



**P.S. 23 Q  
2008-09  
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN  
(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 75/ Q/ 023**

**ADDRESS: 74-03 COMMONWEALTH BLVD.**

**TELEPHONE: (718) 264-4880**

**FAX: (718) 264-4836**

## **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:** P.S. 23Q      **SCHOOL NAME:** P23 Q at Queens Children's Center

**DISTRICT:** 75      **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** Self-Management School  
Network 1

**SCHOOL ADDRESS:** 74-03 Commonwealth Blvd., Bellerose, New York 11426

**SCHOOL TELEPHONE:** (718) 264-4880      **FAX:** (718) 264-4836

**SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON:** Phyllis Weinfeld      **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Pweinfo@schools  
.nyc.gov

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON**      Jackie Jones

**PRINCIPAL**      Phyllis Weinfeld

**UFT CHAPTER LEADER**      Maryann Giordano

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION  
PRESIDENT**      Lynn Clendennin

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE**  
*(Required for high schools)*      \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SUPERINTENDENT**      Bonnie Brown

**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
Phyllis Weinfeld	*Principal or Designee	
Mariann Giordano	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Lynn Clendenin	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Jackie Jones	Assistant Principal	
Kathy Sobatka	Teacher	
Adam Joseph	Teacher	
Peter Zendt	Teacher	
Margo DeJesus	Parent	
Don LaMere	Teacher	
Ebony Wright Simmons	Parent	

\* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

### **SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE**

#### **Part A. Narrative Description**

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

---

PS 23 Q is a multi-site organization K-12, comprised of 5 different sites at various locations, within day treatment agency and hospital settings. Our agency affiliates include Queens Children's Psychiatric Center, Lifeline Center for Child Development, Zucker Hillside Psychiatric Hospital, Holliswood Hospital, and St. Mary's Hospital for Children. None of our programs is located within a community school or a free standing school building. In order for any student to attend our school, he/she must be screened by the specific agency/hospital. Any decision, from admission to discharge and class placement must include the clinical component and is collaborative. We are considered a psycho-educational milieu.

Students who attend P.S. 23 Q are admitted after all other options for school placement have been exhausted. We are the most restrictive placement within District 75, Citywide Programs. Students entering our program have spent much of their previous school time in crisis, out of the classroom, in detention, hospitalized or being truant. Many students have learning deficits due to the amount of time not spent in class.

Students serviced at PS 23 Q range in disabilities including seriously emotionally handicapped, multiply disabled and health impaired. Students who attend our program are from the five boroughs. Students demonstrate a wide range of cognitive and academic needs resulting from severe emotional deficits and learning disabilities. As a result all of the children require an intensive day treatment and clinical model inclusive of full time medical supports in addition to educational services. The school has an extremely high transition rate as the medical/psychiatric component of the program attempts to stabilize and treat the child and family in as short a period as possible in an effort to return the child to a less restrictive environment. At the same time the Department of Education needs to address the students' current functioning level.

Our instructional program follows the Department of Education Uniform Curriculum in addition to providing academic intervention services across the grades. Our classes are formed primarily based upon a student's social emotional needs and then instructional levels. Each of our classrooms has a wide variety of instructional materials to accommodate the individual needs of each student. We provide an extended school day program for our high school students and a recreational program for our middle school students.

Despite the high admission and discharge rate of our students we provide an instructional program that is challenging for our students, while providing them with the necessary medical/clinical supports in order to prepare them to successfully transition back to a less restrictive environment.

## 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				
<b>School Name:</b>	PS 23 Q			
<b>District:</b>	75	<b>DBN #:</b>		<b>School BEDS Code #:</b>

DEMOGRAPHICS									
<b>Grades Served in 2008-09:</b>	<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.		
<b>Enrollment:</b>				<b>Attendance:</b>					
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)	2006	2007	2008		
Pre-K	0	0	0		85.5	88.3			
Kindergarten	9	13	19						
Grade 1	16	17	17	<b>Student Mobility:</b>					
Grade 2	22	19	8	(% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	29	25	20		56.1	61.1			
Grade 4	27	25	18						
Grade 5	17	23	32	<b>Eligible for Free Lunch:</b>					
Grade 6	53	17	18	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7	36	56	31		48.4	50.4	45.0		
Grade 8	30	35	44						
Grade 9	39	39	78	<b>Students in Temporary Housing:</b>					
Grade 10	31	31	34	(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11	11	11	24		8	3	54		
Grade 12	8	8	18						
Ungraded Elementary				<b>Recent Immigrants:</b>					
Ungraded Secondary				(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total					1	1	1		
<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>				<b>Suspensions:</b>					
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	328	320	342						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	0	Principal Suspensions	7	0	1		
Number all others	5	4	17	Superintendent Suspensions	5	3	2		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
				<b>Special High School Programs:</b>			
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:</b>				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	0	5	0	<b>Number of Staff:</b>			
# ELLs with IEPs	3	2	8	(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	67	69	68
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	46	6	43
<b>Overage Students:</b>							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	27	TBD	34
	4	8	13				
				<b>Teacher Qualifications:</b>			
<b>Ethnicity and Gender:</b>				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.9	1.2	1.0	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	77.6	78.3	79.4
Black or African American	42.6	46.2	45.7	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	64.2	75.4	79.4
Hispanic or Latino	22.8	24.1	26.2				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	6.8	5.5	6.4	Percent Masters Degree or higher	91.0	88.0	90.0
White	26.0	23.0	20.8	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	94.0	97.2	98.4
Multi-racial							
<b>Male</b>	67.2	69.5	61.6				
<b>Female</b>	32.8	30.5	38.4				

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		
<b>Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 2005-06	<input type="checkbox"/> 2006-07	<input type="checkbox"/> 2007-08	<input type="checkbox"/> 2008-09

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
<b>SURR School:</b> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<b>If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:</b>	
<b>Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB 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
<b>All Students</b>						
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Black or African American						
Hispanic or Latino						
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander						
White						
Multiracial						
<b>Other Groups</b>						
Students with Disabilities						
Limited English Proficient						
Economically Disadvantaged						
<b>Student groups making AYP in each subject</b>						

**Key: AYP Status**

√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ <sup>SH</sup>	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		Overall Evaluation:	Well Developed
Overall Score		Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Well Developed
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Well Developed
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well Developed
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Well Developed
Additional Credit		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Well Developed

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

## **SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

- At P.S. 23 Q, we utilize a variety of ways to measure and report on student progress and achievement: report cards, teacher observation, standardized ELA and Math test results, Performance Series and the Qualitative Reading Inventory. As a result of our Quality Review it was identified that we need to disaggregate data based on gender and ethnicity in order to assess whether the school is accommodating cultural and gender differences when teaching Reading and Math. In order to accomplish this we need to:
  1. Provide disaggregated data on student performance based on ethnicity and gender in a simple and understandable way for the teachers.
  2. Provide professional development for teachers on how to use, analyze and develop interventions that will drive instruction based on this data.

Through the systematic collection of data, our school hopes to eliminate subjective conclusions and assumptions about students and their achievements.

- The Learning Environment Survey indicated that 75% of students that took the survey requested more classes in vocational training be provided at our school.
- 60% of the parents surveyed stated on the Learning Environment Survey that student to student incidents occurred most of the time. 49% of the students surveyed on the Learning Environment Survey stated that students threaten or bully other students at school some of the time. Bullying is an issue that needs to be addressed at our school.

### **Performance Trends**

- Informal teacher/student assessment reflects that students are functioning more than two years below their actual grade level in both reading and math.
- Incremental improvements are demonstrated – (quality based gains).
- There are presently 417 students on register. The majority of our students in grades 3-8 are functioning on Level 1 and Level 2 on the standardized tests in both reading and math, based upon the last two years of Standardized Assessment scores.

The total number of students tested in grades 3-8 during 2006-2007 was 166. Out of that number 48% scored level 1 on the Standardized ELA; and 40% scored Level 2. During the school year of 2007-2008, out of 131 students tested, 27% scored Level 1; and 56% scored Level 2. All of our students receive academic intervention services.

In the area of Math Standardized testing, in the year 2006-2007 out of 131 students tested, 49% scored Level 1; and 33% scored Level 2. In 2007-2008, out of 124 students tested, 48% scored Level 1; 28% scored Level 2. All of our students receive academic intervention services.

- The students at PS 23 Q are transient and their length of stay can be as few as 45 days . Due to this fact it is difficult to come up with a performance trend in ELA or Math. Students often don't take the standardized tests in our school 2 years in a row.

### **Accomplishments:**

- Receipt of \$200,000 capital funding to update technology throughout the school.
- Middle School Success Planning Grant
- Book Mobile – School Leadership Team successfully wrote a proposal to fund a Library on Wheels and obtained funding from the Queens Borough President's Office in the amount of \$349,000.
- Within a six month period for any year, we move at a minimum 25% of our students to a Less Restrictive Environment.
- School-wide Science Fair and Literacy Fair.
- Quality Review has rated our school as well developed for the past two years.
- Two mobile science labs funded by Queens Borough President.

### **Strengths**

- 79% of our teachers have taught in our school for 2 years or more and received a satisfactory rating.
- School wide system to collect, interpret and use data to differentiate instruction.
- Clinical collaboration provides additional supports in maintaining our students in the classroom.
- 97.5 % of our total school population met their modified promotional criteria in grades 3-8 for 2007-2008 school year.
- We provide an extended academic school day for our high school students.
- We provide an extended school day for our high school that is vocational based.
- We provide an extended recreational program for our middle school students.
- On-going parent support groups and workshops supported by agency personnel.
- All teachers are trained in Therapeutic Crisis Intervention.
- Recreational programs offered to Intensive Day Treatment students during school closings.

- Uniformity of textbooks and curriculum across all sites.
- Teachers voluntarily attend professional staff development workshops throughout the year.

### **Barriers to demonstrating our school's continuous improvement**

- The students at P.S. 23 Q are transient and their length of stay at our school can be as short as 45 days to a year. This can pose a major barrier to demonstrating our school's continuous academic performance improvement in that we are unable to review data for the same child from year to year.
- Most of our facilities are a locked facility and our students cannot leave the campus due to their behaviors. In order to provide exposure to the arts, we must develop community and art partnerships that will enhance our student's educational experiences.
- Our school sites are not conveniently located to any train station therefore parent involvement is low.
- Many of our children reside in foster homes and the foster families are not involved with the student's education or the school on any level.
- Completion of the Compliance Survey and Learning Environment Survey do not reflect our school. Many of the survey questions are written for a "typical school program" which we are not. Therefore the data is skewed as we are forced to respond to questions that are not applicable to our program.
- Our students have been diagnosed, labeled and are attending a psychiatric day treatment school program. When an occurrence occurs in our program, it is generally connected to the child's medical/psychiatric diagnosis, as per medical doctor. Occurrence reporting should allow for us to put in NO8 (medical reason) when applicable. This is another instance where mandated data may be skewed as we tend to have many occurrences due the "classification/diagnosis" of our students.

### **Significant Aids**

- At PS 23 Q we follow the NYC Uniform Curriculum that is used at all 5 of our sites. This ensures that there will be continuity of instruction when and if a student needs to move from one site to another and/or return to a less restrictive environment.
- There is a school wide data and recording system that is used to help drive instruction and provide continuity when a student is moved from one site to another site at PS 23 Q.
- Site specific behavior checklist completed by teachers for collaboration with DOE and Agency staff for on-going review of treatment plan and movement back to LRE/MRE.
- Our Literacy Coach models best practices for teachers as well as providing on-going support and turn-key training.
- Common preparation periods for teachers to meet and share best practices. Teachers are encouraged to participate in professional development opportunities.

## **SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS**

***1. By the end of the 2008-2009 school year, 10% of students in grades 3-8 will increase their Performance Series scaled scores from the 25% to 50% range or better in Language Arts and Reading as measured by Performance Series.***

50% of our students in grades 3-8 enter our program with standardized assessment levels of either 1 or 2 in reading. Based on a review of informal assessments, review of student IEP's and ATS data, our students grade level equivalent in reading falls 2 or more years below their actual grade.

***2. To maintain and increase community partnerships by 10% from the 2007-2008 school year in order to generate resources and enhance our school programs as evidenced by increased school performances and grant money received.***

Last year we partnered with Alley Pond Environmental Center, Chauncey Music Foundations, The Christina Foundation, Local Assembly Members, State Senators, and Council Members for Reso-A funding and Capital Funding, Borders Books, Teach for America Grant, Starlight Foundation.

***3. To implement a Bullying Awareness program in order to reduce the number of incidents of bullying by 10% during the 2008-2009 school year.***

Since the beginning of the 2008 school year, we have observed an increase in the number of verbal assaults between students that is directed towards gender identity, weight, gay bashing and overall issues of tolerance amongst our students.

***4. During the 2008-2009 school year 25% or more students will move on to a Less Restrictive Environment as evidenced number of students placed and accepted into community schools by September 2009.***

A collaborative goal for our teachers, parents, students and clinicians is to prepare our students and have them return to a less restrictive environment with the necessary supports and tools for success.

***5. During the 2008-2009 school year parent involvement will increase by 10% as compared to the 2007-2008 school year.***

At our first parent workshop for the 2008-2009 school year, less than 4% of the parents of our students participated.

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Reading

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><i>By the end of the 2008-2009 school year, 10% of students in grades 3-8 will increase their Performance Series scaled scores from the 25% to 50% range or better in Language Arts and Reading as measured by Performance Series.</i></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students in grades 3-8 will be administered the Performance Series to obtain baseline data.</li> <li>• Teachers will identify the deficit areas as identified by the results of this assessment for all students in grades 3-8 in the area of ELA.</li> <li>• Teachers will differentiate instruction based upon data from and focus instruction to skill deficit areas.</li> <li>• On-going supports will be provided through the use of Jamestown, Guided Reading and other school wide programs.</li> <li>• Standardized test preparation built into the school day and through extended school day.</li> <li>• AIS – teacher will provide push-in small group/individualized instruction.</li> <li>• Monthly grade level conferences with Literacy Coach and classroom teachers to ensure effective implementation of school wide initiative “<u>7 Keys to Comprehension</u>”.</li> <li>• On-going review of portfolios (grade specific indicators in ELA) by administration.</li> <li>• Instructional updates from Principal as needed.</li> <li>• School-wide book of the month by grade addressing various reading strategies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy Coach – monthly literacy meetings</li> <li>• District Literacy Coach – site visits throughout the 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Tax Levy Funding – 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Project ARTS Funding – 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Reso-A funding – 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Inquiry Team – monthly meetings</li> <li>• Other Grant Writing</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Series test to be given every 12 weeks (Oct. 08, Jan. 09, April 09)</li> <li>• QRI administered October 2008 and May 2009</li> <li>• IEP mastery goals updated 4x (Oct.08, Jan.09, Mar. 09, June 09)</li> <li>• Students meet 25 book standard as indicated on Student Profile Sheet by June 2008</li> </ul>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Community Resources

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><i>To maintain and increase community partnerships by 10% from the 2007-2008 school year in order to generate resources and enhance our school programs as evidenced by increased school performances and grant money received.</i></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target Population – Grades K-12</li> <li>• Grant-writing Training Sessions for grant committee (on-going)</li> <li>• School Leadership Team to assess school wide needs (on-going)</li> <li>• Administrative Cabinet to review existing grants and future grant opportunities (weekly)</li> <li>• Parent Coordinator to research grants and resources (on-going)</li> <li>• Out reach to Arts Partners – on-going throughout the school year</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tax-Levy Funding – 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Reso-A request from local politicians – Fall of 2008</li> <li>• Professional Development – Grant Writing Workshops through ISC Fall 2008/ Spring 2008</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekly cabinet meetings – September 2008 – June 2009</li> <li>• Acceptance of 3 grants by June 2008</li> </ul>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Bullying

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><i>To implement a Bullying Awareness program in order to reduce the number of incidents of bullying by 10% during the 2008-2009 school year.</i></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff professional development November 4, 2008</li> <li>• Classroom teachers will incorporate units of study on tolerance, diversity and bullying as age appropriate.</li> <li>• Students will be provided with a bullying survey to establish to establish a baseline</li> <li>• Follow up surveys at least 3x per year to assess change in attitude.</li> <li>• Participate in Bullying Prevention Week Program (November 17-21)</li> <li>• Data specialist to chart number of incidents related to bullying from 09/08 – 11/08 based on anecdotes</li> <li>• Data specialist to chart number of incidents monthly once anti-bullying campaign begins 12/08.</li> <li>• Anti-bullying committees formed at each site to include teachers and student council members.</li> <li>• School environment to reflect school wide initiative of anti-bullying campaign.</li> <li>• Monthly parent newsletter to include information about school wide anti-bullying campaign.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project ARTS - L.E.A.P. 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Tax Levy – 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Planned Parenthood – October 2008, January 2009, February 2009, March 2009 and April 2009</li> <li>• Community Non-for Profit Agencies – 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Research and purchase Bullying Prevention Program – September 2008 through November 2008</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anecdotal logs to be reviewed monthly by lead teacher at each site.</li> <li>• Name of student and number incidents to be reported to Data Specialist for review at the end of each month</li> <li>• Baseline survey for students to complete 12/08</li> <li>• Surveys distributed to students every 12 weeks after baseline survey to be reviewed by Data Specialist</li> <li>• Data specialist to review surveys throughout the school year. (12/08, 3/08 and 8/08)</li> </ul>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><i>During the 2008-2009 school year 25% or more students will move on to a Less Restrictive Environment as evidenced number of students placed and accepted into community schools by September 2009.</i></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain Type III tracking log to be updated as Type III's are completed to be reviewed by Assistant Principals, 05/09</li> <li>• Transition planning groups with guidance counselor/clinicians weekly near end of school year</li> <li>• Travel Training for students transitioning to other schools/and or work</li> <li>• Visits to possible new school placement for students and parents with guidance counselor/and or clinician prior to actual placement</li> <li>• Treatment team meetings to assess student readiness to leave – weekly/monthly</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance Counselor – on-going through out the year</li> <li>• Parent Coordinator – Parent Support Breakfasts (10/08, 11/08, 01/09, 03/09, 05/09, 06/09) during 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Clinicians – monthly phone conference</li> <li>• Parent/Teacher Conferences twice a year</li> <li>• Annual Review Updates</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekly review of crisis logs/anecdotal</li> <li>• Monthly Team Treatment meetings: goal setting for students going to LRE</li> <li>• Weekly point sheets maintained at 85% individual length of time for each student</li> <li>• Mastery of IEP goals (4-6 x a year Oct.08, Dec., 08, Jan.09, Mar. 09, May 09, June 09)</li> </ul>

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><i>During the 2008-2009 school year parent involvement will increase by 10% as compared to the 2007-2008 school year.</i></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter, follow-up letter and phone call for Parent/Teacher Conferences; IEP Conferences and Parent Workshops</li> <li>• Initiate School Messenger Phone service</li> <li>• Parent Needs Assessment Survey</li> <li>• Review home language survey to ensure that both written and verbal conferences provide adequate translation services</li> <li>• Provide workshops on various topics as determined by parent needs assessment</li> <li>• Agency to provide travel services from home to school and back</li> <li>• Written invitation to student performances at assembly programs throughout the school year</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tax-Levy</li> <li>• Grants</li> <li>• Parent Coordinator Budget 2008-2009</li> <li>• Friends of Iris Hill – (quarterly meetings throughout the 2008-2009 school year)</li> <li>• Lifeline Board of Directors – (quarterly meetings throughout the 2008-2009 school year)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gather attendance data from 6 Parent Support Breakfasts (10/08, 11/08, 01/09, 03/09, 05/09, 06/09) during 2008-2009 school year</li> <li>• Increased attendance at 7 Parent Coordinator Workshops (10/08, two parent workshops in 12/08, 02/09, 03/09, 04/09, 05/09, 06/09)</li> <li>• Increase parent response to Learning Environment Survey by 10%</li> </ul>

## **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	25	25	N/A	N/A				25
1	25	25	N/A	N/A				25
2	19	19	N/A	N/A				19
3	18	18	N/A	N/A				18
4	26	26	26	26				26
5	27	27	27	27				27
6	43	43	43	43				43
7	41	41	41	41	41			41
8	38	38	38	38	38			38
9	75	75	75	75	75			75
10	39	39	39	39	39			39
11	17	17	17	17	17			17
12	19	19	19	19	19			19

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

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

**Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services**

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	<b>Description:</b> Provide a brief description of <b>each</b> of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
<p><b>ELA:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foundations</li> <li>• Scantron Performance Series</li> <li>• Achieve 3000</li> <li>• Jamestown</li> <li>• Read 180</li> <li>• Rewards</li> <li>• ELA Test Prep Coach Books</li> <li>• High school extended school day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Foundations</u> - Small group instruction during the school day (Grades K-3)</li> <li>• <u>Scantron</u> - Individualized remediation based upon data results in Language Arts and Reading</li> <li>• <u>Achieve 3000</u> - One to one instruction during the school, web based(Grades 4-12)</li> <li>• <u>Jamestown</u> - One to one instruction and small group instruction web based and teacher guided 5x a week (Grades 4-8)</li> <li>• <u>Read 180</u> - One to one instruction and small group instruction 5x a week (Grades 7-8)</li> <li>• <u>Rewards</u> - One to one instruction (Grades 4-12)</li> <li>• <u>Coach Books</u> - One to one or small group instruction during school day (Grades 3-8)</li> <li>• <u>Extended School Day</u> - Small group instruction and/or one to one instruction based on review of credits by guidance counselor.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mathematics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Leaps</li> <li>• Everyday Math Games</li> <li>• Scantron</li> <li>• Math Steps</li> <li>• High school extended school day</li> <li>• Math Test Prep Coach Books</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Great Leaps</u> - One to one or small group instruction specific to computation (Grades 2-8)</li> <li>• <u>Everyday Math Games</u> - One to one or one to two during the school day. (Grades K-5)</li> <li>• Scantron – Individualized remediation based upon data results</li> <li>• <u>Math Steps</u> - One to one during the school day (Grades K-5)</li> <li>• <u>Extended School Day</u> - Small group instruction and/or one to one instruction based on review of credits by guidance counselor.</li> <li>• <u>Coach Books</u> - One to one or small group instruction during school day (Grades 3-9)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Science:</b></p> <p>Test Prep Books</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Test Prep</u> - One to one or small group instruction during or after school day. (Grades 4, 8 and high school)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Social Studies:</b></p> <p>Test Prep Books</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Test Prep</u> - One to one or small group instruction during school day (Grade 5, 8)</li> </ul>

<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b> Promotion criteria and credits reviewed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One to one Individual conferences with guidance counselor.</li> </ul>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	N/A
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	N/A
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>  Psychiatric/Medical Intervention Supports Therapeutic Crisis Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counseling/Intervention with agency therapist - Scheduled daily and on an as need basis (Grades K-12)</li> </ul>

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

*NCLB/SED requirement for all schools*

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

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

---

Type of Program:  Bilingual  ESL  Both      Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08:           0            
(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).
  - 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.
- III. Project Jump Start: Describe the programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL/LEP students prior to the first day of school.
- 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.
- V. Support services provided to LEP students: Describe other support structures that are in place in your school which are available to ELLs.
- 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.

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

School Building: \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_

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	

\* 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.

**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-12      Number of Students to be Served: 8 LEP 0 Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 0      Other Staff (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview**

**Title III, Part A LEP Program**

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

---

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

---

Professional Development will be incorporated in workshops that will teach ESL strategies for ELL students. This professional development will be offered by the ESL coach and other professionals from the District Office for Bi-Lingual Services. All teachers are encouraged to attend workshops provided by the Division of Teaching and Learning specific to English Language Learners. . We will also take advantage of the offerings from "Learning Times" that pertain to ESL issues. Teachers at the middle and high school levels will work collaboratively with an ESL teacher. Teacher planned lessons will compliment instead of merely translating the content instruction in the other language. Paraprofessionals are to be included in all professional development opportunities. Professional development may include intervisitation of other teachers and programs that support best practices.

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

**Form TIII – A (1)(b)**

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

<b>Allocation:</b>		
<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Budgeted Amount</b>	<b>Explanation of Proposed Expenditure</b>
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)		
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts		
Supplies and materials	\$471	Purchase interpretation resources (dictionaries etc) and interpretation equipment (printing costs) of foreign language materials to be disseminated to LEP parents.
Travel		
Other		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$471</b>	

### **APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION**

*Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools*

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

#### **Part A: Needs Assessment Findings**

---

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

Prior to a student's admission to our school he/she must participate in an in-take which is a collaborative process between the Department of Education and the Agency. The need for translation services is identified when the screening appointment is first set up.

On the school level, all students are given a home language. If English is not the primary language it is noted in the school office so that all future correspondence and communication will be available in the language indicated on the home language survey. In addition the IEP indicates on page one the preferred language of the parent/guardian. This data is then shared with the teachers, clinicians and related service providers.

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

Our major finding is that there is minimal need at this time for translation services based upon the fact that no one this year has made a request for such services and it has not been indicated on Home Identification Language Surveys.

If a parent/guardian whose preferred language is not English, all staff and related service providers are notified of the interpretation needs, specific to the language of the parent through inter-office memos.

## 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.**

All parents of ELL students are given a copy of “Guide for Parents of ELL” upon enrollment in their native language. They are also given the “Bill of Parental Rights and Responsibilities” in their native language. When the need arises, we have been able to accommodate the needs of parents of non-English speaking students through access of our agency/DOE bi-lingual personnel. The Translation and Interpretation Unit of the Department of Education is contacted if necessary. Letters that are sent from the Department of Education are sent in various languages in addition to English. Additional written translation services can be obtained through one of the DOE-approved contacted vendors.

- 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.**

All parents of ELL students are given a copy of “Guide for Parents of ELL” upon enrollment in their native language. In addition they are given the “Bill of Parental Rights and Responsibilities” in their native language. When the need arises, we have been able to accommodate the needs of parents of non-English speaking students through access of our agency/DOE bi-lingual personnel for oral interpretation during meetings, in addition to the Translation and Interpretation Unit of the Department of Education if necessary.

- 3. Describe how the school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor’s Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services. Note: The full text of Chancellor’s Regulations A-663 (Translations) is available via the following link: <http://docs.nycenet.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-151/A-663%20Translation%203-27-06%20.pdf>.**

In an effort to fulfill Section VII of Chancellor’s Regulations of A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services parents are given the “Bill of Parental Rights and Responsibilities” in their native language. Parents are informed about a website posting the availability for them to obtain translation and interpretation services as well as downloading the Bill of Parental Rights in their native language.

**APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS -“ NOT APPLICABLE**

**NOT APPLICABLE**

**Directions:**

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

**Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES**

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

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

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

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

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

**NOT APPLICABLE**

*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:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SURR<sup>1</sup> Phase/Group (If applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

**Not Applicable**

*All SURRE schools must complete this appendix.*

SURRE Area(s) of Identification: \_\_\_\_\_

SURRE Group/Phase: \_\_\_\_\_ Year of Identification: \_\_\_\_\_ Deadline Year: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part A: SURRE 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 SURRE. Indicate the specific actions the school has taken, or will take, to address each of the recommendations.

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

**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)*<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.**

Our school cabinet is made up of lead teachers, coaches and administrators who review the findings and identify the areas that are relevant to our school. The administration will share the findings with the school community at staff faculty conferences, School Leadership Team meetings, Parent Association meetings as well as the monthly newsletters.

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

X 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 report supports areas of needs that our school exhibits. While we follow a standards based curriculum for all of our students who are cognitively able and we have curriculum maps that are aligned to the state standards, it continues to be a challenge to differentiate the curriculum and to meet the diverse needs of the severely emotionally challenged and learning disabled students that we serve in our standardized classes. The use of formative assessments has provided us with evidence that highlights additional deficits that our students exhibit that need to be addressed in our program.

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

Our school has moved towards more intense data analysis. We will continue to identify skill areas and needs and broaden the process of inquiry across the school to address relevant issues. Since the population of students that we serve are all special needs, and the majority of these students are at minimum 2 years below grade level due to the severity of their handicapping conditions, we recognize that these students will not achieve full proficiency on NY State exams. However, these students will eventually achieve standards at a different pace and since they are able to be in school until age 21, we believe this will assist in moving students with special education needs forward.

---

## **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.**

Our school cabinet is made up of lead teachers, coach and administrators who review the findings and identify the areas that are relevant to our schools. The administration will share the findings with the school community at staff faculty conferences, School Leadership Team meetings, Parent Association meetings as well as the monthly newsletters.

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

X Applicable  Not Applicable

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

Our school follows a standards based curriculum for all of students. We follow curriculum maps that are aligned to the NYS Standards and pacing calendars. Our students require more time to master various skills and concepts as the pacing calendar is too rigorous for our student population who are severely emotionally challenged and learning disabled.

The use of formative assessments has provided us with additional evidence that highlights deficit areas in our educational program.

---

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

Our school continually analyzes data. We will continue to identify skill areas in need and broaden the process of inquiry across the school to address these deficits. Given that the population of the students that we serve is all special needs and the majority of these students are at minimum 2 years below grade level due to the severity of their handicapping conditions, we believe that they should be given the NYS Standardized assessments at minimum two years below their grade. These students will eventually achieve standards but perhaps at a slower pace and given that they have the rights to a Public Education until the age of 21, it is our belief that this will assist in moving students with special education needs forward.

**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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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.**

Our school cabinet is made up of lead teachers, coach and administrators who review the findings and identify the areas that are relevant to our schools. The administration will share the findings with the school community at staff faculty conferences, School Leadership Team meetings, Parent Association meetings as well as the monthly newsletters.

**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?**

Instructional materials are available in our school across the grades in ELA that is adequate to meet the needs of struggling readers. Many of our programs are researched based and are relevant to student’s background knowledge, are age appropriate and culturally relevant for student use. Our teachers provide small group instruction where students are grouped according to their functional level in ELA. We use a variety of research based programs to accommodate our student’s individual needs and learning styles.

**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.**

N/A

---

**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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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* (SOM<sup>3</sup>) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

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

Our school cabinet is made up of lead teachers, coach and administrators who review the findings and identify the areas that are relevant to our schools. The administration will share the findings with the school community at staff faculty conferences, School Leadership Team meetings, Parent Association meetings as well as the monthly newsletters.

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

X 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?**

While we follow the NYS Standards, we have found that many students are functioning at least 2 years below their actual grade level. The use of individual work sheets and independent seat work, with our severely emotionally challenged students is not a practice that we follow on a regular basis. Our students requires close adult proximity which in order to take place requires small group instruction. Technology is beginning to be infused into the math curriculum particularly as AIS.

**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.**

We will analyze data and continue to identify skill areas in need of inquiry across the school in order to address the relevant issues.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

### **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 administration will share the findings with the school community at staff faculty conferences, School Leadership Team meetings, Parent Association meetings as well as the monthly newsletters.

**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?**

Statistical Data from School Report Card supports the fact that we have a low teacher turnover. Based upon statistical data for the last 2 years, 79% of our teachers have been with us for over two years. This supports the fact that we have a low teacher turnover. Therefore, key finding 3 is not applicable to our school.

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

N/A

---

### **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.**

Our school cabinet is made up of lead teachers, coaches and administrators. During our weekly cabinet meetings, as a group we review the data to see if there are any students who were admitted and identified as ELL. If it is determined that there is a student(s) who need ESL instruction, teachers are encouraged to attend professional development workshops that are relevant above and beyond the procedures in our Language Allocation Policy.

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

X 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?**

While the above is applicable it does not directly affect our teaching staff. A trend in our school is that most ELL students are generally with us for a very short period of time, 2 weeks to 45 days. Instructional materials and workshops are made available to the classroom teacher on an as-needs basis. In addition we receive on-going support from the District Office of English Language Learners on ELL. Based upon our last school wide survey the area of ELL Professional Development was not an area that staff requested opportunities to participate in because it did not support the needs of presently of our student population.

**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.**

While the key finding is applicable to our school, the lack of staff awareness is only due to the fact that we have very few ELL students. When they are in our school the necessary accommodations are available.

---

**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.**

While the above is applicable it does not directly affect our teaching staff. A trend in our school is that most ELL students are generally with us for a very short period of time, 2 weeks to 45 days. Identification of ELL students is generated through ATS and the IEP's upon admission. However, even if there is only one ELL student, we are able to accommodate his/her needs.

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

X 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?**

Testing Coordinator assures that student is provided with NYSESLAT and downloads and explains testing data to teachers to include information that provides instructional techniques that enhances ELL learning.

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

N/A

---

**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.**

Our school cabinet is made up of lead teachers, coaches and administrators. During our weekly cabinet meetings, as a group we discussed the above finding for accuracy.

**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?**

As the most restrictive special education program, housed in an agency/hospital setting, our students do not have access to a mainstream school, and therefore cannot participate with the general education population. There are no opportunities for inclusion. This supports our reason for the above finding to not be applicable to our school, as we do not have any general education teachers on-site. Our professional development opportunities are geared towards interventions that will assist our teachers in being proactive in promoting positive student outcomes both academically and behaviorally. Most of the professional development workshops that our teachers attend are geared towards the special needs of our students with regard to instruction and behavior management.

**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.**

As a unique school within the Department of Education while additional support from Central is always welcomed, it is necessary for Central to recognize our uniqueness and accept our differences.

---

**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.**

During our weekly cabinet meetings, as a group we discussed the above finding for accuracy. On-going discussion with parents, staff and clinicians.

**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?**

While we are proficient in providing all of our students with accommodations for assessments as per page 9 of the IEP, teachers often have difficulty in the classroom environment providing the same accommodations during instructional time as well as on classroom assessments. There is a major discrepancy with the IEP goals (along with modified promotion criteria) and the assessed grade level content areas.

**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.**

Teachers and paraprofessionals regularly provide accommodations to students during class lessons. Paraprofessionals will assist with small group instruction under the teacher's supervision so that the variety of accommodations is met and all students receive equal instructional access during a lesson. Even though the IEP is individualized and students are being instructed on a modified level, they are expected to sit for a standardized test in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies on grade level. While these students have accommodations and modifications the content of these exams is higher than their actual functional level by 2 or more years. School discussion between staff, parents, students and clinicians clearly indicates that the standardized assessment and the way it is being administered to our students is not a valid tool.