



**EAST BRONX ACADEMY FOR THE FUTURE**

**2008-09**

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

**SCHOOL: EAST BRONX ACADEMY FOR THE FUTURE**  
**DISTRICT 12/ BRONX/ 12X271**  
**ADDRESS: 1716 SOUTHERN BOULEVARD**  
**BRONX, NY 10460**  
**TELEPHONE: 718-861-8641**  
**FAX: 718-861-8634**

## 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 (SURR).**

**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: CONTRACT FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2008-09**

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

**SCHOOL NUMBER:** 12x271      **SCHOOL NAME:** East Bronx Academy for the Future

**DISTRICT:** 12      **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** ESO CFN Jan McDonald

**SCHOOL ADDRESS:** 1716 Southern Boulevard, Bronx, NY 10460

**SCHOOL TELEPHONE:** 718-861-8641      **FAX:** 718-861-8634

**SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON:** Principal Sarah Scrogin      **EMAIL ADDRESS:** [sscrogin@school.s.nyc.gov](mailto:sscrogin@school.s.nyc.gov)

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON**      Heath Wade, Teacher

**PRINCIPAL**      Sarah Scrogin

**UFT CHAPTER LEADER**      Kevin Magee

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION  
PRESIDENT**      Cynthia Holmes & Cecily Morales, Co-Presidents

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE**  
*(Required for high schools)*      Rachel Spencer, SLT Student Member

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
SUPERINTENDENT**      Myrna Rodriguez, Superintendent, District 12  
Joel DiBartolomeo, HS Superintendent

**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
Sarah Scrogin	*Principal	
Kevin Magee	*UFT Chapter Chairperson	
Cynthia Holmes	*PA/PTA President	
Elaine Morales	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Jose Valcarcel	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
Rachel Spencer	Student Representative, if applicable	
Heath Wade	SLT Chairperson	
Nichole Patterson	SLT Parent Member	
Melinda Dore	SLT Teacher Member	
Vivian Ramos	SLT Parent Member	
Sabrina Cook	SLT Teacher Member	

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.

---

East Bronx Academy is a sixth through twelfth grade, technology-based school of approximately 630 students with a focus on hands-on active learning. Teams of teachers work closely with small groups of students to plan interventions and remediation and differentiate and accelerate their learning. This results in close-knit, caring communities of teachers and students.

**School Vision:** At East Bronx Academy all of us work together to create a school where all students are engaged in learning by doing and where all students graduate from high school well-prepared for college and the world of work. This vision is expressed in our school motto, "Real learning for a real future."

**School Mission:** At East Bronx Academy, we believe that all of us learn by doing, by actively digging in to the job at hand. Our mission is for parents, students, faculty and partners to find ways to work together collaboratively to ensure that all students become engaged in learning and graduate from high school well-prepared for college or the world of work. Our school is distinctive for the following reasons:

1. **ACCELERATION AND DIFFERENTIATION:** As a 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade school we have a strong focus on accelerating students' learning. 16 percent of our students are Special Education students and 13 percent are English Language Learners. Selected 8<sup>th</sup> grade students take three Regents Examinations in U.S. History, Math A and Living Environment. At-risk students receive in and out of class support from Learning Specialists in what we call a "Learning Lab." Teachers also differentiate within the classroom setting for students' learning styles and make modifications for special education and English Language Learners in our inclusionary setting.
2. **TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION:** We have more than 12 mobile laptop carts totaling nearly 400 laptops for our 600 students to use on a daily basis. To promote technology use, we have a unique partnership with Teaching Matters, Inc., a non-profit focused on providing technology professional development to New York City schools and teachers. Teaching Matters staff members are in the building two days a week in a "residency" model through which they 1) support technology integration overall in the school and 2) support teachers' using Teaching Matters' English Language Arts units.
3. **TEAM STRUCTURE FOR COLLABORATION & ADULT LEARNING:** Differentiated Professional Development: Teachers are organized in subject area and grade-level teams to support adult learning. These teams meet several times a week to collaborate around meeting students' needs using a "Kid Talk" protocol and around creating and implementing meaningful curriculum using a "Teacher Talk" protocol.

Milestones in progress towards our vision of "Real learning for a real future" include:

- Graduation of 49 out of 74 students in our first graduating high school class (of these graduates, 46 continued on to post-secondary institutions and 2 enrolled in the military).
- Exemplary progress in 2008 as demonstrated by our School Quality Review score of Well Developed and by our Progress Report which rose from a D to a B in one year, meeting all performance targets.
- Good student progress on standardized tests scores, with 66% of ELA students and 48% of math students making "one year's progress" on NY State tests. Among students in our school's lowest third, 92% made "one year's progress" in ELA and 69% in mathematics.
- 65% of our 8<sup>th</sup> grade graduates in June 2008 chose to continue in our school for their high school experience.

**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>	East Bronx Academy for the Future (12x271)				
<b>District:</b>	12	<b>DBN #:</b>	12x271	<b>School BEDS Code #:</b>	321200012271

DEMOGRAPHICS									
<b>Grades Served in 2008-09:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11	<input checked="" 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	n/a	n/a	n/a		80.5%	82.5%	86.2%		
Kindergarten	n/a	n/a	n/a						
Grade 1	n/a	n/a	n/a						
Grade 2	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>Student Mobility:</b> (% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	n/a	n/a	n/a		91.5%	92.1%	96.1%		
Grade 4	n/a	n/a	n/a						
Grade 5	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>Eligible for Free Lunch:</b>					
Grade 6	68	87	78	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7	102	109	76		75.1%	80.2%	64.6%		
Grade 8	76	93	102						
Grade 9	73	106	90	<b>Students in Temporary Housing:</b>					
Grade 10	91	78	98	(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11	64	82	75		4	8	3		
Grade 12	n/a	56	82						
Ungraded Elementary	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>Recent Immigrants:</b>					
Ungraded Secondary	n/a	n/a	n/a	(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	487	611	620		12	10	4		
<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	2	1	25						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	1	12	18	Principal Suspensions	157	142	18		
Number all others	24	47	94	Superintendent Suspensions	35	45	8		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
				<b>Special High School Programs:</b>			
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:</b>				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	67	82	87	<b>Number of Staff:</b>			
# ELLs with IEPs	1	5	7	(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	27	41	47
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	5	7	8
<b>Overage Students:</b>							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	0	5	4
	6	7	8				
				<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	96.3	100	n/a
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	11.1	31	n/a
Black or African American	38.2	36.3	33.3	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	18.5	28.6	n/a
Hispanic or Latino	58.8	61.5	63.5				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	1.5	1.0	1.6	Percent Masters Degree or higher	78	88	n/a
White	1.5	1.3	1.5	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	78.5	83.9	n/a
Multi-racial	1.6	0	0				
Male	56.9	52.6	53.9				
Female	43.1	48.4	46.1				

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
<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 ____		

**NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY**

<b>Individual Subject/Area Ratings</b>	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level	
	ELA:	In Good Standing		ELA:	In Good Standing
	Math:	In Good Standing		Math:	In Good Standing
	Science:	In Good Standing		Grad. Rate:	64.9%

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	√	√	√	n/a	n/a	64.9%
Ethnicity				n/a	n/a	
American Indian or Alaska Native				n/a	n/a	
Black or African American	√	√		n/a	n/a	
Hispanic or Latino	X	√		n/a	n/a	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander				n/a	n/a	
White				n/a	n/a	
Multiracial				n/a	n/a	
Other Groups				n/a	n/a	
Students with Disabilities				n/a	n/a	
Limited English Proficient	√	√		n/a	n/a	
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√		n/a	n/a	
Student groups making AYP in each subject	X 4 of 5	√ 5 of 5		n/a	n/a	

**Key: AYP Status**

√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ <sup>SH</sup>	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status		

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

\* Please note that this data was not available for our high school as we did not graduate a class yet.

**CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY: HS = High School; MS = Middle School**

<b>Progress Report Results – 2007-08</b>		<b>Quality Review Results – 2007-08</b>	
Overall Letter Grade	B for the HS & MS	Overall Evaluation:	Well-Developed
Overall Score	53.3 HS 58.8 MS	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Well-Developed
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	8.3 HS 7.4 MS	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Well-Developed
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	14.3 HS 14.9 MS	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well-Developed
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	28.7 HS 33.7 MS	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Proficient
Additional Credit	2.0 HS 3.8 MS	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?
- 

**Needs Analysis:** Our school's needs come directly from conclusions of formal, external reviews of our school's performance, from our Inquiry Team work, and from our own self-assessments and reflections.

### **GREATEST ACCOMPLISHMENTS: COLLABORATIVE PLANNING**

Accordingly, our Inquiry Team work from 2008-2009 (Appendix 2) builds upon our prior Inquiry Team strength in gathering data and demonstrates how we have significantly revised the Kid Talk protocols used for examining at-risk students with a renewed focus on gathering information that will lead directly to effective interventions. Furthermore, our teams have been empowered to move away from traditional administrative supervision of "Kid Talk" meetings to a more distributive manner with lead teachers and guidance counselors assuming leadership. Supervisors meet weekly with Team Leaders and attend Kid Talk and Teacher Talk meetings several times a week.

### **BARRIERS TO IMPROVEMENT: SYSTEMATIZING DATA COLLECTION & USAGE**

After a review of these sources, our Inquiry Team work from 2007-2008 (Appendix 1) brought together statistical information about selected students including attendance, grades, subject area performance, NY State examination results, student anecdotal, and lists of interventions attempted. In reflecting upon last year's work, we discovered that we were gathering a great deal of information but that the type of information gathered needed to be honed and systematized.

- Our **June 2008 School Quality Review**, while "Well Developed" overall, explicitly identified a need to "expand extra-curricular and enrichment activities to engage students and parents before and after school." The reviewer also noted that our male students were much more likely to be over-age and at-risk than were our girls.
- Our **2008 Learning Environment Survey** demonstrated that students rated us only slightly better than average when compared to the city horizon in terms of Academic Expectations (57.9%), Communication (58.3%), Engagement (54.5%), and Safety and Respect (50%).
- Our **2008 Progress Report** data further identified that we could do more to engage students, as we had an attendance rate of 88.7%, which was rated at 38.6 percent of our peer horizon.
- Our **2007-2008 Inquiry Team** research findings supported the above needs by demonstrating that even students who were experiencing success academically did not feel a deep connection to the school as a community.

## SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

### **Our Goals for the 2008 – 2009 School Year:**

- 1) IMPROVE MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE SCHOOL-WIDE:** Mathematics performance was an area of concern on *both* our High School and our Middle School progress reports. On the HS report, mathematics performance was just 36.4% of our peer index. On the MS report, the percentage of students making at least one year of progress was just 48.3 percent, which was 33.7 percent of our peer index.
- 2) IMPROVE ATTENDANCE SCHOOL-WIDE:** We would like to approve our over-all school attendance from 86.3 to 90 percent, with a particular focus on the high school grades.
- 3) INCREASE CREDIT ACCUMULATION IN HIGH SCHOOL:** Our High School progress reports reflects a the fact that students other than those in the lowest third and students in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year of high school are not earning the requisite 10 credits per year. Our goal is increase credit accumulation from 60.3% to at least 70% for 2008 – 2009.
- 4) DIFFERENTIATE INSTRUCTION FOR HIGH ACHIEVING STUDENTS:** Both our School Quality Review recommendations and our Progress Reports reflect a need for differentiation to challenge our highest performing students. In the MS report, students' average change in proficiency for Level 3 and Level 4 students was -0.08 for English and -0.19 for mathematics. In the HS report, students in the lowest third did relatively well (68.8 percent or 79.1 percent of our peer index) while students in the top two thirds did less well, dropping below 50 percent of the peer index in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year. Our goal is to increase the performance of students with Level 3 and 4's to above 50 percent of our peer index in middle school and high school.
- 5) IMPROVE REGENTS PASS RATES IN HIGH SCHOOL:** Our high school "weighted Regents pass rates" are as follows: English 1.00, Math 0l.64, Science 0.73, US History 0.29 and Global History 0.57. We are performing below 50% of our peer index in Mathematics, Science and US History. The goal is to increase these weighted Regents pass rates to at least 50 percent of the peer index for 2008 – 2009, particularly in the areas of Mathematics (36.4% of peer index) and US History (18.9% of peer index).

Furthermore, based upon the feedback and outcomes from our Inquiry Team work, Learning Environment Survey, Progress Report, and School Quality Review, our needs assessment identified the following two primary needs:

- **Building our internal capacity to better support our students' adolescent development via interventions**
- **Improving our ability to integrate parent and community engagement to connect home and school**

In response to these needs, we will target our persistently failing students by building upon systems already established at our school which have been proven successful in our environment, including:

- **Individualized Student Programming:** Students who may have been denied promotion in other schools due to poor performance on state tests can selectively rejoin their original cohort for selected subjects. Over-age and at-risk students are regularly referred to the Student Support Team for intervention recommendations. These students with Individualized Programs are supported by Learning Specialists before, during and after school.
- **Second Session:** We will expand our successful High School Second Session program to include middle school students. This program invites over-age and at-risk students to join in a smaller, non-traditional academic program after school hours on a daily basis. We have tailored this Second Session program to meet the unique needs of our male at-risk population by staffing the program with exemplary male teachers and role models.
- **Zero Period & Seventh Period:** Students who are at-risk and who are seeking acceleration are enrolled in supplemental courses including Advisory, Homework Help, Dance, Physical Education, Visual Art, and Music.
- **Increased Parental Involvement:** Our Parent Involvement Policy (Appendix 3) exemplifies our belief in seamless, two-way communication via monthly community meetings, parent walk-throughs, on-line Gradebook system, monthly progress reports and newsletters. This year, we are providing students and parents with a school-managed email. Our Peek Program, which provides a free, wireless email device to every 7<sup>th</sup> grade family, illustrates how we have worked out systems to make home-school communication instant and effective.

**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 received a 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):** Mathematics

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>IMPROVE MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE SCHOOL-WIDE:</b> Mathematics performance was an area of concern on both our High School and our Middle School progress reports. On the HS report, mathematics performance was just 36.4% of our peer index. On the MS report, the percentage of students making at least one year of progress was just 48.3 percent, which was 33.7% of our peer index.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use Interim Assessment results from teacher-created and Acuity assessments to create Interim Assessment spreadsheets enabling student and standards-based groupings.</li> <li>- Review assessment results, course pass rates and ARIS data to target student improvements in Mathematics Team meetings and in goal-setting meetings with the Administrative Team.</li> <li>- Add literacy strategies, such as vocabulary development and written explanation of problem solving, to mathematics teachers strategies, particularly as it applies to open-ended problems.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p><b>Staff Responsible: AP Mathematics &amp; Science; Mathematics Team:</b> We are using CFE and TL funds to add an assistant principal to focus exclusively on mathematics and science instruction and we are pursuing mathematics professional development via the Petrie Foundation at City College and various other workshops. We have weekly Math Team meetings to turnkey this learning to other team members. Our Mathematics Team leader is visiting North Star Academy Charter School in Newark, NJ to learn from their Interim Assessment work.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Quarterly goal setting meeting with teachers and the Admin Team. Use of Acuity Predictive assessments (quarterly) and Scantron Performance Series Assessments (twice annually). <u>GOAL is to increase to at least 88% by February 2009.</u></p>

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>IMPROVE ATTENDANCE SCHOOL-WIDE:</b> We would like to approve our over-all school attendance from 86.3 to 90 percent, with a particular focus on the high school grades.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Attendance goals and objectives in order to improve attendance are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review daily attendance report for any errors</li> <li>- Outreach to students with patterns of lateness and absences</li> <li>- Student and parent meetings with Guidance Counselor to assess cause of absences</li> <li>- Monthly celebrations for Perfect Attendance and Improved Attendance</li> <li>- Posting of Perfect Attendance and Improved Attendance by grade on main floor</li> <li>- Quarterly trips for students' with Perfect Attendance for three consecutive months.</li> <li>- Monthly Attendance meetings with Grade Level Guidance Counselors, Attendance Coordinator/AP and Attendance Liaison to review ATS attendance reports of students not meeting school's attendance goals.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p><b>Staff Responsible: Principal, Attendance Coordinator, Attendance Team (Includes Guidance &amp; Teachers)</b></p> <p>We are using CFE and Tax Levy funds to pay for an attendance teacher per session and to hire a full-time attendance coordinator. Additionally, Tax Levy funds are supporting the incentives discussed above.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Monthly Attendance meetings with Grade Level Guidance Counselors, Attendance Coordinator/AP and Attendance Liaison to review ATS attendance reports of students not meeting school's attendance goals. <u>GOAL is to increase to at least 50 percent of our peer index by the next Progress Reports.</u></p>

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** CREDIT ACCUMULATION IN HS

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>INCREASE CREDIT ACCUMULATION IN HIGH SCHOOL:</b> Our High School progress reports reflects a the fact that students other than those in the lowest third and students in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year of high school are not earning the requisite 10 credits per year. Our goal is increase credit accumulation from 60.3% to at least 70% for 2008 – 2009.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Individualized Student Programming: Students who may have been denied promotion in other schools due to poor performance on state tests can selectively rejoin their original cohort for selected subjects. Over-age and at-risk students are regularly referred to the Student Support Team for intervention recommendations. These students with Individualized Programs are supported by Learning Specialists before, during and after school.</li> <li>- Second Session: We will expand our successful High School Second Session program to include middle school students. This program invites over-age and at-risk students to join in a smaller, non-traditional academic program after school hours on a daily basis. We have tailored this Second Session program to meet the unique needs of our male at-risk population by staffing the program with exemplary male teachers and role models.</li> <li>- Zero Period &amp; Seventh Period: Students who are at-risk are enrolled in supplemental courses including Advisory, Homework Help, Dance, Physical Education, Visual Art, and Music.</li> <li>- Student Support Resource Guide: Our Student Support team is working to establish modification to grading for special education and English Language Learners.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responsible: Principal, AP Math &amp; Science, AP Social Studies, Learning Specialists, Content Area Teachers</b></p> <p>We are using CFE and Tax Levy funds to pay for teacher per session for second session and Independent Study. Additionally, Tax Levy funds are supporting the initiatives discussed above.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Quarterly reviews of students’ transcripts. <u>GOAL is to increase to at least 60 percent of our peer index by the end of the fall semester.</u></p>

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** DIFFERENTIATE FOR HIGH ACHIEVING STUDENTS

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>DIFFERENTIATE INSTRUCTION FOR HIGH ACHIEVING STUDENTS:</b> Both our School Quality Review recommendations and our Progress Reports reflect a need for differentiation to challenge our highest performing students. In the MS report, students’ average change in proficiency for Level 3 and Level 4 students was -0.08 for English and -0.19 for mathematics. In the HS report, students in the lowest third did relatively well (68.8 percent or 79.1 percent of our peer index) while students in the top two thirds did less well, dropping below 50 percent of the peer index in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interim Assessments: Our Interim Assessments and the accompanying process of analysis are targeted at ensuring that students pass Regents and Regents Competency Tests (RCT’s). The Social Studies team, in particular, has developed spreadsheets for item analysis and curriculum planning. Also, we are working with Teachers College, Columbia University to design and implement an Interim Assessment and accompanying lessons in grades 6 – 12 that mirror the NY State Assessments in English in those grades.</li> <li>- Teaching Matters: Writing Matters Program: Our English teachers use the “Writing Matters” program developed by our partner organization, Teaching Matters. These units of study, aligned to NY state standards, help to prepare students to take and pass the NY state English Exams, particularly the English Regents.</li> <li>- Individualized Student Programming: Students who may have been denied promotion in other schools due to poor performance on state tests can selectively take “prep” classes to help them prepare to take and pass the Regents..</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responsible: Principal, AP Math &amp; Science, AP Social Studies, Learning Specialists, Content Area Teachers</b></p> <p>We are using CFE and Tax Levy funds to pay for an teacher per session for second session and Independent Study. Additionally, Tax Levy funds are supporting the initiatives discussed above. We spend approximately \$15,000 on our DY0 interim assessment through Teachers College. We have spent \$21,596 on Teaching Matters curriculum, professional development support and related technology.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Semester reviews of students’ transcripts. <u>GOAL is to increase Regents pass rates to at least 50 percent of our peer index by the end of the fall semester.</u></p>

IMPROVE REGENTS PASS RATES  
 IN HS

Subject/Area (where relevant):

<p><b>Annual Goal</b>  <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><b>IMPROVE REGENTS PASS RATES IN HIGH SCHOOL:</b> Our high school “weighted Regents pass rates” are as follows: English 1.00, Math 0l.64, Science 0.73, US History 0.29 and Global History 0.57. We are performing below 50% of our peer index in Mathematics, Science and US History. The goal is to increase these weighted Regents pass rates to at least 50 percent of the peer index for 2008 – 2009, particularly in the areas of Mathematics (36.4% of peer index) and US History (18.9% of peer index).</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>Individualized Student Programming: Students who may have been denied promotion in other schools due to poor performance on state tests can selectively rejoin their original cohort for selected subjects. Over-age and at-risk students are regularly referred to the Student Support Team for intervention recommendations. These students with Individualized Programs are supported by Learning Specialists before, during and after school.</p> <p>Accelerate Student Learning: As a 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade school we have a strong focus on accelerating students’ learning. 16 percent of our students are Special Education students and 13 percent are English Language Learners. Selected 8<sup>th</sup> grade students take three Regents Examinations in U.S. History, Math A and Living Environment. At-risk students receive in and out of class support from Learning Specialists in what we call a “Learning Lab.” Teachers also differentiate within the classroom setting for students’ learning styles and make modifications for special education and English Language Learners in our inclusionary setting.</p> <p>Lehman College Partnership: We have developed a partnership with Lehman College “Middle Grades Initiative,” to provide additional tutoring and guidance services as well as summer programming for middle-school students. Lehman and other CUNY schools also provide college classes for high achieving high school students.</p> <p>AP Classes: We have created an AP English class and have a goal of creating an implementing a second AP class for the spring 2009 semester.</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b></p>	<p><b>Staff Responsible: Principal, AP Math &amp; Science, AP Social Studies, Learning Specialists, Content Area Teachers in the High School</b></p> <p>We are using CFE and Tax Levy funds to pay for an teacher per session for second session and Independent Study.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Semester reviews of students’ transcripts. <u>GOAL is to increase students’ with Levels 3 and 4 to at least 50 percent of our peer index.</u></p>

## **REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009**

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

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

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

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

**APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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

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

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

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

**APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM**

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services*
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
1	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
3	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6	78	78	n/a	n/a	36	n/a	n/a	n/a
7	76	76	n/a	n/a	26	n/a	n/a	n/a
8	13	11	7	6	24	n/a	n/a	n/a
9	14	9	6	7	36	n/a	n/a	84
10	12	9	13	12	52	n/a	n/a	98
11	12	12	8	11	72	n/a	n/a	73
12	12	7	7	6	54	n/a	n/a	62

\* Please note that the Department of Health worker lost funding and will cease services as of 11/17/08.

**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.

**UPDATED – SEPTEMBER 2008**

**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.).
<b>ELA:</b>	Before school day; multiple approaches including Wilson
<b>Mathematics:</b>	Before school day; multiple approaches including Kaplan test preparation guides
<b>Science:</b>	Before school day; multiple approaches including Kaplan test preparation guides
<b>Social Studies:</b>	Before school day; multiple approaches including Kaplan test preparation guides
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b>	Group and individual counseling for failing grades and/or at-risk behaviors
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	We do not have a School Psychologist.
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	We do not have a School Social Worker.
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>	Our DOH Health Worker has lost funding as of November 17, 2008 but was providing at-risk counseling for a wide range of topics including substance abuse, pregnancy and STD prevention, etc.

## 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 to this CEP.  
*See Attachment.*

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

---

**Type of Program:** \_\_\_ Bilingual \_\_\_  ESL \_\_\_ Both      **Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2008-09:** 82

**LAP Team Members:** Sarah Scrogin, Principal, Luke Bauer, AP, Maria Braga ELL Teacher, Steven Schlough ELL Teacher

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).

English as a Second Language will be taught based on the New York City curriculum frameworks for Balanced Literacy and based on the Three-Period Model described by Fountas and Pinnell in Guiding Readers and Writers.

- Language and Word Study: Choral reading, current events, words study, vocabulary building, test readiness
- Reading Workshop: Independent reading, guided reading and literature study
- Writing Workshop: Independent writing, guided writing and investigations

While the Balanced Literacy model will continue into the high-school years, the focus will change somewhat as students grow older and become more sophisticated consumers of literature and non-fiction. The writing workshop model will continue and expand in the later years, with an emphasis on expository, analytical and persuasive writing based up information collected from multiple sources, including primary and secondary sources. By the eleventh grade, students will be able to research and prepare a well-documented research paper on a topic of interest to them. Students will use technology to streamline and support process writing through greater emphasis on: a) use of primary and non-fiction sources, b) planning and organizing ideas through electronic organizers c) increased emphasis on writing and revising, d) improved ability to support peer review and editing, and e) publishing to an authentic audience and f) communicating through visual, written and oral mediums. Additionally, special adaptive and assistive technology will be used to support students with special needs and ELL learners.

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

English Language Learners participate fully in all extra-curricular opportunities at East Bronx Academy for the Future. Among the many extended-day programs offered are:

- Zero Period and 7<sup>th</sup> Period classes for credit recovery and tutoring.
- ESL Extended Day Class for Acceleration and Remediation
- Boys and Girls Basketball Teams
- Boys and Girls Soccer Teams
- Visual Art Class
- Dance Class
- Physical Education
- Debate Club
- Literary Magazine

**UPDATED – SEPTEMBER 2008**

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

BAFF recognizes, values, encourages, and supports parent engagement and responsibility for student learning as critical to student success. The school will support open and meaningful communication between parent/guardians, teachers and the principal. Throughout the school year the PTA will play an active role in creating a strong connection between the school and the parent community. The PTA will meet on a monthly basis starting in September with the Principal. Parents will be engaged to serve on the PTA by first electing grade level representatives. These representatives will bring concerns both to PTA meetings but also deal with issues that might be grade level specific. Parents/guardians will be encouraged to observe classrooms and will be regularly contacted by their students' advisors. Additionally, a school-website will be developed to make it easy for parents to review assignments, school calendars, and all school communications.

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

We do not have Project Jump Start at our school. However, our ELL Learning Specialists collaborate with Guidance Counselors to hold ELL parent meetings each year and send home mailings and reach out to parents and families prior to the school year.

- 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.

At the core of the school are a philosophy, curriculum and faculty that promote success by engaging students in learning they recognize as relevant to their lives. The school will provide standards-focused and technology- informed programs for its 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade students. The problem/project-based learning units that are central to its programs will be developed and offered in conjunction with the Salvatori Center and Teaching Matters and, ultimately, will be reflected in the real world internships provide by the wider community. Commitment to professional development is central to the strength of the CBOs of BAFF. Both the Salvatori Center and Teaching Matters are professional development organizations with common philosophies and methodologies.

Professional development will occur in the following ways:

- In-school and summer curriculum planning
- Weekly 90 minute blocks
- On-site professional development

The priorities for professional development common to all teachers include:

- Training on advisory (on-site with in-house social worker)
- Technology across the curriculum (on-line, on-site consultant)
- Authentic assessment techniques (on-site consultant)
- Strategies for working with English as a Second Language Students (on-site consultant)
- Strategies for identifying and Supporting Special Needs Populations (on-site consultant)

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

Teachers participate in weekly "Kid Talk" sessions focused on students' needs. ELL Kid Talks are facilitated by an ELL Learning Specialist and involve guidance counselors and content area teachers.

- 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.  
We do not currently offer a bilingual program at East Bronx Academy for the Future.

## Number of Teachers and Support Personnel for 2008-09

**School Building:** East Bronx Academy for the Future (12x271) **District** 12

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

School Building	Number of Teachers 2008-2009				Number of Teaching Assistant Paraprofessionals*		Sub- Total
	Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers*		Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
Building Name	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program			Bilingual Program
East Bronx Academy for the Future	None	2	None	None	None	2	4
<b>TOTALS</b>		2				2	<b>Grand Total = 4</b>

\* 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 2008-2009 teacher reported data. Districts randomly selected will be asked to electronically submit to the Department, the name of the teacher(s), social security number and type of license or certificate issued by the NYSED.  
 \*\* Examples of this may include: teachers without an appropriate New York State teaching certificate or New York City license for the subject area(s) being taught or without a valid NYS teaching certificate or NYC license.  
 \*\*\* Teaching Assistants and Paraprofessionals must be working under the direct supervision of a licensed teacher. Attach additional sheets if necessary

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

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL

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

School District: \_\_\_\_\_12\_\_

School Building: East Bronx Academy for the Future 12x271

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>0</b>	From: 8:00 To: 8:50	English Tutorial	English Tutorial	English Tutorial	English Tutorial	English Tutorial
<b>1</b>	From: 8:50 To: 10:00	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra
<b>2</b>	From: 10:00 To: 11:15	Global Studies	Global Studies	Global Studies	Global Studies	Global Studies
<b>3</b>	From: 11:15 To: 12:00	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health
<b>4</b>	From: 12:00 To: 12:45	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
<b>5</b>	From: 12:45 To: 2:00	Biology	Biology	Biology	Biology	Biology
<b>6</b>	From: 2:00 To: 3:10	ESL 11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	ESL 11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	ESL 11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	ESL 11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	ESL 11 <sup>th</sup> Grade
<b>7</b>	From: 3:10 To: 4:10	Physical Education	Physical Education	Physical Education	Physical Education	Physical Education

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2007-08 ESL

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

School District: \_\_\_\_\_ 12\_\_

School Building: East Bronx Academy for the Future 12x271

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>0</b>	From: 8:00 To: 8:50	English Tutorial	English Tutorial	English Tutorial	English Tutorial	English Tutorial
<b>1</b>	From: 8:50 To: 10:00	English/ESL	English/ESL	English/ESL	English/ESL	English/ESL
<b>2</b>	From: 10:00 To: 11:15	US History	US History	US History	US History	US History
<b>3</b>	From: 11:15 To: 12:00	English Theater	English Theater	English Theater	English Theater	English Theater
<b>4</b>	From: 12:00 To: 12:45	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
<b>5</b>	From: 12:45 To: 2:00	Biology	Biology	Biology	Biology	Biology
<b>6</b>	From: 2:00 To: 3:10	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra
<b>7</b>	From: 3:10 To: 4:10	Physical Education	Physical Education	Physical Education	Physical Education	Physical Education

# SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL

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

School District: \_\_\_\_\_ 12\_\_

School Building: East Bronx Academy for the Future 12x271

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<b>0</b>	From: 8:00 To: 8:50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>1</b>	From: 8:50 To: 10:00	US History	US History	US History	US History	US History
<b>2</b>	From: 10:00 To: 11:15	Earth Science	Earth Science	Earth Science	Earth Science	Earth Science
<b>3</b>	From: 11:15 To: 12:00	Debate	Debate	Debate	Debate	Debate
<b>4</b>	From: 12:00 To: 12:45	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
<b>5</b>	From: 12:45 To: 2:00	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra	Algebra
<b>6</b>	From: 2:00 To: 3:10	English/ESL	English/ESL	English/ESL	English/ESL	English/ESL
<b>7</b>	From: 3:10 To: 4:10	Health	Health	Health	Health	Health

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

**Form TIII – A (1)(a)**

**Grade Level(s) 6 – 12**    **Number of Students to be Served:** 87    **LEP** n/a    **Non-LEP**

**Number of Teachers** 2                      **Other Staff (Specify)** 2 paraprofessionals

**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.

---

Students will receive the New York State-mandated ESL/ELA allotted instruction time. We will do this by adding one additional 45 minute period to their 70 minute ESL/ELA block.

<b>Grade/Proficiency</b>	<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Intermediate</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
Grades 6, 7 & 8	360 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week
Grades 9 – 12	540 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week

**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.

---

QTEL: We are committed to implementing the principals of QTEL in all classrooms by having at least 1 teacher per grade (6 total) trained in QTEL by June 2009 and 12 teachers trained by 2010.  
Closing the Achievement Gap- SIFE/Long-term ELL Institute: we plan to have our ESL department (2 teachers, 2 paraprofessionals) attend and then turn-key “best practices” for working with LTE’s through our Internal Common Planning periods.

**Form TIII – A (1)(b)**

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

<b>Allocation: \$13,563</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)	\$13,563	These funds are used to pay per session for before and after-school programming for LEP students and to pay per diem and training rate costs for teachers receiving additional professional development in how to best provide LEP services, such as QTEL.
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	\$0.00	
Supplies and materials	\$0.00	
Travel	\$0.00	
Other	\$0.00	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$13,563</b>	

## **APPENDIX 3: Language Translation and Interpretation**

**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.**

We conduct a parent survey each fall during registration period in September. The parent survey results along with Home Language forms are analyzed by the Parent Coordinator and ELL Learning Specialists and kept on file in the Parent Coordinators office.

- 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.**

Approximately 60 percent of our students' are of Hispanic origin and approximately 30 percent of families report that they speak Spanish at home, though many report that they also speak English. We share this information with staff during summer orientation and with parents via our newsletter and at Parent Association meetings. Among our most important needs are:

- Need for oral translation at Parent Meetings
- Need for written translation of all mailings including monthly Newsletters and Calendars

### **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.**

We provide written translation of all materials sent home from school, including our monthly mailing of our Newsletter and calendar.

- 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.**

We will provide translation at all Parent Association meetings on the first Wednesday of each month. Attendance calls are made daily in English and the language from the Home Language Survey. For Parent-Conferences we will also use Student Translators, who are trained by the Parent Coordinator and guidance counselors to help with conferences for students on other grade levels.

**3. If applicable, indicate any barriers to the school’s ability to address identified language translation and interpretation needs, and the steps the school will take (including outside support the school may seek) to overcome barriers.**

Not Applicable

**Part C: Action Plan- Language Translation and Interpretation**

**Directions: On the action plan template provided below, indicate the key actions to be implemented for the 2007-2008 school year as described in the school’s response to Questions 1,2, and 3 in Part B of this appendix. For each action step, indicate the implementation timeline, person(s) responsible, resources required & targeted funding sources, and indicators of success and/or accomplishment. When completed, the action plan can be used as a tool to support effective implementation. When completing this section, please refer to the Guiding Question for action planning in the accompanying CEP Guide for 2007-2008.**

**Goal:** Ensure Translation of ALL Oral and Written Communication to Parents

<b>ACTION STEP-WHAT needs to be done to accomplish goal?</b>	Provide oral and written translation of ALL meetings and documents sent home.
<b>WHEN:</b>	2008-2009
<b>BY WHOM?</b>	Staff Members will earn per session to provide oral and written translation at all meetings and of all written documents sent home to parents.
<b>SUPPORT</b>	Budget set aside specifically for oral and written translation surveys.

<b>INDICATORS OF SUCCESS AND/OR ACCOMPLISHMENT-How will we know our strategies are working?</b>	90 percent of parents will give us a rating of 10 or higher on the communication aspect of our Learning Environment Survey for 2008 – 2009.



**East Bronx Academy for the Future  
1716 Southern Boulevard  
Bronx, NY 10460**

---

**2008 – 2009 Language Allocation Policy**

**I. Describe each program model in your school (TBE, D/L, ESL)**

a) Describe the demographics of the school community.

The population of East Bronx Academy is diverse. With a total current register of 634 students, approximately 59 percent of the student population is black, 30 percent is Hispanic, 5 percent is Asian or Pacific Islander, 2 percent is white and 4 percent was unidentified. At least 89 percent of the student population is entitled to free or reduced lunch. 13.4 percent of the population is ELL.

b) What is the total number of ELL students by grade?

Grade	Number of ELL Students
Grade 6	12
Grade 7	16
Grade 8	15
Grade 9	15
Grade 10	10
Grade 11	7
Grade 12	7

c) What are the languages spoken by these students?

The students speak Spanish, Arabic, Albanian, Garifuna, and Twi.

d) What do the parent survey letters indicate as the trend in program choice?

We have only one program at the school. All students are in an ESL program.

e) **Part A, Question 1:** Using the LAB-R and NYSESLAT results, indicate by grade the number of students scoring at the Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced Proficiency Levels.

Proficiency Level/Grade	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12
Beginner	0	2	2	2	0	1	1
Intermediate	4	7	3	7	3	2	3
Advanced	8	7	10	6	7	4	4

f) **Part A, Question 1:** What are the patterns in students’ results in the four modalities across proficiency levels and grades?

Students are generally strongest in listening. They do less well in reading and writing and most poorly in speaking (see table below).

	Listening	Reading	Writing	Speaking
Average Score				

g) Using city and state assessment data, indicate how ELLs are performing in targeted content areas?

Average ELL Score	English	Math
Grade 6		
Grade 7		
Grade 8		
Grade 9		
Grade 10		
Grade 11		
Grade 12		

h) **Part A, Question 2:** What are the implications for your school’s LAP and instruction?

Students’ language abilities may be affecting their performance in other subject areas. Our plan is to continue targeted push in and pull out interventions for students in the ESL program *and* to continue to use Balanced Literacy as the instructional approach.

i) How is the students’ level of literacy in the native language taken into consideration?

We work to develop students’ ability in the native language by providing dictionaries and other aids in that language and helping them to make the transition between that language and English. We provide materials and testing materials in native language *until* the student reaches a level of proficiency at which these materials are no longer needed.

j) How is academic language development planned?

Students work with the learning specialist, who collaborates with the teaching team to plan for students’ academic language development.

k) What services are provided for Students with Interrupted Formal Education?

We do not currently have students who are SIFE, but if we did would provide with push-in and pull-out services.

l) Are Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE) provided with additional instructional time in extended day and/or Saturday academies?

## II. Based on your school’s data analysis, articulate the LAP for each program model

### Freestanding English as a Second Language (ESL)

- a) Which program instructional model will be implemented? (Note: The two recommended models include self-contained ESL classes and “push-in” teaching).

Our ESL program is designed to address the four language skill areas of understanding, speaking, reading and writing in English as well as in content-area classes. The language arts component includes English language arts instruction and English as a second language instruction. Both ESL and ELA teachers collaborate to create a push-in model of ESL. Language Arts is based on the NY State learning standards and on the New York City curriculum frameworks for Balanced Literacy and is loosely based on the Three-Period Model described by Fountas and Pinnell in Guiding Readers and Writers. Program components include:

- Language and Word Study: Choral reading, words study, vocabulary, test readiness
- Reading Workshop: Independent reading, guided reading and literature study
- Writing Workshop: Independent writing, guided writing and investigations

This Balanced Literacy model continues into the high-school years. The writing workshop model will continue and expand in the later years, with an emphasis on expository, analytical and persuasive writing based on information collected from multiple sources, including primary and secondary sources. For English Language Learners, the expanding focus also emphasizes increasingly focused and complex listening and speaking opportunities. As a culminating activity, students will be able to research and prepare a well-documented research paper on a topic of interest to them. They will give an oral presentation on this topic to a committee of students and judges.

- b) In elementary schools, are there common planning periods for the ESL and classroom teachers in order to maximize English language acquisition for ELLs?

Yes. There is a daily common planning period for these teachers.

- c) At the middle and high school levels, do ESL teachers work collaboratively with ELA teachers?

Yes. There is a daily common planning period for these teachers.

- d) Are students receiving the New York State-mandated ESL/ELA allotted instruction time based on student proficiency level?

Students will receive the New York State-mandated ESL/ELA allotted instruction time. We will do this by adding one additional 45 minute period to their 70 minute ESL/ELA block.

<b>Grade/Proficiency</b>	<b>Beginner</b>	<b>Intermediate</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
Grades 6, 7 & 8	360 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week

Grades 9 – 12	540 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week
---------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

e) Are ESL strategies infused into content instruction?

ESL strategies are infused into content instruction by the content area teachers. Content area teachers provide opportunities for sheltered language, structuring and scaffolding and alternative assessments for ELL students. Content Area teachers will collaborate with the ESL teacher to create a plan for ELL students.

f) In self-contained, free-standing ESL models, do teachers hold both ESL and content area credentials?

We do not have a free-standing model.

## **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\_\_\$557,462\_\_\_\_\_
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program\_\_\$5,182\_\_\_\_\_
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified\_\_\_\_\_ \$28,000 \_\_\_\_\_
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year \_\_\_\_ 100% \_\_\_\_\_
5. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2007-2008 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year.

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

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

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

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

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

### **Parental Involvement Policy**

Our school agrees to implement the following statutory requirements:

- The school will put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents, consistent with section 1118 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Those programs, activities and procedures will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children.
- The school will ensure that the required school-level parental involvement policy meets the requirements of section 1118(b) of the ESEA, and includes, as a component, a school-parent compact consistent with section 1118(b) of the ESEA.
- The school will incorporate this parental involvement policy into its school improvement plan.
- In carrying out the Title I, Part A parental involvement requirements, to the extent practicable, the school will provide full opportunities for the participation of parents with limited English proficiency, parents with disabilities, and parents of migratory children, including providing information and school reports required under section 1111 of ESEA in an understandable and uniform format and, including alternative formats upon request, and, to the extent practicable, in a language parents understand.
- The school will involve the parents of children served in Title I, Part A programs in decisions about how the 1 percent of Title I, Part A funds reserved for parental involvement is spent.
- The school will be governed by the following statutory definition of parental involvement, and will carry out programs, activities and procedures in accordance with this definition:
  - Parental involvement means the participation of parents in regular, two-way, and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring:

- that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning;
- that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school;
- that parents are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child; the carrying out of other activities, such as those described in section 1118 of the ESEA.
- The school will inform parents and parental organizations of the purpose and existence of the Parental Information and Resource Center in the State.

## **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.

We have undergone a comprehensive needs assessment this year to look at school performance. Also, as part of the accountability program, we were a pilot school in the new School Quality Review process. The needs assessment process involved the pre-assessment for this visit, combined with the reflections on the visit by our teacher leadership team on our school retreat. We concluded that our major goals were: creation of improved adult teams, increased parental involvement, a system of data from assessments, a system for school-wide behavioral data and increased support for at-risk students.

### **2. School-wide reform strategies that:**

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

We are using school-wide programs to provide opportunities for all students to meet the state's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement and to use effective methods and instructional strategies such as before and after school tutoring for at-risk students, including ELL and

special education students. Specifically, we do extended day programming including tutoring, book clubs, test preparation and year book and we use some portion of the Title 1 monies to pay for professional development for our teachers in the integration of technology into the curriculum in order to provide opportunities for our students to meet and exceed state standards.

### **3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.**

A portion of the SWP money goes to pay for on-going professional development and support by our partner organizations, Teaching Matters and the Salvadori Center. These partners provide support in curriculum planning, technology integration and technology support. At the core of the school are a philosophy, curriculum and faculty that promote success by engaging students in learning they recognize as relevant to their lives. The school will provide standards-focused and technology-informed programs for its 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade students. The problem/project-based learning units that are central to its programs will be developed and offered in conjunction with the Salvadori Center and Teaching Matters and, ultimately, will be reflected in the real world internships provide by the wider community. Commitment to professional development is central to the strength of the CBOs of BAFF. Both the Salvadori Center and Teaching Matters are professional development organizations with common philosophies and methodologies.

**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 School-wide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.

Professional development will occur in the following ways:

- Institute and summer curriculum planning
- Weekly adult learning minute blocks
- On-site professional development
- Live online training

Our priorities for professional development common to all teachers include:

- Training on advisory (on-site with in-house social worker)
- Project-based learning through the built environment (Institute and on-site, in-class support)
- Technology across the curriculum (on-line, on-site consultant)
- Authentic assessment techniques (on-site consultant)
- Writing Workshop (Workshops)
- Strategies for working with English as a Second Language Students (on-site consultant)

### **4. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.**

We have a school-wide hiring committee which actively recruits experienced teachers to teach in all of the school's grade levels. The hiring committee sends flyers and mailings, post vacancies on electronic websites and actively recruits experienced teachers to join our "staffulty".

### **5. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.**

We involve parents in workshops regarding literacy and technology and involve parents in our library as volunteers and as members of the book club. We also involve parents through the motherhood and fatherhood programs and through the ARM program, which provides mentoring and assistance on an ongoing basis on Saturdays.

6. **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.

We do not have a pre-school age population.

7. **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.

This is a major goal for the 2006 – 2007 school years. We are working with New Leaders for New Schools to develop and implement a more rigorous Interim Assessment program, including keeping track of students' progress in terms of reading, writing and math and evaluating them on a periodic basis.

8. **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.

We use learning specialists and a learning lab as well as before and after school tutoring to give students additional help and to catch them up to the proficient level.

9. **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.

We do not have any of the above programs in our school.

**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:** 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

**UPDATED – SEPTEMBER 2008**

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>1</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>1</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 used a team of English Teachers from our ELA Team in grades 6 – 12 to assess whether Finding 1A was relevant to our school's educational program. This group meets weekly on Wednesday afternoons. Further more, our ELA team met with members of our Inquiry Team to discuss reading comprehension and instruction. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

We have school-wide curriculum maps aligned to NY State Standards in all grades and subject areas, including English Language arts.

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.

The finding is not applicable.

---

## **1B. Mathematics**

### **Background**

New York State assessments measure conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem solving. In the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, these are represented as *process strands* and *content strands*. These strands help to define what students should know and be able to do as a result of their engagement in the study of mathematics. The critical nature of the process strands in the teaching and learning of mathematics has been identified in the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, revised by NYS Board of Regents on March 15, 2005: The process strands (Problem Solving, Reasoning and Proof, Communication, Connections, and Representation) highlight ways of acquiring and using content knowledge. These process strands help to give meaning to mathematics and help students to see mathematics as a discipline rather than a set of isolated skills. Student engagement in mathematical content is accomplished through these process strands. Students will gain a better understanding of mathematics and have longer retention of mathematical knowledge as they solve problems, reason mathematically, prove mathematical relationships, participate in mathematical discourse, make mathematical connections, and model and represent mathematical ideas in a variety of ways. (University of the State of New York & New York State Education Department, 2005, p. 2) When curriculum guides lack precise reference to the indicators for the process strands, then explicit alignment of the curriculum to the process strands is left to the interpretation of the individual classroom teacher.

### **Specific Math Alignment Issues:**

- A review of key district documents for mathematics shows substantial evidence that the primary mathematics instructional materials for Grades K–8 (*Everyday Mathematics* [K–5] and *Impact Mathematics* [6–8]) are aligned with the New York state *content strands* except for some gaps that appear at the middle school level in the areas of measurement and geometry and number sense and operations. The instructional materials that were available at the high school level during the time of the audits (New York City Math A and B [8–12]) were aligned with the 1999 standards but not with the newer 2005 standards. Furthermore, these documents show that there is a very weak alignment to the New York state *process strands* for mathematics at all grade levels.
- The SEC data for mathematics curriculum alignment (similar to Key Finding 1A for ELA), shows that there is a lack of depth in what is being taught in the mathematics classroom as compared to what is required by the state standards.

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

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

We used a team of mathematics teachers from our Math Team in grades 6 – 12 to assess whether Finding 1A was relevant to our school's educational program. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school's educational program.

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

**UPDATED – SEPTEMBER 2008**

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?

We have school-wide curriculum maps aligned to NY State Standards in all grades and subject areas including Mathematics.

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

Not applicable.

---

## **KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION**

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

### ***2A – ELA Instruction***

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

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

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

We used a team of English from grades 6 – 12 to assess whether Finding 1A was relevant to our school’s educational program. This group meets weekly on Wednesday afternoons. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school’s educational program.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

Our English instruction is among the best in our school, as evidenced by high performance on our school Progress Reports and by supervisory visits.

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

Not applicable.

---

## **2B – Mathematics Instruction**

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (SOM<sup>2</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.

---

<sup>2</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

We used a team of Mathematics Teachers from our Math Team in grades 6 – 12 to assess whether Finding 1A was relevant to our school’s educational program. This group meets weekly on Wednesday afternoons. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school’s educational program.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

Our mathematics instruction is focused on an active learning model, which incorporates technology and the use of manipulatives for problem solving.

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

---

### **KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

We used members of our Steering Team to review the BEDS survey and data from teacher surveys by our partner organization, National Academy for Excellent Teaching. This group meets weekly on Thursday afternoons. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school’s educational program.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

We have a very low number of new and transfer teachers each year.

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

Not applicable.

---

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

We used members of our Steering Team to review the data from English Language Learners and data from teacher surveys by our partner organization, National Academy for Excellent Teaching. This group meets weekly on Thursday afternoons. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

We offer extensive on-site and off-site professional development for teachers of English Language Learners.

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

Not applicable.

---

**KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

We used members of our Steering Team to review the data from English Language Learners and data from teacher surveys by our partner organization, National Academy for Excellent Teaching. We also used members of our Student Support team, which meets weekly on Wednesday afternoons. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

We routinely share ELL data with teachers and discuss ELL interventions at our weekly Kid Talk sessions.

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.

Not applicable.

---

**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 used members of our Steering Team to review the data from English Language Learners and data from teacher surveys by our partner organization, National Academy for Excellent Teaching. We also reviewed this at our weekly Student Support Team meeting, which meets weekly on Wednesday afternoons. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

We routinely share Special Education data with teachers and discuss Special Education interventions at our weekly Kid Talk sessions.

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

Not applicable.

---

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

We used members of our Steering Team to review the data from Special Education students and data from teacher surveys by our partner organization, National Academy for Excellent Teaching. We also reviewed this at our weekly Student Support Team meeting, which meets weekly on Wednesday afternoons. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a teacher meeting and with our Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

We routinely share Special Education data, including IEP's, with teachers and discuss Special Education interventions at our weekly Kid Talk sessions. We make a point to ensure that IEP's and interventions include classroom modifications.

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

Not applicable.

## CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

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

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

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

Submit date: **Jul 9, 2008**

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

School DBN	12x067
School Name	C. S. 67X
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 264,756
Principal Name	Mrs. Emily B. Grimball
Principal Email	egrimba@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	7185898090

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	\$ 264,756
Reducing teacher-student ratio through team teaching strategies	\$ 0

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

- Yes  
 No

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

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

For example:

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

C4E Target #2: 8 - Math - Students with Disabilities - 26 - 1 -25

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

For example:

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

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

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

For example:

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

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

	Targeted Grade	Targeted Subject	Targeted Population	Average Class Size 2007-08	# New Classrooms / New Sections
C4E Target #1	3	All (ES only)	Students with Low Academic Achievement	27.0	1
C4E Target #2	4	All (ES only)	Students with Low Academic Achievement	27.0	1
C4E Target #3	5	All (ES only)	Students with Low Academic Achievement	27.0	1
C4E Target #4					
C4E Target #5					
C4E Target #6					

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

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 Engl Learners (ELLs)?

Yes

No

---

**CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence**