



MICHAEL J. PETRIDES SCHOOL

2008-09

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN

(CEP)

SCHOOL: 31R080
ADDRESS: 715 OCEAN TERRACE, STATEN ISLAND, N.Y. 10301
TELEPHONE: (718) 815-0186
FAX: (718) 815-9638

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: 80 **SCHOOL NAME:** Michael J. Petrides

DISTRICT: 31 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** Empowerment Network 22

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 715 Ocean Terrace, Staten Island, New York 10301

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (718) 815-0186 **FAX:** (718) 815-9638

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Joanne Buckheit **EMAIL ADDRESS:** jbuckhe@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON Judith Bello

PRINCIPAL Joanne Buckheit

UFT CHAPTER LEADER Leah Cetera

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT** Laurie Daghestani

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools) Morgan Vazquez

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT** Linda Waite

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
Joanne Buckheit	*Principal or Designee	
Leah Cetera	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Laurie Daghestani	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
Morgan Vazquez	Student Representative, if applicable	
Judith Bello	High School Parent, Chairperson	
Lucia Chionchio	Elementary School Parent	
Elizabeth Clancy	Elementary School Parent	
Stephanie Hasandras	Middle School Teacher	
Terry Lombardi	Middle School Parent	
MaryAnne MacDermot	Middle School Parent	
Ann Olivieri	High School Teacher	
Tenaya Perry	High School Teacher	
Maria Premus	Elementary School Teacher	
Jacque Treglia	Middle School Teacher	
Wendy Vaphides	High School 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.

The Michael J. Petrides School is committed to creating an environment for learning that nurtures the "whole child" – mind, body, and spirit. Teachers, parents, administrators, and support staff collaborate to provide an education that celebrates the diversity of our students and recognizes the individuality and creativity of each child. Using alternative strategies as well as the organizational and programmatic approaches of a laboratory environment, we integrate the arts into a rigorous, interdisciplinary curriculum. We engage students in active learning, developing self-esteem and promoting literate, creative, lifelong learners.

The Michael J. Petrides School serves students in grades K through 12. Our unique organizational structure has allowed us to develop a truly seamless curriculum and provides us thirteen years to help our students earn a high school diploma. We are proud of our near perfect 4-year high school graduation rate (since 2001), and pleased that 95% of our graduates go on to attend 4-year colleges.

Classes are heterogeneously grouped K through 12. Our stimulating learning environment offers an accelerated, rigorous curriculum, including rich arts opportunities for all students. Our Middle School students participate in accelerated courses and take the following Regents exams at the end of 8th grade: Integrated Algebra, Living Environment, and U.S. History. (Historically, approximately 70% of them move on to high school with 6 high school credits, and three Regents exams in their pockets!) At the high school level, we offer Advanced Placement courses in most every discipline, with about half of our students taking advantage of the program.

Our distinctive organization allows many chances for intergenerational interaction. Our peer-teaching and peer-tutoring programs are unmatched.

The Petrides School provides a wide array of co-curricula and extra-curricula activities for students, including: (international) trips, competitive academic teams, clubs, musical performing groups, theatrical productions and competitive sports teams.

SECTION III – Cont'd

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	Michael J. Petrides School				
District:	31	DBN #:	31R080	School BEDS Code #:	353100011080

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec.		
Enrollment:				Attendance:					
(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(As of June 30 – % of days students attended)	2006	2007	2008		
Pre-K	0	0	0		93%	94.5	94.5		
Kindergarten	73	75	75						
Grade 1	74	73	75						
Grade 2	84	82	83	Student Mobility: (% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	84	83	84		99.3	99.2	99.4		
Grade 4	92	96	96						
Grade 5	92	93	96	Eligible for Free Lunch:					
Grade 6	98	98	99	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7	97	95	98		20.4	23.7	25.3		
Grade 8	100	96	91						
Grade 9	121	110	121	Students in Temporary Housing:					
Grade 10	113	120	111	(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11	104	107	115		1	1	1		
Grade 12	101	98	100						
Ungraded Elementary	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants:					
Ungraded Secondary	0	13	28	(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	1233	1241	1272		2	0	1		
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions:					
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	(Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	0	15	29						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	0	Principal Suspensions	64	83	83		
Number all others	97	97	125	Superintendent Suspensions	4	3	6		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
				Special High School Programs:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	1
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	17	27	30	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	0	1	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	76	78	83
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	5	6	5
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	4		7
	0	1	0				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender:				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	97	97.1	97.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4	0.4	0.4	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	72.7	81.4	86.1
Black or African American	16.1	16.7	17.1	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	66.7	64.3	66.7
Hispanic or Latino	15.1	15.7	17.1				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	7.3	7.7	8.1	Percent Masters Degree or higher	85	89	88
White	61.2	59.4	57.3	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	83.8	89.1	89.9
Multi-racial	0	0	0				
Male	51.7	52.7	50.9				
Female	48.3	47.3	49.1				

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

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Individual Subject/Area Ratings	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level	
	ELA:	170		ELA:	183
	Math:	178		Math:	189
	Science:	193		Grad. Rate:	96%

This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	√	√	√	√	√	√
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black or African American	√	√	-	-	-	-
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	-	-	-	-
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	√	√	-	-	-	-
White	√	√	√	√	√	√
Multiracial	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	√	√	-	-	-	-
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	-	-
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√	-	-	-
Student groups making AYP in each subject	559	560	383	101	101	101

Key: AYP Status

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

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

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08	
Overall Letter Grade	B/A	Overall Evaluation:	Well Developed
Overall Score	53.7/78.6	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Well Developed
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	8.7/11.5	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Well Developed
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	12.5/21.7	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well Developed
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	29.5/41.4	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Well Developed
Additional Credit	3/4	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Well Developed

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

- **Student performance as measured by NYS assessments in ELA and Math, has shown a decline in the number of students performing at Level 1 (far below grade level standards). Historical data also shows approximately 20% of students (in grades 3 through 8) performing at Level 2. While we have been successful in reducing the number of students performing at Level 1, we need to identify and meet the needs of Level 2 students to improve their performance.**
- **Initial student progress data revealed that only 40 % of our students demonstrated one year's progress in ELA based on the results of the Spring 2007 assessment. With focus on this area, student progress in ELA improved, with 58% of assessed students demonstrating one year's progress in the Spring of 2008. We need to continue our focus in this area.**
- **Our greatest accomplishment continues to be our near perfect 4-year high school graduation rate (since 2001). We continue to meet the individual needs of our students and ensure they meet the graduation requirements established by New York State.**
- **The loss of State Magnet Funding (2.3 million at its height) has caused organizational changes, such as increased class size, and the inability to offer academic intervention and tutoring services. This loss of funding combined with continuing budget reductions can be a barrier to our continued success.**

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.

- **In June 2009, 75% of all students in grades six-twelve (577 out of 770 students) will score a Level 3 or Level 4 on their final writing pieces as measured by internal rubrics.**
- **There will be a 3% overall increase in the number of students (17 of 569 students) performing at Level 3 or 4 on the NY State ELA assessments (for all tested students in grades 3 through 8.)**
- **There will be a 3% overall increase in the number of Middle School students (9 out of 294) performing at Level 3 or 4 on the NY State Mathematics assessment.**

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): Literacy

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>In June 2009, 75% of all students in grades six-twelve (577 out of 770 students) will score a Level 3 or Level 4 on their final writing pieces as measured by internal rubrics.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional team will review checklists/rubrics created by grade level teachers to ensure consistency in format and increased expectations per grade level. • Teachers will continue to use checklists/rubrics throughout the revision process of each Writing unit.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create position of Literacy Coach • Establish time for Instructional Team to meet regularly throughout the school year • Create opportunities for inter-grade and inter-component sharing
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students will use a checklist (K through 5) to assess their writing throughout a unit as a means by which to evaluate final, published pieces. • All students (grades 6 through 12) will use a rubric throughout a unit as a means by which to evaluate final published pieces.

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 1A: 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	Inquiry Team	Credit Recovery
	# 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	1	1					NA
1	9						NA
2	6						NA
3	18	15	15	15		10	NA
4	21	18	18	18		10	NA
5	18	15	15	15		10	NA
6	99	99	99	99	7	13	NA
7	94	94	94	94	21	17	NA
8	97	97	97	97	7	14	NA
9	10	8	4	3	5		0
10	10	10	10	10	8		5
11	12	15	10	8	11		7
12	8	5	3	2	7		15

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	<p>Reading Recovery: one to one intervention provided during the school day</p> <p>Study Skills: dedicated class meeting once each week</p> <p>Small Group Targeted Skills Instruction: provided during the school day</p> <p>Wilson Reading: small group instruction during the school day</p> <p>My Skills Tutor: targeted skills lessons (and on-line practice) assigned to individual students</p>
Mathematics:	<p>V-Math: small group instruction provided during the school day</p> <p>Study Skills: dedicated class meeting once each week</p> <p>Small Group Targeted Skills Instruction: small group instruction during the school day</p> <p>My Skills Tutor: targeted skills lessons (and on-line practice) assigned to individual students</p>
At-risk Guidance Services (Provided Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, Social Worker):	One to one and/or small group counseling sessions during the school day
Inquiry Team:	Small Group Targeted Skills Instruction provided during the school day
Credit Recovery	Early morning and late afternoon classes offer students the opportunity to earn additional credits.

APPENDIX 1B: ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT OPPORTUNITIES

	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	Foreign Language	Other
K						
1						
2						
3				84		
4			96			
5	96			10		
6			10	14	99	15
7		97	10	97	97	15
8	10	99	99	99	99	15
9	5			3		45
10	5		10	5		50
11	53		10	7	23	55
12	59	26		15	13	60

Part B. Description of Academic Enrichment Opportunities

Name of Academic Enrichment Opportunities	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Enrichment Opportunities
ELA:	Beats and Blues (Literary Magazine Publication) 5 th Grade Yearbook 8 th Grade Yearbook High School Yearbook Reader's Theater (5 th Grade) Advanced Placement Courses (High School)
Mathematics:	Math Team Accelerated Courses (Middle School) Advanced Placement Courses (High School)
Science:	Myth Busters (4th Grade) Middle School Robotics Team Civic Kids Initiative Accelerated Courses (Middle School) Advanced Placement Courses (High School)
Social Studies:	Around the World (3rd Grade) Kids Care Club Junior Statesmen of America Key Club Student Government Accelerated Courses (Middle School) Advanced Placement Courses (High School)
Foreign Language:	Foreign Language Internship Program International Travel Italian Club
Other:	National Honor Society National Junior Honor Society International Thespian Honor Society Dance Company Middle School STEP Team, High School STEP Team Theatrical Productions

MICHAEL J. PETRIDES SCHOOL – 31R080

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 ESL ___ Both Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2008-09: 20
(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.

The Michael J. Petrides School offers a freestanding ESL program to all our entitled students. A certified ESL teacher provides push-in and pull-out ESL services according to the CR part 154 instructional requirements. Our ESL teacher uses a wide range of ESL resources and materials to address the four modalities. Both ELA and ESL teachers differentiate instruction and use the following instructional strategies: total physical response methods, engaging students in the writing process by responding to audio and video, pictures, films, etc. The ESL teacher also collaborates with teachers of ELL's by sharing instructional strategies at regularly scheduled common planning time meetings. Our school has embraced Balanced Literacy and the everyday Mathematics curriculum. All of our students, including our English Language Learners are engaged in reading and writing workshops daily. Our curriculum includes a rich arts program, also available to all students. After-school activities allow our students to participate in sports such as swimming, soccer, and cheerleading.

- 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.

Meaningful parent involvement includes: Curriculum Conferences, Parent Literacy Workshops, Family Math Events, Fall and Spring Parent Teacher Conferences, Parent Orientation for each component of the school. Translation services are available at all events to allow our ELL parents to fully participate in the activities.

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

Our K through 12 structure and lottery admissions policy limits the number of new admits to our school. Individual conferences are conducted with new admits to familiarize parents and students with our school and the programs and services we offer.

- 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.

Professional Development will be ongoing throughout the school year. Our certified ESL teacher will present best practices to classroom teachers during scheduled weekly Common Planning meetings for teachers of Grades K through 5. Professional Development opportunities are also scheduled for the Chancellor's Professional Development Days – November 4, 2008 and June 4, 2009.

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

Our English Language Learners will be offered such support services as: At-risk Special Education Teacher Support Services, push-in and/or pull-out Academic Intervention Services, SLIP, and Enrichment Clusters.

- 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.

Not applicable

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

School Building: Michael J. Petrides District 31

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

Number of Teachers 2008-2009				Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals***		Total
Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**		Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program			
0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules

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

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

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

School District: 31

School Building: Michael J. Petrides School

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:00 am To: 9:00 am	Subject: Art	Subject: Literacy ESL	Subject: Literacy ESL	Subject: Literacy ESL	Subject: Literacy
2	From: 9:01 am To: 9:57 am	Subject: Literacy ESL	Subject: Literacy	Subject: Literacy	Subject: Art	Subject: Literacy ESL
3	From: 9:58 am To: 10:54 am	Subject: Literacy	Subject: Movement	Subject: Mathematics	Subject: Literacy	Subject: Science
4	From: 10:55 am To: 11:51 am	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
5	From: 11:52 am To: 12:48 am	Subject: Science	Subject: Mathematics	Subject: Movement	Subject: Mathematics	Subject: Skills
6	From: 12:49 To: 1:45	Subject: Mathematics	Subject: Mathematics	Subject: Science	Subject: Mathematics	Subject: Physical Education
7	From: 1:46 To: 2:50	Subject: Social Studies	Subject: Social Studies	Subject: Social Studies	Subject: Physical Education	Subject: Science

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (Bilingual)

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

School District: _____ School Building: _____

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

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) K-12 Number of Students to be served: 20 LEP _____ Non-LEP _____

Number of Teachers 2 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.

The Michael J. Petrides School offers a freestanding ESL program to all our entitled students. A certified ESL teacher provides push-in and pull-out ESL services according to the CR part 154 instructional requirements. Our ESL teacher uses a wide range of ESL resources and materials to address the four modalities. Both ELA and ESL teachers differentiate instruction and use the following instructional strategies: total physical response methods, engaging students in the writing process by responding to audio and video, pictures, films, etc.

Title III funding will be used to create additional opportunities for (17 of our 20) ELL students to receive additional literacy instructions. We will establish an after-school program for ELL students as well as an evening program for parents of ELLs. One weekly after-school session (1.5 hours) will be dedicated for Early Childhood students, and one weekly after-school session (1.5 hours) will be reserved for upper Elementary and Middle School students. Weekly Parent Workshops (1.5 hours) will be presented (in the evening) to provide ELL parents the skills needed to help their children. The parent and student programs will run from January through June 2009. Licensed ESL teachers will provide the services.

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

Professional Development will be ongoing throughout the school year. Our certified ESL teacher will present best practices to classroom teachers and supervising assistant principals during scheduled weekly Common Planning meetings (during the regular school day) for teachers of Grades K through 5. During these professional development sessions, the ESL teacher will demonstrate different reading strategies that the classroom teacher can implement with English Language Learners in their class. The strategies include: the Jigsaw Reading Format technique, double entry journals (and other graphic organizers), Think, Pair, Share activities, Language Modeling/Guidelines for descriptions, and Reading with Purpose. Professional Development for additional staff members will be presented on the Chancellor's Professional Development Days – November 4, 2008 and June 4, 2009.

Title III funding will be used to allow our licensed ESL teacher to attend ELA, Literacy and Writing training sessions offered by the ISC. She will then turn-key the training to classroom teachers at after-school workshops. Title III funding will also be used to provide additional instruction to our English Language Learners in an after-school Literacy Workshop program in the Spring of 2009. Parents of English Language Learners will be invited to evening adult literacy workshops, presented by the ESL teacher as well. Materials will be purchased to support our ESL instruction.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

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

Allocation: \$15,000		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	\$9,750	Per session hours for ESL teachers to provide weekly after-school sessions for students and weekly evening sessions for parents. Per session hours for ESL teacher to provide Professional Development for teachers
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	\$1,500	From Analysis to Achievement: Using Elementary-Level Data to Design Effective Instruction for ELLs
Supplies and materials	\$2050	Finish Line Writing, Help Your Child Get Ready for Math, Help Your Child Get Ready for Reading, ROOTS – Reading Observation Tools, Rigby ELL Assessment Kit
Travel		
Other	\$1,500	Refreshments for Parent Meetings/Workshops
TOTAL	\$15,000	

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.

Outreach was made to identify families in need of receiving translated services documentation.

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.
 - **Few families are in need of translation services (Spanish/Russian/Chinese)**
 - **Parent Coordinator maintains database of families and ensures translated notices are sent home.**
 - **Assistant Principals and teachers were notified of translation needs**

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.
 - **Parent Coordinator will mail DOE Communications to identified parents in appropriate languages**
 - **Written translation for individual parent communication will be provided as needed.**

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.
 - **Oral translation services will be provided for Parent Teacher Conferences**

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>.
 - **Translation signage is posted in main lobby and main office.**
 - **Announcements are made in other languages explaining translation services available at Parent Teacher Conferences.**

**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)*¹ 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.

¹ 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.

- Gaps in the Written Curriculum – A New York State Curriculum Alignment committee was formed to assess the schools' existing curriculum maps in the area of writing and their alignment to New York State standards. If it is found that the maps are misaligned, said committee will update maps and training will be provided to the staff to discuss implementation requirements.
- Curriculum Maps – The New York State Curriculum Alignment Committee will review the school's existing curriculum maps representing all grade levels to update the content to include skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, and student outcomes to be attained. Student action plans in the areas of reading and writing will be reviewed to ensure alignment with content specific standards-based expectations.
- Taught Curriculum – Formal and informal observations will include a focus on teachers' attention to writing, critical analysis, speaking and listening.
- ELA Materials – The results of the 2008/2009 Learning Environment Survey will be used to ascertain whether teachers have the materials they need to adequately deliver instruction, particularly, to sub populations of students including: English Language Learners and students with special needs.
- English Language Learners – All classroom teachers and service providers, including ESL and teachers of bilingual education classes will be given the ESL Standards. These Standards will be reviewed at grade and department meetings in order to ensure alignment with the school's ELA curriculum and ELA standards.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Petrides uses a standards-based Balanced/Comprehensive Literacy Program of study for all students including those for whom English is not their first language and for students who have special learning needs. Balanced Literacy stresses the essential dimensions of reading through explicit teaching of phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and expressiveness, vocabulary, and comprehension. Daily read-alouds, independent reading time, reading workshop, writing workshop, and systematic word study instruction are key features of the approach. Teachers demonstrate the habits and strategies of effective reading and writing through a variety of structures: read-aloud, guided reading,

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

shared reading, interactive writing, and mini-lessons in reading and writing. By coaching students in individual or small-group conferences, teachers allow students to successfully and independently apply those strategies to their own reading and writing.

Classroom libraries are the centerpiece of Balanced Literacy. These libraries allow teachers to organize instruction around authentic literature. Extensive use of classroom libraries encourages students to read and write about a variety of topics they know and like. The libraries are designed so that each grade will have a common core of books that span a range of reading levels and cover all kinds of literature from picture books, chapter books, and novels to poetry and nonfiction.

In the middle school grades, teachers continue to use the structures and components of Balanced Literacy. Though the emphasis shifts from learning to read to reading to learn, students in middle school continue to refine, advance, and apply their reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills to build knowledge about new subject matter.

High school students become more sophisticated readers and writers while deepening their knowledge through the study and exploration of various themes in American and World Literature. Students meet graduation requirements by earning at least 8 English credits. High school students who score at least 65 on the ELA Regents exam fulfill the English requirement toward the Regents diploma.

Furthermore, our most recent test results in ELA show growth:

2005-2006: 72% of students in grades 3 through 8 meeting or exceeding the standards

2006-2007: 78% of students in grades 3 through 8 meeting or exceeding the standards

2007-2008: 78% of students in grades 3 through 8 meeting or exceeding the standards

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.

NA

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

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.

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 Petrides New York State Curriculum Alignment Committee will review the content strands of measurement and geometry and number sense and operations in order to uncover and gaps that may exist in the intended curricula. We will the revise grade level specific maps to include stronger foci in each of these areas. Professional development will be provided by the Math Coach to teachers in the math department to ensure understanding of the curriculum areas in need or in deficit. Summative and formative assessment results will be used to determine student understanding in these as well as in other areas. Formal and informal observation will be used to assess teacher's depth in the delivery of all content in the area of mathematics including measurement and geometry and number sense and operations.

The New York State Curriculum Alignment Committee will review the High School curriculum, which is a Regents-based curriculum already, to ensure complete alignment to the 2005 NYS Standards and make any necessary adjustments. Professional development will be provided to teachers in the Math Department, as needed.

- 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.

This school supplements the mathematics curriculum with constructivist problem solving opportunities for students on all grade levels. Regular and ongoing evaluations using problems that are aligned to the process strands allow the school to determine whether students have a conceptual understanding of mathematical content. Students' constructed responses are assessed using grade appropriate rubrics. Student work is discussed at grade meetings and the math program is adjusted, as necessary, based on students' ability/inability to problem solve. Furthermore, the New York State Curriculum Alignment Committee will review curriculum maps representing all grade levels to update content to include skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, and student outcomes to be attained.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Petrides uses *Everyday Mathematics*, which is a research-based curriculum developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project. UCSMP was founded in 1983 during a time of growing consensus that our nation was failing to provide its students with an adequate mathematical education. The goal of this on-going project is to significantly improve the mathematics curriculum and instruction for all school children in the U.S.

Several basic principles that have guided the philosophy of *Everyday Mathematics* include:

- **Students acquire knowledge and skills, and develop an understanding of mathematics from their own experience. Mathematics is more meaningful when it is rooted in real life contexts and situations, and when children are given the opportunity to become actively involved in learning. Teachers and other adults play a very important role in providing children with rich and meaningful mathematical experiences.**
- **Children begin school with more mathematical knowledge and intuition than previously believed. A K-6 curriculum should build on this intuitive and concrete foundation, gradually helping children gain an understanding of the abstract and symbolic.**
- **Teachers, and their ability to provide excellent instruction, are the key factors in the success of any program. Previous efforts to reform mathematics instruction failed because they did not adequately consider the working lives of teachers.**

The scope of the K-6 *Everyday Mathematics* curriculum includes the following mathematical strands which are aligned to the NYS standards:

- Algebra and Uses of Variables
- Data and Chance
- Geometry and Spatial Sense
- Measures and Measurement
- Numeration and Order
- Patterns, Functions, and Sequences
- Operations
- Reference Frames

***Impact Mathematics* is both a comprehensive program, including the strands of number and operations, proportional reasoning, geometry, probability, and data, as well as a program focused on the development of algebraic thinking. The publication of *Algebra for Everyone* by NCTM in 1990 put forth the view of algebra as the gateway course, a course that must be part of the background of all employees. Therefore, algebra must be taught on a broadened scale, where students come to it with an appropriate mathematical background and disposition. In *Impact's* approach to algebraic thinking, they relied on the research reported in the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Algebra Working Group (1995). Algebra in the K-12 curriculum: Dilemmas and possibilities, pointing to the inaccessibility of the traditional algebra curriculum, generally taught as a stand-alone course in the 9th grade. In *Impact Mathematics*, student understanding of the algebra strand – interwoven with and related to the other mathematical strands – evolves over a three-year period, allowing such important ideas as patterns, functions, proportional reasoning, and algebraic structure and skills to develop and become familiar over time. The algebra strand is based on the highly successful Australian program. Access to Algebra, developed by Curriculum Corporation, which provided an algebra curriculum relevant to students' lives, more inclusive of the interests and experiences of middle school students. *Impact Mathematics* is unique, then, in its comprehensive, standards-based, developmental approach, while completing a full year of algebra by the end of the third course. Finally, the authors of *Impact Mathematics* recognize that mathematics has developed as an extension and codifications of ways of thinking that are natural to us all. To that aim, *Impact Mathematics* is written to help students use and sharpen their own logical thinking, learn to be comfortable with the abstractions that give mathematics its power, develop their ideas and mathematical imagination, and acquire the skills that support their good thinking and the ability to express their ideas clearly to others.**

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.

NA

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.

Formal and informal observation will be used to confirm that all teachers are using the workshop model of implementation for both reading and writing.

Informal observation will be used to assess student engagement.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

As stated, Petrides employs a workshop model of instruction for English Language Arts instruction. The architecture of the mini lesson component of both the Reader's and Writer's Workshops includes:

Teacher directed mini lesson	10-15 minutes (20%)
Active engagement	5-10 minutes (13.3%)
Share	5minutes (6.6%)
Independent practice	30-45 minutes (depending on grade level) (60%)

During this time, teachers are either conferring with individual students or working with groups of students for guided practice and/or small group strategy instruction. Student independent practice does not include "busy work". At this time, students are reading independently from and responding to their "just-right" books. During writing, students are drafting or editing and revising their genre-specific pieces.

Student engagement is informally assessed using the following student engagement checklist:

**Student Engagement Checklist 2008/2009
School-Wide Informal Observations**

Category	Observation	Comments
Whole Class Instruction: Rug Area -All students are attentive and looking at teacher(s) -Students sit on rug in purposeful ways depending on task -Various students participate when questions are posed-not the same hands all the time -Student responses to queries are positively validated	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes to all <input type="checkbox"/> Yes to some <input type="checkbox"/> Not really	

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.

NA

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 (SOM²)* 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.

Formal and informal observation will be used to confirm that all teachers are using the workshop model of implementation for mathematics instruction.

A student engagement checklist will be used to assess teachers' awareness of student intrinsic motivation and metacognition.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

This finding is not relevant to Petrides for the following reasons:

Petrides employs a workshop model of instruction for Mathematics instruction. The architecture of the mini lesson component of the Math Workshop includes:

Teacher directed mini lesson	10-15 minutes (20%)
Active engagement	5-10 minutes (13.3%)
Share	5 minutes (6.6%)

² 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.

Independent practice 30-45 minutes (depending on grade level) (60%)

During this time, teachers are either conferring with individual students or working with groups of students for guided practice and/or small group strategy instruction. Student independent practice does not include “busy work.” At this time, students are working alone, in partnerships or in groups to practice their computation and/or conceptual skills.

Formal and informal observation will be used to confirm that all teachers are using the workshop model of implementation for mathematics instruction.

At this school, SMART boards are often used of demonstration during the mini lesson.

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.

NA

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.

Year-to-year teacher turnover rate is evaluated by the school’s administrative Cabinet. To date, this school does not have a high turnover rate with a minimal number/percentage of new teachers joining the school’s organization each year.

If the turnover rate becomes high, i.e., more than 10%, over a three-year period, the school will contact staffing pools such as Teach for America and/or NYC Teaching Fellows in order to recruit teachers with greater sustainability.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

Over the past three years, the school has welcomed the following number and percent of new teachers.

2008	1	1%
2007	0	0
2006	3	2%

These numbers are insignificant. New teachers at this school receive professional development and support from the school's internal coaches, external staff developers as well as from their UFT mentors.

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.

NA

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

The school engages in teacher goal setting. When meeting with teachers who work with students for whom English is a second language, the administration will develop professional development plans aligned to those teacher's expressed and anticipated needs.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

Petrides is an Empowerment Support Organization School. In addition to the professional development each teacher receives in the school from internal and external coaches, the ESO also customizes 1:1 PD for all ELL teaches. These sessions are planned and facilitated by the Network’s Special Services Manager and delivered either at the school or in a venue for Network collaboration. Finally, this school year, the ESO has contracted and ELL Specialist, Catherine Brown, from *Accelerating Minds with Language*. Ms. Brown will be conducting five full-day workshops for the Network’s ELL and bi-lingual teachers.

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.

NA

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

Data from district and teacher interviews indicate that there is very little specific monitoring of ELLs’ academic progress or English language development. Testing data, where they do exist (for example, the NYSESLAT yearly scores) either are not reported to all teachers involved in instructing ELLs or are not provided in a timely manner useful for informing instruction. If and when testing data are provided, the data are not disaggregated by proficiency level of ELL student, students’ time in the United States, or type of program in which the ELL is enrolled (i.e., ESL, TBE, Dual Language, or general education).

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

The school will use Quality Statement 1 from its most recent and its upcoming Quality Review to determine whether or not this finding is relevant.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Petrides received an overall score of well-developed for SQ1: “School leaders consistently gather and generate data, and use it to understand what each student knows and is able to do and to monitor the students’ progress over time” and a score of well-developed for sub criteria 1.2: “School leaders and faculty provide an objective, constantly updated understanding of the performance and progress of English Language Learners.”

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.

NA

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

The school will use formal and informal observation to assess the teacher’s understanding of appropriate differentiated instructional practices.

The school will use Quality Statement 3 from its most recent and its upcoming Quality Review to determine whether or not this finding is relevant.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

UPDATED – OCTOBER 2008

Petrides received an overall score of well-developed for SQ3: “The school aligns its academic work, strategic decisions and resources and effectively engages students around its plans and goals for accelerating student learning, and an overall score of well developed for sub criteria 3.4: “The school ensures that teachers use school, class and student data to plan for and provide differentiated instruction that meets the specific needs of all students in their charge.”

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.

NA

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

The school’s Administrative Cabinet, along with the IEP Teacher, will review all IEP’s in order to determine whether or not the NYS performance standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics were used on each grade level when determining, based on classification, student cognition and the results of both formative and summative assessments, the percentage each child with an Individualized Educational Plan must achieve in order to be promoted. Furthermore, the Administrative Cabinet and IEP Teacher will ensure that these performance outcomes have been incorporated into the IEP’s and that short term goals were aligned to the performance/promotional outcomes.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Petrides teachers have received extensive professional development in the area of student goal setting and writing correct, appropriate and educationally sound IEP's. This training has been provided to them at the school level by the Empowerment Support Organization's Special Services Manager. Teachers at this school use the NYS standards when making promotional decisions prior to writing an IEP at annual review. All students with special needs at this school have promotional goals that clearly reflect a percentage of their current grade level's performance outcomes. We aspire to have each classified student achieve proficiency in both ELA and mathematics.

Teachers at Petrides have received Mel Levin training and know how to write and use functional behavioral plans for students for whom this is a necessary intervention.

Finally, Petrides is a PBIS School. Positive Behavior Intervention and Support is a foundational behavioral philosophy shared by the staff, students and parents. All students at Petrides know what is expected of them behaviorally and academically and also know the consequences for not being prepared, safe, respectful or responsible. Parents support the school's efforts and teachers do not belittle, berate or admonish children at this school. We understand that all behaviors are precipitated by an internal or external stimulus. We try to understand why children choose certain behaviors and work with them to understand those behaviors, as well, so as not to repeat them in the future.

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.

NA

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: **Jun 23, 2008** Email address: **jbuckhe@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	31R080
School Name	Michael J. Petrides School
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 86,767
Principal Name	Joanne Buckheit
Principal Email	jbuckhe@gmail.com
Principal Phone	7188159625

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

- Yes
 No

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

- Yes
 No

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

Before- and After-School Programs	
Summer School Programs	
Dedicated Instructional Time	
Individualized Tutoring	\$ 86,767

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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

- Yes
- No

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