
- This years ELL professional development was given one week before the social studies state test. Therefore, there was not enough time to work with the students or to turn-key the information to the staff in preparation for the test.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

P.S. 268 is affected by the District 18 label as a District In Need of Improvement (DINI). Therefore, the school has decided to embark on a rigorous program to raise student's scores school wide. The following initiatives have been collaboratively identified by the School Leadership Team, Principal and Administrators, Math and Literacy Coaches, Inquiry Team Specialists, teachers and parents to improve students' performances on mandated New York State Tests (NYST).

- ***English Language Arts (ELA)***
 - o Approximately 65% of the student population will achieve level 3 or 4 on the New York State (NYS) ELA Assessment in January, 2009 (Grades 3-5).
 - o Approximately 65% of the student population will achieve level 2 or 3 on the New York City (NYC) ELA Assessments (ELCAS 2 and EPAL in Spring 2009) for Grades 2 and 3.
 - o Approximately 65% of the student population will achieve level 3 or 4 on the NYS Social Studies Test in November, 2008 for Grade 5.
 - o The English Language Arts coach will provide onsite assistance.
 - o (See Section VI, ELA, Action Plan for ELL/Special Education Students and All Students).
- **These are desired goals that have been determined by the following:**
 - ❖ This will be the second year of successful implementation of the Data Spread Sheets school wide.
 - ❖ The areas of weakness in the delivery of Balance Literacy have been addressed by the implementation of Story town (Harcourt Brace). Most teachers have embraced the program and commented favorably on its ability to bridge the literacy gaps that were previously identified school wide.
 - ❖ The Acuity Assessments were administered earlier this year. Earlier implementation this year means that teachers in grades 3-5 have a larger window of opportunity to address students' academic deficits.
- **English Language Learners (ELLs)**
 - o Approximately 65% of the ELL student population will achieve level 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA Assessment in January, 2009 (Grades 3-5).
 - o Approximately 65% of the ELL student population will achieve level 2 or 3 on the NYC ELA Assessments (ECLAS 2 and EPAL in Spring 2009) for Grades 2 and 3.
 - o Approximately 65% of the ELL student population will achieve level 3 or 4 on the NYS Social Studies Test in November, 2008 for Grade 5.

These are desired goals and have been determined by the following:

- ❖ The school emphasis this year is on Differentiated Instructions.
- ❖ A new thrust to meet the academic needs of ELL students during the Extended Day (Pilot Program – Grades 3-5).

(See Section VI, ELA, Action Plan for ELL/Special Education Students to note information for Pull-Out program (ELL teacher) and Extended Day (2 teachers) ELL program)

- **Special Needs**
 - Approximately 65% of the Special Needs student population will show significant growth towards their individual IEP goals as demonstrated on the NYS ELA assessment in January, 2009 (Grades 3-5)
 - Approximately 65% of the Special Needs student population will show significant growth towards their individual IEP goals as demonstrated on the NYC ELA assessments (ECLAS 2 and EPAL in Spring 2009) for Grades 2 and 3.
 - Approximately 65% of the Special Needs student population will show significant growth towards their individual IEP goals as demonstrated on the NYS Social Studies Test in November, 2008 for Grade 5.

This is a desired goal for 2008-2009.

(See Section VI, ELA, Action Plan for ELL/Special Education Students to note information for Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) inclusive classrooms and the Inquiry Team One-on-One Tutoring Programs.

- **Mathematics**
 - Approximately 80% of the student population (including ELL students and students with Special Needs) will achieve level 3 or 4 on the NYS Mathematics Assessment in March, 2009 (Grades 3-5).
 - An emphasis will be placed on Differentiated Instruction to better reach the ELL students and students with Special Needs, as well as, the General Education student population.
 - The Mathematics coach will provide onsite assistance.

This is an expected goal and was determined by the satisfactory past performance of students on previous NYS Mathematics tests.

Special Note: All classroom teachers identified 6 children who will be targeted to achieve successful academic growth.

- **Behavior Modification**
 - As a result of the number of incidents reported in the 2007/2008 school year, P.S. 268 has been identified as a Potentially Persistently Dangerous School (PPDS). Therefore there is a need to reduce this number by 50%. To achieve this goal, P.S. 268 identified classes and targeted the five classes in the most need of assistance with an on-site Leadership Program.

This is a desired goal for the school year 2008-2009. In order for this program to be successful all personnel involved should be 100% committed.

The lunchroom schedule has been rearranged for the 2008/2009 school year to have multi-aged lunches to decrease incidents.

- An After-School Program for female students will continue to promote responsible school behavior (Girl Scouts of the USA). The program is run by parents and teachers. (Grades 2-5)
- An After-School Program for male students will begin to promote responsible school behavior (Martial Arts - Karate). The program is run by teachers (Grades 2-5).

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (E.L.A)

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>Approximately 65% student population will achieve Level 3 or Level 4 in the NYS E.L.A. Test in January, 2009 (Grade 3-5).</p> <p>Approximately 65% student population will achieve Level 2 or Level 3 in the NYC E.L.A Assessments (ECLAS2 and EPAL in Spring 2009) for Grades 2 and 3.</p> <p>Approximately 65% student population will achieve Levels 3 or 4 in the NYS Social Studies Test in November, 2008 (Grade 5).</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>ELL/ Special Ed. Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry Team will provide small group/one-one tutoring for identified ELL and Special Education students Grades 3-5. • ELLs will be provided with tutoring and enrichment services during Extended Day with a teacher who will be addressing needs assessment for this population as a project for her Performance Review. The teacher will be training another teacher to service the ELL Grade 3 population. • PULL-OUT Program for ELLs – the ELL teacher will continue to service this population using the ELL component for Storytown. • Grade 3 and 5 CTT inclusive classrooms with paired Special Education and General Education teachers – instruction in Balanced Literacy with modifications as needed. Storytown will be used with Grade 3 and Grad 5 will follow the program for that grade. <p>ALL STUDENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 3—4 will be instructed using Storytown, KAPLAN, STARS, Grade 5 – Making Meaning, STARS (Strategies to Achieve Reading Success), ORBIT

	<p>(Writing Program – Grades 3—5).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades K—4 Storytown (Balanced Literacy Program) • Writing Samples -- focus will be on Expository writing, the use of rubrics as an assessment tool, and the aligning of graphic organizers to writing samples. • Grade 4 will be the new grade to be introduced to Storytown this school year. • PUSH-IN E. L. A. Skill Concentration 25 minutes daily • D.E.A.R. (Drop Everything And Read) 10 minutes • Running Records, DRA (Diagnostic Reading Instruction) –Periodic/Monthly • Grade 5 – Social Studies Tutorials – Extended Day, After School Saturday Program, (September – November, 2008). • Grade 4 -- Social Studies Tutorial – Extended Day in June 2008
<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>Schedule : July, 2008, September, 2008—January, 2009 Professional Development for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storytown – Grades K—4 (July 2008) • Differentiated Instruction (November 4, 2008) • Tutorial Sessions -- After school –Grades 3—5 Acuity, STSRS, Orbit—Grade 2 Kidzlit • E.L.L. Program -- Grades 3—5, Extended Day • PUSH-IN Program – School-wide Skill focus per week/month/theme every other month for ELA. • E.L.A. Concentration on Skills and Writing as Test Prep for N.Y.S./E.L.A. Test (November – December, 2008). Coordinated by Literacy Coach. • After-School Program (Grades 3-5) Acuity Tests (November 2008—January, 2009). <p style="text-align: center;">Due to Budgetary Constraints, Grades K—1 Tutorial Sessions will be Eliminated.</p> <p>Grade 1 classes performed poorly (2007-2008), due to classroom management issues. The Principal in consultation with the SLT has decided to focus on Grade 2 for the school year 2008-2009. Thus Grade 2 has been identified as the Grade in Need of Improvement.</p> <p>Grade 2 students will receive After-school Tutoring in ELA using the New York Life</p>

	<p>After-School Program Kidzlit (November 2008—January 2009).</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Grades 3—5 Acuity Assessment (NYC Assessments), STARS Assesments, (weekly School's Data Sheets (Monthly) Grade k—4 Storytown Assessments -- (Weekly/By Theme/Beginning, Middle, End of Year). Grade 2-3 NYC Assessments – ECLAS 2 (Fall 2008 /Spring 2009)- EPAL (Spring 2009) Grade K-1 NYC Assessments – ECLAS 2</p>
<p>Goal Number 2 ELL Population</p>	<p>Approximately 65% of the ELL student population will achieve a level of 3 or 4 on the NYS/NYC test in January, 2009 (Grades 3-5). Approximately 65% of the ELL student population will achieve a level 2 or 3 on the NYC ELA assessment (EPAL and ECLASS 2 in Spring 2009 for Grades 2 and 3. Approximately 65% of the ELL student population will achieve a level 2, 3, Or 4 on the NYS Social Studies Test in November 2008 for Grade 5. <u>These are desired goals and have been determined by the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school emphasis this school year on differentiated instruction • A new thrust to meet the academic needs of ELL students during the Extended Day
<p>Action Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Push-In program with mandates ESL teacher (daily). • Extended day- Intensive test Prep with two (2) teachers (daily). • All ELL students instructed in Balance Literacy using the ELL component of the Storytown program (daily). • <u>Push-In Program-</u> This year the school's focus is <i>Differentiating Instruction by Utilizing Data</i>. It is expected that the differing needs of ELL will be addressed during these sessions (daily). • Professional Development Workshop- <u>Differentiating Instruction</u> November 4, 2008 • Parent Workshop for ELA Test Prep- This year, there was a redoubling of the effort to attract parents of ELL students to the annual ELA Workshop. Thus two (2) teachers were selected to provide translation services at the workshop on a per session basis. The Literacy Coach and the Data Specialist facilitated the Workshop. Their services were also secured on a per session

Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acuity Assessments- Fall 2008 • NYS ELA Test- January 2009 • NYC Assessments- ECLAS 2 and EPAL- Spring 2009 • NYS Social Studies Test- Fall 2008 • School Data Spread Sheets- Monthly • Inquiry Team Feedback- Monthly/ Quarterly • Learning Team/SLT and Staff Walkthroughs- Monthly • Mock Quality Review- Spring 2009 • Tracking of Acuity results grade by grade and making comparisons by data specialist- All Year • Feedback from PULL-OUT mandated WSL Teacher and two (2) other teachers piloting the Extended Day Program
Goal 3 Mathematics	<p>Approximately 75% of the school population (ELLs, students with Special Needs, and General Education students) will achieve Levels 3 or 4 on the NYS Mathematics Test in Winter 2009 (Grades 3-5). <u>This is an expected goal and was determined by the satisfactory past performance of students on previous NYS Mathematics test.</u></p>
Action Plan	<p>Due to severe Budget cuts, the school was unable to purchase the Supplementary text- Math Steps. It was decided by the Learning Team and the Math Coach that comprehension could be effected if an emphasis was placed on the Differentiated Strand of each math lesson.</p> <p>It was agreed that this was keeping with the theme for this school year which is Differentiated Instruction. The team also suggested that all teachers should implement the Differentiation Strand. This is the Math Focus for the year 2008-2009.</p>
Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NYS Math Test- Winter 2009 • Data Spreadsheets School wide- Monthly • Learning Team/SLT Walkthroughs • Acuity Math Assessments

Goal 4 Special Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 65% of all students with Special needs will reach their maximum academic, physical, social or emotional potential as is indicated by their individual IEPs. This is a desired goal for 2008-2009. • For ELA goals refer to Goal #1
Action Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two (2) CTT classes –Grade 3 and 5 (1 Special Needs and General Education teacher per class). • Workshop on Differentiated Instruction to meet the needs of Special Needs students in other General Education classes school wide – Fall 2008 • Three (3) Special Needs Classes Self Contained Grades K-1, 2/3, 3/4 • Dissemination of pertinent information to staff regarding Student IEPs during Faculty Conferences (monthly or as needed)
Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the objective evidence you will use throughout the year to evaluate your progress towards meeting your goal. • IEP Meetings • PPT Meetings • Meetings with CTT Teachers to obtain feedback
Goal 5 Behavior	<p>For the school year 2008-2009, P. S. 268 has been identified as a Potentially Persistent Dangerous School (PPDS) by the NYS OORS. Thus the administration and the staff of P.S. 268 have determined that by the Spring of 2009 there should be a 50% reduction in the number of incidences. This is a desired goal for the school year 2008-2009. In order for this program to be successful all personnel involved should be 100% committed.</p>
Action Plan	<p>Describe the plan for meeting the goal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Program – Identified Grade 3 • Guidance _ An f Status Guidance Counselor to work with lower grades • Lunchroom heterogeneous mixing of grades with the expectancy that the Upper Grade students will provide positive leadership to the younger grades. • Implementation of Class Commendation Cards – Classes eill be rewsarded for positivr behavior in the classrooms/lunchrooms/ auditorium, for Fire Drills and for 100% uniform. • Renewed emphasis on the PEACE BUILDERS' PLEDGE which will be recited

	<p>chorally at morning lineup each day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of data to track the number of incidences each month and to make comparisons (Pie Chart). The data will be shared with the staff each month at the Faculty Conference, It is expected that with staff notification of the number of incidences, and pertinent discussion on how to reduce the number in each class that there will be a collaborative response. • Social Clubs – This will be an After School Initiative according to Gener, Bous – • DOJO 268 Karate Grades 2-3 on Mondays from 3:00 –4:00 p.m. and Grades 4-5 on Fridays from 3:00 – 4:00 p.m. • Girls – Brownies—Grades 2-3; Girl Scouts—Grades 4—5 all on Wednesdays
Evidence	<p>Identify the objective evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings with karate, Brownies, and Girls Scout Leaders • Meetings with the Learning Team • Comparisons month by month of Data from Safety Incidences • Discussions at Monthly Safety Meetings • Evaluation of Commendation Cards/New Lunchroom Rotations/Effectiveness of F-Status Guidance Counselor • Feedback on Leadership Program as decided by their personnel

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K	28	28	N/A	N/A	15	10	4	3
1	32	32	N/A	N/A		10	0	0
2	54	54	N/A	N/A	10	0	1	0
3	68	2568		N/A	25	0	0	4
4	48	48	50	60	27	0	1	7
5	60	60	60	60	30	0	1	0
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

- 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:	During the school day at least thirty students will be serviced in grades one and two by one intervention teacher as a pull out program. At least twenty-five students from grades two, three, four, and five will be serviced in an after school program. At least eight students in grades two through five are serviced by a SETTS teacher. In grade three CTT at least five special education students and at least 14 general education students and in the grade five CTT class at least six special education students and at least eleven general education students. The ELL teacher provides service for at least twenty-six students in a pull our program. Level one and level two students In all classes from K-5 benefit from differentiated instructions small group. Extended day is provided for level one and level two students as identified by the classroom teachers. After school tutorial (Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday) will be provided for students in grades two through five for ELA. Saturday tutorial will be provided for identified students in the fall and spring. The literacy program is Storytown for grades K-4 and Making Meaning for grade five. The diagnostic components to be used STARS, Kaplan Foundations, Wilson, Orbit, ECLAS, EPAL, DRA etc.
Mathematics:	SAME STUDENTS WILL BE IDENTIFIED AS ABOVE with the same AIS teachers, SETTS, ELL, CTT grades three and five, as well as paraprofessionals. Programs can either be pull out/push in. The academic program to be used will be Everyday Mathematics (revised edition), Math Steps, Math coach, Measuring Up, Kaplan and Test Ready Plus. (Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday) will be provided for students in grades two through five for math during the winter months.
Science:	Science: Approximately seventy fourth grade at-risk students will be identified by classroom teachers for science tutorial. Instruction will be tailored to meet their needs by using Harcourt curriculum, mandated by the city. A two day science tutorial will be made available during spring break.
Social Studies:	Social Studies: Approximately seventy fifth grade at-risk students will be identified by classroom teachers for social studies tutorial. Instruction will be tailored to meet their needs by using a pacing calendar, the Barons book for Social Studies, Measuring up, NYS Learning Standards, NYS Social studies Coach and NYS Documents Base Questions. A Saturday tutorial program is

	being provided.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	At-risk general education, mandated and special needs students will be identified by the guidance counselor as per students IEP and teachers needs. Number of times to see special needs students is stipulated in IEP.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	At-risk general education, mandated students, and special needs students will be provided assistance by the school psychologist, as needed. Services will be provided during the school day.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	At-risk general education students, mandated students, and special needs students will be identified by the social worker according to students IEP, or teacher request. Services will be provided during the day on Wednesdays and Fridays.
At-risk Health-related Services:	Mandated students, special needs students, will be identified by their IEP, and serviced by the Nurse.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

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

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

- I. Instructional Program for ELLs (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc). Program planning and management description to include identification and placement of ESL/Bilingual certified teachers, utilization of appropriate instructional materials (English and other languages) and technology, school-based supervisory support, use of external organizations, compliance with ELL-related mandates, and use of data to improve instruction:
- A. Curricular: Briefly describe the school's literacy, mathematics and other content area programs and explain ELLs' participation in those programs. Briefly describe supplemental programs for ELLs (i.e., AIS, Saturday Academies).
There will be approximately 30 ELL students enrolled in General Education class from grades K – 5. They will receive instruction in English as a second language (ESL) from the ELL teacher. It is a Pull Out program during the day where the students are grouped homogeneously according to skill level as Beginning, Intermediate or Advanced. The amount of instructional time will be determined by the LAB-R exam, which is administered upon entrance at the beginning of each school year.
- B. Extracurricular: Briefly describe extracurricular activities available in your school, and the extent to which ELLs participate.
- 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.
A Parent Outreach Program will be implemented. Communication will be written in parents' native languages. We will continue to solicit staff members to serve as translators for ELL parents at Parent/Teacher Conferences, Parent Teacher Association meetings, Parent workshops and for after school and Saturday programs. A monthly parent newsletter will be provided quarterly by the Parent Coordinator in Spanish and Creole.
- III. Project Jump Start: Describe the programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL/LEP students prior to the first day of school.
NA
- IV. Staff Development (2008-2009 activities—tentative dates and ELL-related topics): Describe how staff will participate in ongoing, long-term staff development with a strong emphasis on the State learning standards and high impact differentiated and academic language development strategies.

The ELL teacher will be involved in ongoing professional development in and out of the school. The ELL teacher will be retrained with the ELL component of Storytown Program (Harcourt) to better the student's needs. Additional professional development will be provided, as needed, by the Literacy and Mathematic Coaches, as well as the Empowerment Network.

- V. Support services provided to LEP students: Describe other support structures that are in place in your school which are available to ELLs.
NA
- VI. Name/type of native language assessments administered (bilingual programs only): Describe how you assess the level of native language development and proficiency of the ELLs who are in a bilingual program.
NA

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

School Building: PS 268 **District** #18

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

Number of Teachers 2007-2008				Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals***		Total
Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**				
Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
						1

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

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

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

Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules

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

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: _____

School Building: _____

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

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (Bilingual)

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

School District: _____ School Building: _____

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

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) K-5 _____ Number of Students to be Served: 30 LEP 0 Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 1 Other Staff (Specify) Classroom Teachers

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

We will continue to implement the Pull Out model and begin the implementation of the Push-In model to facilitate differentiated instruction. In order to promote collaborative team teaching between the ELL teachers and identified classroom teachers training will be provided using the ELL component of the Storytown Program (Harcourt), in grades K – 2. Effective implementation of the monitoring assessment of the ELL program will be facilitated by the Storytown diagnostic program. The Making Meaning Program will continue to be implemented in grades 3 – 5 and closely monitored by assessments, i.e., data sheets. This will ensure that ELL instruction is aligned with NYS standards.

Spanish and French library books will be integrated into classroom libraries to be made available to ELL students. Students will be given an opportunity to write in their native language. However, formal writing is to be done in English to promote writing skills.

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

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

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

Allocation:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	\$150.00	
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts		ELL teacher will use Storytown ESL component, for grades K-4
Supplies and materials	\$350.00	Library Book (Spanish and Haitian Creole)
Travel	NA	
Other	NA	
TOTAL	\$500.00	

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.

High quality professional development will be provided by HARCOURT BRACE, (Storytown), Making Meaning, Kaplan, and possible Hunter College, as funds allow. The building literacy and mathematic Coaches, the Empowerment Network Team and the School Administrators will facilitate professional development as needed. Additional support will be provided by outside companies, as needed, for all staff members. The ELL teacher along with other staff members will be expected to participate in all professional development activities and will be encouraged to participate in Parent Workshops.

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.
Based on the data collected from the English Language survey, the number of parents needing translation services will be determined. Written communication will be in various languages, as is reflected from the English Language survey. Oral translation services will be provided by staff members on a per diem basis or as volunteers.
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.
During the 2007-2008 school year, P.S. 268 serviced 30 ELL students. Many of the parents/guardians required oral translation services for Parent Conferences and other meetings with the staff. They also required additional oral and written communication to be translated to provide a clear understand. All findings will be shared at PTA Parent Workshops and School Leadership Meetings.

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.
In house school staff and resource persons identified by the Principal will provide written translation of all documents to ELL parents. Additional resources will be utilized to translate documents into languages that are not spoken by staff members. The Parent Coordinator will be encouraged to make home visits accompanied by translators who speak the native language of parents and provide feedback. The feedback will be used to analyze the effectiveness of the program.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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.
Classroom teachers, out of classroom personnel, along with the Parent Coordinator will provide oral translation services to parents of ELL students. Additional resources, along with Parent Volunteers will be utilized during meetings. Parents of ELL students will be encouraged to attend and participate in School Leadership Team Meetings, whereby translation services will be provided, as needed. Parent Teacher Conferences—parents will be greeted in Spanish/Haitian Creole. In addition the school will utilize the School Messenger (phone system) to provide ELL parents with school updates in Spanish and Haitian Creole.
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>.

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 \$583,645
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program \$5837
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified \$29,183
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year 96%
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. Schools, in consultation with parents, are encouraged to include other relevant and agreed upon activities and actions as well that will support effective parental involvement and strengthen student academic achievement. The school parent involvement policy must be provided and disseminated in the major languages spoken by the majority of parents in the school. For additional information, please refer to the 2008-09 Title I Parent Involvement Guidelines available at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

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

See Attachment B

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
 - Refer to Section IV: Needs Assessment (page11)and Section V: Annual School Goals(page13) and Section VI (page 16) _)
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:
 - Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the 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.
 - Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

- Refer to Section IV: Needs Assessment(page11) and Section V: Annual School Goals(page13-15) and Section VI: Action Plan (page16-21)_

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

Refer to Action Plan Section VI: Action Plan(page 16-21)

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.

- Refer to Action Plan Section VI(page 16-21).

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

- N/A

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

- Refer to Appendix 4 Part B – Title 1 School Parental Involvement Policy and School-Parent Compact (Attachment B page 36)

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.

- Pre-Kindergarten Program with highly qualified teacher, scheduled morning and afternoon sessions with two groups.

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.

- Decision making at Grade Conferences, Faculty Conferences, One-on-One Conferencing with Teachers.

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.

- Push-In, Pull-Out, Small Group Instruction, Extended Day, After-School Programs, Aquity, and Kidzlit/Kidmath. School Focus on Differentiated Instruction. After-school Programs/Tutorials are held in Social Studies, Science, ELA, and Math.

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.

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

- Violence Prevention courses for all staff members. Leadership Program conducted for students in grades 3-5. Nutrition Committee is comprised of staff members. Health Instruction/PE, Fitness Gram/PE, Parent Workshops (ELA, Math, Book of the Month), professional development for staff.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

NCLB/SED Status: NA **SURR¹ Phase/Group (If applicable):** NA

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

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

SURR Group/Phase: NA

Year of Identification: NA

Deadline Year: NA

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The written ELA curriculum used at Public School 268 is aligned to the New York State Standards. (See Section IV, page 11 in the School Comprehensive Educational Plan.) Teacher professional development by the New York City Department of Education division of Teaching and Learning helped to compare the Harcourt Story Town currently used at Public School 268 to the New York State Standards. In areas where there was a deficiency in the scripted curriculum, additional materials were suggested and then provided. Teachers now use supplemental materials, such as trade books, the S.T.A.R.S. program, and Orbits. (See page 7, section III of the School Comprehensive Educational Plan) The curriculum maps used by the teaching staff expose the expected level of cognitive demand for students and the evidence markers applied. The materials include below-level activities for struggling readers and ELL activities that all correspond with the lesson objectives and themes.

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

New York State assessments measure conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem solving. In the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, these are represented as *process strands* and *content strands*. These strands help to define what students should know and be able to do as a result of their engagement in the study of mathematics. The critical nature of the process strands in the teaching and learning of mathematics has been identified in the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, revised by NYS Board of Regents on March 15, 2005: The process strands (Problem Solving, Reasoning and Proof, Communication, Connections, and Representation) highlight ways of acquiring and using content knowledge. These process strands help to give meaning to mathematics and help students to see mathematics as a discipline rather than a set of isolated skills. Student engagement in mathematical content is accomplished through these process strands. Students will gain a better understanding of mathematics and have longer retention of mathematical knowledge as 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. **The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program.**

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

As an elementary school, the Everyday Mathematics program is aligned with the New York State content strands. (See page 7, section III of the School Comprehensive Educational Plan) Teachers use the additional activities and resources suggested through the Everyday Mathematics program to create more in-depth mathematics lessons.

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.

Not Applicable

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

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

The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program.

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?

Differentiated Learning workshops and professional developments have been given to all staff members (teachers, paraprofessionals, and out-of-classroom professionals). As the study found, students are self-paced frequently and the instructional time is highly academically focused.

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.

Not Applicable

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

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

The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program

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?

In-house trainings for Smart Board use and newly installed mathematics computer games and activities increase the technology used in the mathematics classroom. Direct instruction is, indeed, used, as stated, but centers, group work, and individualized explorations are used throughout the Everyday Mathematics program as well. The Everyday Mathematics is utilized in a differentiated manner.

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.

The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program.

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?

As per the Public School 268 Galaxy, the average salary of teachers corresponds to a low turn-over rate. The number of school teachers has increased greatly in the past 2 years. The data shows highly qualified teachers remain at Public School 268.

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.

Not Applicable

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.

The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The English Language Learners' teacher attends many professional developments. (See page 20, Appendix 2, in School Comprehensive Educational Plan) The classroom teachers use the ELL components in the scripted Story Town ELA program, the Everyday Mathematics program, and the Harcourt Science program. The components provide activities, support, and resources based upon the content of the programs to enrich the learning of English Language Learners. Professional development has been provided for teachers in these curriculums that include ELL components.

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.

Not Applicable

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.

The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

5.3: Based on your response to Question 5.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

In-house trainings for Smart Board use and newly installed mathematics computer games and activities increase the technology used in the mathematics classroom. Direct instruction is, indeed, used, as stated, but centers, group work, and individualized explorations are used throughout the Everyday Mathematics program as well. The Everyday Mathematics is utilized in a differentiated manner.

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

6.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.
The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

All 408's have been distributed for the 2008-2009 school year. The S.E.T.S. teacher meets with all classroom teachers on a regular basis. The school received 86% positive feedback in the principal's compliance data in IEP in regards to completing IEPs consistently and properly. The annual review stated that IEP mandated special education services were provided in a timely manner.

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.

Not Applicable

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

The School Leadership Team created a sub-committee to review school curriculum, overall test scores, data regarding the New York State and City assessments, and standards-based planning. The sub-committee included three teachers, one parent, and the school principal. The sub-committee determined that the findings were not relevant to Public School 268's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

7.3: Based on your response to Question 7.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

93.33% of all IEPs were reviewed annually and effectively. 100% of initial evaluations were conducted within 30 days and reevaluations were done on existing IEPs at least every 3 years. IEPs included behavioral goals and objectives when necessary.

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. **NOT APPLICABLE**

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

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

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

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

Submit date: **Jul 10, 2008**

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

School DBN	18K268
School Name	Emma Lazarus School
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 63,710
Principal Name	Mosezetta F. Overby
Principal Email	moverby@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7187735332

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

Before- and After-School Programs	
Summer School Programs	
Dedicated Instructional Time	
Individualized Tutoring	\$ 63,710

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

I plan to hire a F Status guidance counselor to address the educational and social needs of our most at risk students.

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

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

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

- New implementation
- Program Expansion

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

pre-kindergarten program at the school?

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No