



# **P.S. 232Q**

**2008-09**

## **SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN (CEP)**

**School: 27/Q/232**

**Address: 153-23 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, Howard Beach, NY 11414**

**Telephone: (718) 848-9247**

**Fax: (718) 738-8505**

## **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. 232Q      **SCHOOL NAME:** The Walter Ward School

**DISTRICT:** 27      **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** Knowledge Network

**SCHOOL ADDRESS:** 153-23 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, Howard Beach, NY 11414

**SCHOOL TELEPHONE:** (718) 848-9247      **FAX:** (718) 738-8505

**SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON:** Lisa Josephson, Principal      **EMAIL ADDRESS:** ljoseph3@schools.nyc.gov

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON**      Susan Vigliarolo

**PRINCIPAL**      Lisa A. Josephson

**UFT CHAPTER LEADER**      Robert Sentnor

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION  
PRESIDENT**      Amy Prince/Kim Morales

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

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SUPERINTENDENT**      Michele Lloyd-Bey

**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
Lisa A. Josephson	*Principal or Designee	
Robert Sentnor	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Amy Prince/Kim Morales	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-Presidents	
Susan Vigliarolo	Leadership Chair	
Lois Maglione	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
Shelley Brous	Teacher	
Carol Panico	Parent	
Josephine Carney	Parent	
Nyree Suazo	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 232 is a diverse school with high academic and social expectations for all students. That's what makes our school work! It is culturally diverse and all school members respect one another. We provide a safe and nurturing school environment where everyone knows everyone in our 'home away from home'!

We are in transition, moving from an original K-5 elementary school into a K-8 school. We will finally become a K-8 school in Sept., 2008, and so far, the transition has been a smooth one due to our committed faculty and organizational expertise. We are proud of the fact that we now provide a curriculum that educates the whole child – academically, socially, and creatively. We have a history of instructional excellence, and now we are working on expanding an extra curricula program that includes sports and the creative arts.

As a two-year member of the LSO Knowledge Network, our kindergarten teachers began last year to plan and integrate Core Knowledge themes into the kindergarten curriculum. As a result, our 5 year olds are learning how to read and write as they are introduced to content area literature about their community, the Pilgrims, Ancient Egypt, and the continents of the world.

With respect to the future, it is our philosophy that each student possess a broad knowledge base that will strengthen their writing. The Core Knowledge philosophy transitioned into our 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade classrooms this September of 2008. Core Knowledge will be woven into our curriculum throughout the school in September, 2009.

A third year push for technological advancement will be made this year. Tiffany Concilio, our full-time technology teacher continues to build a comprehensive computer program that enables our students in grades 5 – 8 to develop extensive computer skills beyond word-processing. She has also conducted several workshops throughout the year for our teachers, and collaborates and integrates her program with each teacher's instructional goals and objectives. In addition, budgetary decisions were made to purchase an additional 75 laptops for three classrooms (401, 7-130, 7-703) and two more smart-boards (7-130, 7-703). Our plan for the new school year is to place class sets of laptops in every 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade classroom and a smart-board and projector in every classroom on our 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. This plan includes professional development for all staff members to learn how to use the smartboard and other technology. Our school placed first and second in the citywide "ThinkQuest" competition and our tech teacher won "Coach of the Year".

An emphasis on intensive and ongoing professional development in all areas has effectively improved our literacy and math program, which is evident in our improving reading and math scores. The principal and two assistant principals, two literacy coaches, one math coach, and other teachers on staff provide extensive professional development with an emphasis this year on Writer's Workshop (with a focus on the mini-lesson) and conferencing during independent reading, guided reading and writing.

In mathematics, our emphasis is on making math language connections, creating math workshop model classrooms, and lesson development in the newly approved Pearson Math Program (gr. 6 - 8). Our plan is to maintain the goals of our Professional Development Program and to include future topics as follows:

- Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarking
- Teaching Reading Strategies using Content Area Materials
- Developing Interactive Math Centers
- Test Sophistication

One of our most enjoyable accomplishments has been the addition of both our After-school Academy and Saturday Morning Academy. As a result of last year's data from the Learning Environment Survey, both parents and students expressed their concern with the lack of creative arts and extra-curricula activities in our school. Our goal last year was to provide an after-school program for students in grades 5-7 that included both academic and extra-curricula activities. For Sept., 2008, we have provided the same program for our grade 6-8 students. On Mondays and Tuesdays, the program emphasizes ELA and Mathematics Test Sophistication and on Wednesdays and Thursdays, our students have a choice of the following:

- Basketball Team
- Cheerleading Squad
- Science Lab Club
- Think-Quest Computer Club
- Ezra Jack Keats Book-Making Club (Writing and Art)
- School Band
- Robotics

On Saturday mornings, our 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> graders come to a 3 hour program that emphasizes both hands-on math and science. Both classes provide experiences that will help them on the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade state exams and next year's 4<sup>th</sup> grade Science exam. On Mondays and Tuesdays, we also have an ELL program for our students who need additional language enrichment.

This year, our music program has expanded into a school-wide program. Ms. Kupferman, our music teacher, has begun to build a comprehensive music program that includes the following:

- Music Appreciation that compliments Content Area Themes in K-2 (Core Knowledge)
- Recorder lessons in Grade 3
- 7<sup>th</sup> Grade School Chorus
- School Band
- Winter and Spring Concerts

Since Ms. Kupferman cannot logistically instruct all 37 classes, we additionally hired Tor Snyder, a part-time music teacher from a local community agency – 144 Music, Inc. He also provides instruction to those classes not covered by Ms. Kupferman and also teaches guitar lessons to our sixth graders on Wednesdays and Fridays.

## **Trends**

Past year's trends have shown that our students display strong literacy and math skills, which impact all curricula areas. As evidenced by our test results, our general education students have shown steady

growth. At present, 86% of our students are meeting the standards (levels 3 & 4) in ELA, and 97% are meeting standards in mathematics. Since the last school year, the results for all tested students indicate a 13% increase in ELA and a 15.4% increase in math.

Physical space availability continues to be a great concern. We've had to think 'out-of-the-box' and carefully utilize space for everyone, including four additional 8th grade classrooms. Two occupational and one physical therapist work out of an area that used to be a bathroom. Both of our speech teachers share a large supply closet. Most of our coaches and academic intervention teachers service students are in closets or on the auditorium stage. Classes in the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade are going outside into our portable classrooms, and 3<sup>rd</sup> grades will be consolidated in order to create room for our 8<sup>th</sup> grade. As a result, class size has increased significantly and we have lost our art lab to create the room we need. This also creates a problem during testing time when we need small group testing.

A key area of concern each year always seems to be in the achievement of our Special Education students. Of the 87 students categorized as 'students with disabilities', only 16% are level 3 and above in ELA, and only 40% are level 3 and above in mathematics. We continue to analyze our yearly data for each 'Special Needs' child and individualize an educational plan for each one. Last year, all seven Special Education teachers became Wilson certified, which has enabled them to integrate Wilson or Foundations' activities into their balanced literacy block. We've also 'streamed' students by reading level. We also added a full-time 'pull-out' Wilson teacher who services small groups for both Special Education and General Education students (about 40 students). We continue to target their weaknesses and strengths: decoding, encoding, comprehension, etc. We also hired an F-status teacher to pull out grades 3, 4, and 5 boys from self-contained classrooms to receive AIS in both reading and math. The focus of one of our Inquiry Teams is on 15 students that we've chosen to follow throughout the school year. As we analyze daily, weekly, and monthly hard and soft data, we make recommendations for improvement.

We have a strong Parent Teacher Association that consists of a small group of approximately twenty devoted parents that plan and organize many of our school events for both students and staff. The PTA is led by Amy Prince and Kim Morales, our co-Presidents who work very closely with our administration. A concerted effort has always been made to get more parents and teachers involved because it seems that the small group of devoted parents are the same ones doing all of the organizing. Both our Co-Presidents and our school's Parent Coordinator, Debra Falcone, continue to reach out by providing monthly PTA meetings and workshops. The administration continues to reach out through monthly calendars and the Principal's monthly newsletter. We collaborate with our parent association and schedule events together that will bring more parents into the building.

**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 232Q								
<b>District:</b>	27	<b>DBN #:</b>	27/Q/232	<b>School BEDS Code #:</b>	342700010232					
DEMOGRAPHICS										
<b>Grades Served in 2008-09:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> X K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1X	<input type="checkbox"/> 2X	<input type="checkbox"/> 3X	<input type="checkbox"/> 4X	<input type="checkbox"/> 5X	<input type="checkbox"/> 6X	<input type="checkbox"/> 7X	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8X	<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		93.4	93.6	TBD			
Kindergarten	101	93	98							
Grade 1	91	106	110	<b>Student Mobility:</b>						
Grade 2	107	98	106	(% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008			
Grade 3	107	97	96		TBD	TBD	TBD			
Grade 4	102	114	103							
Grade 5	136	102	119	<b>Eligible for Free Lunch:</b>						
Grade 6	0	89	82	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007			
Grade 7	0	0	81		44.9	46.4	26.4			
Grade 8	0	0	0							
Grade 9	0	0	0	<b>Students in Temporary Housing:</b>						
Grade 10	0	0	0	(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008			
Grade 11	0	0	0		1	0	TBD			
Grade 12	0	0	0							
Ungraded Elementary	2	0	0	<b>Recent Immigrants:</b>						
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0	(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008			
Total	646	699	795		0	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	77	72	72							
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	0	Principal Suspensions	1	1	TBD			
Number all others	0	0	0	Superintendent Suspensions	0	0	TBD			
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>										

				<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	45	48	40	<b>Number of Staff:</b>			
IEPs and ESL	5	4	0	(As of October 31; includes all full and part-time staff)	2006	2007	2008
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	46	49	57
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	16	8	14
<b>Overage Students:</b>				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	2	TBD	1
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008				
	0	0	0				
				<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	0.2	0.1	0.4	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	76.1	65.3	68.4
Black or African American	7.7	8.3	8.6		78.3	69.4	63.2
Hispanic or Latino	36.8	37.9	38.9	Percent Masters Degree or higher	96.0	94.0	91.0
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	15.5	14.3	13.6		86.7	98.8	95.6
White	39.8	39.3	39.5	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)			
Multi-racial	TBD	TBD	TBD				
Male	52.0	53.2	52.7				
Female	48.0	46.8	47.3				

### 2008-09 TITLE I STATUS

<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Title I		
<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"/>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:		
<b>Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1	
<input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)	
<input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Restructured – Year ____	<input type="checkbox"/> School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____		

Individual Subject/Area Ratings	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA:			ELA:		
	Math:			Math:		
	Science:			Grad. Rate:		
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:						
Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	/	/	/			
<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	X	/	---			
Limited English Proficient	----	----	----			
Economically Disadvantaged	/	/	/			
<b>Student groups making AYP in each subject</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Key: AYP Status</b>						
√	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			
<i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i>						

### CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08	
Overall Letter Grade	B	Overall Evaluation:	Well developed
Overall Score	66.3	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Well developed
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	10.3	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Well developed
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	16.3	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well developed
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	30.7	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Well developed
Additional Credit	9.0+	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Well developed
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

## **SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

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

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

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

### **Greatest Accomplishments**

An emphasis on intensive and ongoing professional development in all areas has effectively improved our literacy and math program, which is evident in our high reading and math scores. The principal and assistant principal, two literacy coaches, one math coach, and other teachers on staff provide extensive professional development with an emphasis this year on Writer's Workshop (with a focus on the mini-lesson) and conferencing during independent reading, guided reading and writing. In mathematics, our emphasis is on making math language connections, creating math workshop model classrooms, and lesson development in the Impact Math Program (gr. 6 – 8). Our plan is to maintain the goals of our Professional Development Program and to include future topics as follows:

- Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarking
- Teaching Reading Strategies
- Developing Math Centers
- Test Sophistication

One of our most enjoyable accomplishments has been the addition of both our After-school Academy and Saturday Morning Academy. As a result of last year's data from the Learning Environment Survey, both parents and students expressed their concern with the lack of creative arts and extra-curricula activities in our school. Our goal this year was to provide an after-school program for students in grades 6-8 that included both academic and extra-curricula activities. On Mondays and Tuesdays, the program emphasizes ELA and Mathematics Test Sophistication and on Wednesdays and Thursdays, our students have a choice of the following:

- Basketball Team
- Cheerleading Squad
- Science Lab Club
- Think-Quest Computer Club
- Robotics
- School Band

On Saturday mornings, our 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> graders come to a 3 hour program that emphasizes both hands-on math and science. Both classes provide experiences that will help them on the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade state exams and next year's 4<sup>th</sup> grade Science exam. On Mondays and Tuesdays, we also have an ELL program for our students who need additional language enrichment.

This year, our music program has expanded into a school-wide program. We hired Lindsay Kupferman, our first full-time, licensed music teacher ever! Ms. Kupferman has begun to build a comprehensive music program that includes the following:

- Music Appreciation that compliments Content Area Themes in K-2
- Recorder lessons in Grade 3
- 7<sup>th</sup> Grade School Chorus
- School Band
- Winter and Spring Concerts

Since Ms. Kupferman cannot logistically instruct all 35 classes, we additionally hired Tor Snyder, a part-time music teacher from a local community agency – 144 Music, Inc. He also provides instruction to those classes not covered by Ms. Kupferman and also teaches guitar lessons to our sixth graders.

Past year's trends have shown that our students display strong literacy and math skills, which impact all curricula areas. As evidenced by our test results, our general education students have shown steady growth. At present, 86% of our students are meeting the standards (levels 3 & 4) in ELA, and 97% are meeting standards in mathematics. Since last school year, the results for all tested students indicate a 13% increase in ELA and a 15.4% increase in math.

### **Aids/Barriers/Trends**

Physical space availability continues to be a great concern. We've had to think 'out-of-the-box' and carefully utilize space for everyone, including four additional 7<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms. Two occupational and one physical therapist work out of an area that used to be a bathroom. Both of our speech teachers share a large supply closet. Most of our coaches and academic intervention teachers service students in closets or on the auditorium stage. Classes in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grades will be consolidated in order to create room for our 8<sup>th</sup> grade classes in September 2008. As a result, class size has increased significantly and we are afraid of losing our art and lower grade science lab to create the room we need.

A key area of concern each year always seems to be in the achievement of our Special Education students. Of the 87 students categorized as 'students with disabilities', only 16% are level 3 and above in ELA, and only 40% are level 3 and above in mathematics. We continue to analyze our yearly data for each 'Special Needs' child and individualize an educational plan for each one. This year, all seven Special Education teachers became Wilson certified, which has enabled them to integrate Wilson activities into their balanced literacy block. We've also 'streamed' students by reading level. We also added a full-time 'pull-out' Wilson teacher who services small groups for both Special Education and General Education students (about 40 students). We continue to target their weaknesses and strengths: decoding, encoding, comprehension, etc. The focus of our Inquiry Team is on 15 students that we've chosen to follow throughout the school year. As we analyze daily, weekly, and monthly hard and soft data, we make recommendations for improvement.

We have a strong Parent Teacher Association that consists of a small group of approximately twenty devoted parents that plan and organize many of our school events for both students and staff. The PTA is led by Amy Prince and Kim Morales, our co-Presidents who work very closely with our administration. A concerted effort has always been made to get more parents and teachers involved because it seems that the small group of devoted parents are the same ones doing all of the organizing. Both our Co-Presidents and our school's Parent Coordinator, Debra Falcone, continue to reach out by providing monthly PTA meetings and workshops. The administration continues to reach out through monthly calendars and the Principal's monthly newsletter. We collaborate with our parent association and schedule events together that will bring more parents into the building.

Past year's trends have shown that our students display strong literacy and math skills, which impact all curricula areas. As evidenced by our test results, our general education students have shown steady growth. At present, 86% of our students are meeting the standards (levels 3 & 4) in ELA, and 97% are meeting standards in mathematics. Since the last school year, the results for all tested students indicate a 13% increase in ELA and a 15.4% increase in math.

Another noticeable trend was a drop in ELA scores in fifth grade. As we study our data yearly, we've noticed that in 2007, our fifth graders dropped from 71.8% to 58.3% in levels 3 and 4. In 2008, our fifth grade scores gradually climbed back up to 61.3%. We determined that several students needed additional literacy support in both general and special education.

## SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

---

- I. **Twenty of thirty students (60%) in the subgroup, students performing on the lowest level with a focus on boys in special education in grades 3-6, will demonstrate reading growth on the predictive scale scores from the fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009.**
- II. **Twenty-five of forty (63%) students in the subgroup, students performing on the lowest level with a focus on 5<sup>th</sup> grade students, will demonstrate mathematics growth on the predictive scale scores from the fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009.**
- III. **To move 75% of students in K-2 (262 out of 350 students), three or more Fountas & Pinnell levels from the fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009.**
- IV. **Fifteen students in grade 3 (13%) and 15 students in grades 4/5 (15%) will use context clues to determine meaning 80% (8 of 10) of the time when answering multiple choice questions on teacher made assessments.**
- V. **Throughout the 2008-2009 schoolyear, 20 of 40 (50%) classroom teachers will have the opportunity to observe best practices in classroom instruction through interclass and network school inter-visitations.**

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

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

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>Twenty of thirty students (60%) in the subgroup, students performing on the lowest level with a focus on boys in special education in grades 3-6, will demonstrate reading growth on the predictive scale scores from the fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>We will provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fund AIS teacher for pull-out program</li> <li>• Select Signatures program for AIS</li> <li>• Benchmark three times a year to show growth in Fountas &amp; Pinnel reading levels</li> <li>• Schedule all boys to use Study Island in reading</li> <li>• Schedule common preparation periods with classroom teachers</li> <li>• Work with data specialist to deepen staff awareness and understanding of hard and soft data</li> <li>• Professional development in skills and strategy instruction</li> <li>• Study Groups</li> <li>• Observations</li> </ul>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisors – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Teachers – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Literacy Coach – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Push-in/Pull-out AIS Teachers – Tax Levy/Contracts for Excellence</li> <li>• SETTS Teacher – Tax Levy</li> </ul>

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment  
Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains

- Predictive scale scores from Fall 2008 to Spring 2009
- Interval review will be Nov. 1st, Feb. 1st and May 1st

<b>Subject/Area:</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>
<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>Twenty-five of forty (63%) students in the subgroup, students performing on the lowest level with a focus on 5<sup>th</sup> grade students, will demonstrate mathematics growth on the predictive scale scores from the fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>We will provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fund AIS teacher for pull-out/push-in program</li> <li>• Schedule 5<sup>th</sup> grade subgroup to use Study Island for math</li> <li>• Schedule common preparation periods with classroom teachers</li> <li>• Work with data specialist to deepen staff awareness and understanding of hard and soft data</li> <li>• Observations</li> <li>• Study Groups</li> <li>• Intervisitations</li> </ul>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisors – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Teachers – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Mathematics Coach – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Push-in/Pull-out AIS Teachers – Tax Levy/Contracts for Excellence</li> <li>• SETTS Teacher – Tax Levy</li> </ul>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Predictive scale scores from Fall 2008 to Spring 2009</li> <li>• Interim Review will be after each Everyday Math unit test</li> </ul>

**Subject/Area (where relevant):**  
**English Language Arts**  
**(Reading)**

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To move 75% of students in K-2, three or more Fountas &amp; Pinnell levels from the fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009 (262 out of 350 students).</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>We will provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmark three times a year to show growth in Fountas &amp; Pinnell reading levels</li> <li>• ECLAS 2 data</li> <li>• Teacher conference notes</li> <li>• Terra Nova bimonthly data</li> <li>• Use of Study Island in the computer center</li> </ul>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisors – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Teachers – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Literacy Coach – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Push-in/Pull-out AIS Teachers – Tax Levy</li> <li>• SETTS Teacher – Tax Levy</li> <li>• Wilson Teacher – Tax Levy</li> <li>• ELL Teacher – Tax Levy</li> <li>• F-Status Reading Specialist – Tax Levy</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare Fountas and Pinnell levels from fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009.</li> <li>• Interval review of progress will be Nov. 1st, Feb. 1st and May 1st</li> </ul>

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Fifteen students in grade 3 (13%) and 15 students in grades 4/5 (15%) will use context clues to determine meaning 80% (8 of 10) of the time when answering multiple choice questions on teacher made assessments.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>We will provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fund AIS teacher for pull-out/push-in program</li><li>• Guided Reading/Shared Reading lessons devoted to context clues</li><li>• Schedule 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade subgroup to use Study Island for the specific skill of 'context clues'</li><li>• Interval review of progress will be three times a year using context clue teacher made assessment</li></ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supervisors – Tax Levy</li><li>• Teachers – Tax Levy</li><li>• Literacy Coach – Tax Levy</li><li>• Push-in/Pull-out AIS Teachers – Tax Levy</li><li>• F-Status Reading Specialist – Tax Levy</li></ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Compare levels from fall of 2008 to the spring of 2009.</li><li>• Interval review of context clues progress will be Nov. 1st, Feb. 1st and May 1<sup>st</sup></li><li>• Compare Study Island data progress</li></ul>

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Throughout the 2008-2009 schoolyear, 20 of 40 (50%) classroom teachers will have the opportunity to observe best practices in classroom instruction through interclass and network school inter-visitations.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Principal’s Cabinet will determine through data analysis which schools exhibit best practices in areas that address our goals</li><li>• The Principal will provide and schedule inter-class and inter-school visitations for classroom teachers to observe other teachers who exhibit best practices in meeting our goals through differentiation and fluid grouping</li><li>• The School Mentor will recommend and help determine specific needs of new teachers on staff</li></ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supervisors – Tax Levy</li><li>• Teachers – Tax Levy</li><li>• Literacy Coaches – Tax Levy</li><li>• Math Coaches – Tax Levy</li><li>• New Teacher Mentor – Tax Levy</li></ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Teacher Survey</li><li>• The Learning Environment Survey</li><li>• Teacher Observations</li><li>• Administrator Observations/Snapshots</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	4	0	N/A	N/A	2	0	0	0
1	30	0	N/A	N/A	1	0	0	0
2	22	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
3	16	16	N/A	N/A	1	0	0	0
4	11	13	10	6	2	0	0	0
5	17	10	6	6	1	0	0	0
6	28	26	5	6	0	0	0	0
7	15	17	5	5	0	0	0	0
8	12	14	4	3	0	0	0	0
9					N/A			
10					N/A			
11					N/A			
12					N/A			

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

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

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

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	<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> <p>Mrs. Giamundo – 1<sup>st</sup>            Ms. Ansell – 2<sup>nd</sup>            Ms. Durso – 3<sup>rd</sup>            Ms. Honan – 4<sup>th</sup>            Ms. Dalva - 5-6<sup>th</sup>            Mr. Sawczyk – 7-8<sup>th</sup>            Ms. Griffin – Wilson            Ms. Weschler - Enrichment</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. During School Day (K-8)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wilson – small targeted group</li> <li>• One-to-One – Tutoring of Holdovers, K-3</li> <li>• Academic Intervention Groups – Push In Gr. 1-3, Pull Out Gr. 4-8</li> <li>• Leap Frog – small targeted groups in Gr. 2-3</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. After School Academy (Gr. 6-8)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class Groups of 15 targeting ELA skills and test sophistication in math and science</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Saturday Morning Academy (Gr. 3-5)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class Groups of 15 targeting ELA skills and test sophistication in math and science</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<p><b>Mathematics:</b></p> <p>Mr. Gutmann – 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>            Ms. Vigliarolo – 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup>            Mr. Trager – 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>            Ms. Weschler- Enrichment</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. During the School Day (K-8)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One-to-One – Tutoring of Holdovers, K-3</li> <li>• Academic Intervention Groups – Push In Gr. 3-6</li> <li>• Lunchtime Tutoring – Gr. 7-8</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. After School Academy (Gr. 6-8)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class Groups of 15 targeting math skills and test sophistication</li> <li>• Class Groups of 15 targeting problem solving skills for Robotics</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Saturday Morning Academy (Gr. 3-5)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class Groups of 15 targeting math skills and test sophistication</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<p><b>Science:</b></p> <p>Mr. Trager – 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>            Mr. Gutmann – 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During school day, pushing into science lab for small group intervention</li> </ul>
<p><b>Social Studies:</b></p> <p>Mr. Trager – 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>            Mr. Gutmann – 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup>            Mr. Sawczyk – 7-8<sup>th</sup></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During school day pushing into classrooms for small group intervention</li> </ul>

<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b>	Daily guidance intervention services during the school day.
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	Daily psychologist's intervention services during the school day.
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	Daily social worker's intervention services during the school day.
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>	N/A

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

*NCLB/SED requirement for all schools*

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

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

---

Type of Program: \_\_\_ Bilingual \_\_X\_\_ ESL \_\_\_ Both      Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08:   31    
(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.

**I. Instructional Program:**

**The Walter Ward School (PS 232) in Howard Beach, Queens provides a free-standing English as a Second Language instruction to forty-one (41) Language instruction to forty-one (41) mainstreamed and special education students. The main objective of the ESL program is to equip all ELL's (English Language Learners) with tested instructional strategies that will enable them to develop English and improve academic skills. To accomplish this goal, PS 232 has allotted 400 instructional minutes for the beginning and intermediate levels and 250 instructional minutes for the advanced level. (The state mandates 360 minutes for beginning and intermediate levels and 180 minutes for advanced level.) On top of the added instructional minutes, an after-school program designed solely for English Language Learners from October to April of the school year.**

**The instructional strategies and techniques being employed by the state certified ESL teacher supplement any instructional approach used by the classroom teachers. Team teaching and push-in strategies are being implemented on some grade levels. Weekly consultations with the classroom teachers are scheduled. Instructions are based on activating prior knowledge and recognizing the strong correlation between literacy in the first and second languages. English Language Learners participate in read-alouds, interdependent dialogues, partner and echo reading, shadow and whisper reading, silent reading, shared reading, independent reading, and a wide variety of writing activities on a daily basis. In addition, ESL students receive content-based instructions that will enable them to meet standards in Math, Science, Social Studies and Computer Technology.**

- 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.

**II. Parent/Community:**

**Professional Development with parents – ‘ELL Parent Orientation’ and ‘Strategies That Work at Home’ led by ESL teacher/Parent Coordinator. Parents of English Language Learners have a very important role in their children’s education. They can improve and maintain their children’s achievement and can also participate as a group to have a voice in the program’s and the school’s decision-making process. Among the parent involvement opportunities are the following:**

- **Parent-Teacher conferences using the language parents feel most comfortable with or using translators**
- **Parents are invited to visit the school on one of their vacation days or work holidays to observe teachers and students in the classroom**
- **Parents of ELL’s can volunteer to assist teachers in the classroom, on class trips, in class parties, in the cafeteria, library, etc.**
- **Parents can also come to school as students for family literacy workshops and education such as learning the second language or be familiar with computers.**
- **Parents can also be involved at the school as audiences for student performances, assemblies or exhibits.**

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

- 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.

**IV. Staff Development:**

**Staff Development programmed at PS 232 for 2008-2009 will provide opportunities for teachers to have renewed confidence in dealing with teachers to have renewed confidence in dealing with ESL students. The activities set for the school-year would demonstrate development and learning for both students and teachers:**

- **Mandated staff development sessions for new staff and teachers of ELL’s**
- **Monthly scheduled district/regional sponsored staff development sessions for ESL are echoed to the classroom teachers**
- **Teacher demonstrations of tested learning and teaching strategies**
- **Scheduled conferences to discuss continuous study of research on writing, reading and English as a Second Language**
- **Review of instructional strategies to help ELL’s maximize learning potential**
- **Decision-making activities to help teachers pursue their own professional development**

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

**V. Support services provided to LEP students:**

- **Tutoring is the 37.5 minutes a day, Monday through Thursday city mandated support service devoted to reading and math intervention**
- **Wilson Reading System is based on research and Orton-Gillingham philosophy. It provides a teacher-friendly, comprehensive program that incorporates the principles of teaching reading and writing. Its essential components are phonemic awareness, decoding alphabetic principle (sound/symbol relationship), encoding (spelling), advanced word analysis, vocabulary development, right word instruction, metacognition, fluency and comprehension strategies.**
- **Speech and Language Therapy is a related service that is delivered to I.E.P. mandated students. These students have expressive receptive, pragmatic, fluency, motoric and/or phonological difficulties that affect their academic performance. Therapy is given a minimum of two times per week in 30 minute sessions.**

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.

N/A

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

School Building: \_\_\_\_\_ PS 232 \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_ 27Q \_\_\_\_\_

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 1 Teacher
Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**				
Bilingual Program	<b>ESL Program 1</b>	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

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District:        27Q                                School Building:    PS 232Q

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>1</b>	From:8:15 To:9:05 a.m.	Subject (Specify) <b>Social Studies</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Science</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Literature</b>	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
<b>2</b>	From:9:10 To:10:00 a.m.	Subject (Specify) <b>Social Studies</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Science</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Literature</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Math</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Literature</b>
<b>3</b>	From:10:05 To:10:55 a.m.	Subject (Specify) <b>Social Studies</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Science</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Literature</b>	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
<b>4</b>	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
<b>5</b>	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
<b>6</b>	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
<b>7</b>	From:1:45 To:2:35 p.m.	Subject (Specify) <b>Social Studies</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Science</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Literature</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Math</b>	Subject (Specify) <b>Literature</b>
<b>8</b>	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
<b>9</b>	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)
<b>10</b>	From: To:	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)	Subject (Specify)

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (Bilingual)

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

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

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

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

**Form TIII – A (1)(a)**

**Grade Level(s)** K-8 \_\_\_\_\_ **Number of Students to be Served:** 42 **LEP** \_\_\_\_\_ **Non-LEP**

**Number of Teachers** 1 **Other Staff (Specify)** \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Title III, Part A LEP Program**

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

---

P.S. 232, the Walter Ward School in Howard Beach Queens provides a freestanding English as a Second Language instructions to forty-one (41) mainstreamed and special education students. The main objective of the ESL program is to equip all ELL's (English Language Learner) with tested instructional strategies that will enable them to develop English and improve academic skills. To accomplish this goal, PS 232 has allotted 400 instructional minutes for the beginning and intermediate levels and 250 instructional minutes for the advanced level. (The state mandates 360 minutes for beginners and intermediate and 180 minutes for advanced). On top of the added instructional minutes, an after school program designed for English Language Learners is scheduled for October to April of the current school year. Other support services such as tutoring, speech and language, and Wilson Reading System are also provided to English Language Learners.

The instructional strategies and techniques being employed the state certified ESL teacher supplement and instructional approach used by the classroom teachers. Team teaching and push-in strategies will be implemented in some grade levels. Instructions are based on activating prior knowledge and recognizing the strong correlation between literacy in the first and second languages. English Language Learners participate in read-alouds, interdependent dialogues, partner and echo reading, shadow and whisper reading, silent reading, shared reading, independent reading and a wide variety of writing activities on a daily basis. In addition, ESL students receive content-based instructions that will enable them to meet standards in Math, Science, Social Studies and Computer Technology.

**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.

---

Staff Development sessions programmed at PS 232 for 2008-2009 provide opportunities for teachers to have renewed confidence in dealing with ESL students. The activities set for the school year would demonstrate development and learning for both students and teachers:

- Mandated staff development sessions for new staff and teachers of ESL students.
- Monthly scheduled district/regional sponsored staff development for ESL is echoed to the classroom teachers.
- Teacher demonstrations of tested learning and teaching strategies.
- Review of instructional strategies to help ELL’s maximizes learning potential.
- Scheduled conferences to discuss continuous study of research on writing, reading and English as a Second Language.

**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)	\$10,443.00	Afterschool ELL Academy (Mondays and Tuesdays)
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts		
Supplies and materials	\$4,557.00	Supplies and materials for daily instruction and afterschool instruction
Travel		
Other		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$15,000.00</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.

#### **Parent Surveys**

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 Parent Coordinator and ESL Teacher held several workshops for parents, and as a result, informed us of the common languages spoken by our parents.**

#### **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.

**One of our faculty members will translate letters and announcements when possible. We have a number of staff members that speak Spanish. We also have parent volunteers who will help us translate during conferences and workshops.**

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.

**One of our faculty members will translate letters and announcements when possible. We have a number of staff members that speak Spanish. We also have parent volunteers who will help us translate during conferences and workshops.**

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>.

**We will follow Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 to the best of our ability. Several faculty members and one school para professional will translate whenever possible in the following languages:**

- Spanish
- Arabic
- Polish
- Urdu

**Parental notices will be sent in English and other targeted languages (named above) informing parents of the availability of translation and interpretation services at the school. In addition, a copy of such notification will be posted in a prominent location near the main office of the school and on the parent coordinator's "Bulletin Board for Parents".**

## **APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS**

*All Title I schools must complete this appendix.*

### **Directions:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
  - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
  - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
    - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
    - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
    - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
    - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
    - o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.
8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.
10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

#### **Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS**

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

1. Use program resources to help participating children meet the State standards.

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

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

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

**NCLB/SED Status:** \_\_\_\_\_ **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 (SURR).**

*All SURR schools must complete this appendix.*

**SURR Area(s) of Identification:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SURR Group/Phase:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Year of Identification:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Deadline Year:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

<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.

***We presently have a professional development team that can also serve as our “curriculum committee”. The role of the committee will be to review the curriculum and instructional materials in order to assess our own instructional program.***

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

**XX**  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?

***Our goals and objectives change periodically, and as a team, we will need to review our needs and best practices in English Language Arts, math, social studies, science, physical education, and the arts. The evidence that supports this periodic change is a variety of both hard and soft data (state scores, interim assessment data, ECLAS data, running records, teacher-made assessment data, rubric-based portfolio work, etc.)***

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 will address this issue in a collaborative way. As a committee, we will analyze our periodic data every eight weeks and set goals that will affect our instructional program.***

---

**1B. Mathematics**

**Background**

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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.

***This finding is not relevant to our school's mathematical instructional program. We have paced out those Everyday Math skills that are essential by grade, based on the NYS standards. We also did the same with the pacing of grades 6, 7 and 8 since we were approved to use Pearson Mathematics program instead of Impact Mathematics.***

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

Applicable **XXX**  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?

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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

---

## **KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION**

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

### **2A – ELA Instruction**

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

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

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 administrators (principal, two asst. principals) will review instruction during formal and informal classroom observations. We will also utilize the feedback we receive from our math and two literacy coaches who are in the classrooms working with teachers.***

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

XXX  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?

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

***These findings are evident here at PS 232, but we also find that our staff use other instructional methods also. Our findings are that direct instruction is the dominant instructional orientation for ELA instruction in our K–8 classrooms, but we also engage in small group and 1:1 conferencing.***

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.

***We will continue to use a variety of teaching styles.***

---

### ***2B – Mathematics Instruction***

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (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 will address this issue in a collaborative way. The administration, in collaboration with the math coach who actively works in classrooms with teachers, will observe both formally and informally, to set goals that will affect our instructional program.***

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

Applicable **XXX**  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?

---

<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.

***Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades are rarely observed in our school. Other than the initial mini-lesson, our teachers are trained to group children accordingly by data from Acuity and unit tests, so that grouping takes place during the practice component. Math centers have been established so that students can receive additional work to strengthen skills. Our math center is not a hub for materials; it is used as a working, breathing center. Technology use in mathematics classes is used often. We have smartboards and laptops in every classroom in grades 5-8.***

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.

***Even though this finding is not applicable, we will continue to assess and continue to grow.***

---

### **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 principal and hiring committee engages in a lengthy hiring process to make sure that the highest-qualified teacher gets the job. The process includes a model lesson and a video tape of a small group lesson. Once hired, our teachers receive a mandated new teacher mentor, but that relationship continues throughout their second year. Weekly sessions are organized so that the mentor and mentee can discuss best practices.***

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

Applicable    **XXX**  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?

***Our school does not have a high turn-over rate.***

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

---

#### **KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

***A survey will be disseminated to receive feedback.***

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

XXX  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?

***Even though there is a variety of professional development available to our ESL teacher and classroom teachers, they rarely commit to it. Most teachers think that it is the sole responsibility of the ESL teacher, and they rarely differentiate for the ELL students in the classroom. We happen to have a very committed ESL teacher who follows a reader's workshop model in his classroom. Through the read aloud, shared reading, and guided reading, our students are able to test out of ESL in two to three years.***

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.

***We will make sure that our classroom teachers get the support they need. Our ESL teacher will conduct in-house professional development as needed. Advertisement of outside-sponsored p.d. will be replicated and placed in their mailboxes.***

### **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.

***Testing data, does exist in our school and it is reported to all teachers involved in instructing ELLs . It is provided in a timely manner useful for informing instruction. The data is disaggregated by proficiency level by our ESL teacher and time is then scheduled for him to meet with each individual teacher. This is done three times a year so that classroom teachers can also analyze student work that originates in the ESL lab.***

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

Applicable **XXX**  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?

***The above practices in 5.1 are evident and are a part of our best practices.***

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

---

### **KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

***We are constantly trying to fully implement the range and types of instructional approaches that will help our special education teachers to increase access to the general education curriculum and improve student performance. Many of our general education teachers are familiar with the content of the IEPs of their students with disabilities, and they are familiar with accommodations and modifications that would help support the students with disabilities in their classrooms. Our IEP teacher and our assistant principal in charge of special education will continue to monitor unfamiliarity and make sure that all teachers are fully compliant and informed through grade conferences and professional development.***

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

Applicable **XXX**  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?

***Our general and special education teachers are exposed to the same professional development in areas of reading, math, science and social studies. Both groups are also exposed to new ways of differentiating. Our special educ. teachers do not go to professional development solely created for them. Both groups share experiences and good teaching practices monthly. Our IEP teacher is an experience special educ. teacher who is the facilitator for all IEPs, under the direction of the asst. principal in charge of spec. educ. Together they make sure that ALL teachers have a copy of IEPs, that they know the disabilities and accommodations of all students.***

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

---

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

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

**UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008**

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.

***Our PPT team will engage in time to assess whether this finding is relevant to our school.***

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

**XXX**  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?

***IEPs do not regularly include behavioral plans—including behavioral goals and objectives—even for students with documented behavioral issues and concerns. We will assess this aspect of the IEP.***

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.

***If this finding is truly relevant, the SBST specialists will conduct training to our teachers.***

## CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

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

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

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

Submit date: **Jul 9, 2008**      Email address: **ljoseph3@schools.nyc.gov**

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

School DBN	27Q232
School Name	The Lindenwood School
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 82,003
Principal Name	Lisa A. Josephson
Principal Email	ljoseph3@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7188489247

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

- Yes  
 No

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

Creation of additional classrooms	
Reducing teacher-student ratio through team teaching strategies	\$ 82,003

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

- Yes  
 No

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

- Yes

No

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

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

For example:

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

C4E Target #2: 8 - Math - Students with Disabilities - 18 - 1 - 17

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

For example:

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

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

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

For example:

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

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

	Targeted Grade	Targeted Subject	Targeted Population	Students per Teacher 2007-08	# Classrooms / Sections Targeted
C4E Target #1	5	English Language Arts	Students with Low Academic Achievement	32	2
C4E Target #2					
C4E Target #3					
C4E Target #4					
C4E Target #5					
C4E Target #6					

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

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

Yes

No

---

**CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence**