



**PUBLIC SCHOOL 29
JOHN M. HARRIGAN SCHOOL**

**2009-10
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

SCHOOL: 15/ K029

ADDRESS: 425 HENRY STREET BROOKLYN, NY 11201

TELEPHONE: 718-330-9277

FAX: 718-596-1887

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 2009-2010

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 IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT

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: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10

APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A - SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: P.S. 29 **SCHOOL NAME:** John M. Harrigan School

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 425 Henry St. Brooklyn, NY 11201

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-330-9277 **FAX:** 718-596-1887

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Melanie Raneri Woods **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Mwoods4@school.s.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Natalie Green Giles

PRINCIPAL: Melanie Raneri Woods

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Nicole Nadeau

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Lisa Trollback

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools)

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 15 **SSO NAME:** ESA #3

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Joseph Cassidy and Alison Sheehan

SUPERINTENDENT: Anita Skop

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

Directions: Each school is required to form a School Leadership Team (SLT) as per State Education Law Section 2590. SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff (students and CBO members are not counted when assessing this balance requirement), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. Chancellor’s Regulation A-655 requires a minimum of ten members on each team. Each SLT members should be listed separately in the left hand column on the chart below. Please specify any position held by a member on the team (e.g., SLT Chairperson, SLT Secretary) and the constituent group represented (e.g., parent, staff, student, or CBO). 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 revised Chancellor’s Regulations A-655; 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 a written explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Melanie Raneri Woods	*Principal or Designee	
Nicole Nadeau	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Lisa Trollback	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
N/A	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
N/A	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
N/A	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
N/A	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Natalie Green Giles	Member/Parent/SLT Chair	
Lisa Weger	Member/Parent/Co-secretary	
Stephanie Carney-Manske	Member/Parent/Co-secretary	
Katie Browning	Member/Parent	
Jainen Thayer	Member/Parent	
Elizabeth Cosentino	Member/Teacher	
Cara Turnbull	Member/School Counselor	
Monica Salazar-Austin	Member/Teacher	
Maureen Crowley	Member/Teacher	

- Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

P.S. 29 is a vibrant and passionate community of learners, proud of its rich 88-year-history. As a neighborhood school in historic Cobble Hill, P.S. 29 thrives on its tradition of progressive, forward-thinking education and its ability to continuously reflect, grow, and be proactive in meeting the needs of all of our children, at all ends of the learning spectrum.

Our mission statement best conveys the essence of who we are as a school:

At P.S. 29, our multicultural community thrives in a highly collaborative and supportive environment that embodies a commitment to continuous learning and innovative practice. Fueled by powerful connections among our children, families, and staff, P.S. 29 cultivates intellectual curiosity and develops diverse perspectives, motivating children to take risks, respectfully challenge each other's thinking, and discover their own unique ability to make positive change in the world.

P.S. 29 is a Teachers College Reading and Writing Project School. As a designated model literacy school, we open our classroom doors to visitors from across the city and the country, sharing best practices in literacy education. Our children learn in a workshop model across our curriculum.

We are driven by our commitment to the success of all of our children, and work, through differentiated instruction, to ensure individual mastery of the foundational elements of the curriculum—reading, writing, math, social studies, and science—while offering exposure to a wide range of enrichment opportunities which we believe are equally important to a child's success. Our children participate in physical education, research and technology, and visual/fine arts on a weekly basis. Throughout the year, these studies are rounded out by our many enrichment offerings, including our: music program in collaboration with the Brooklyn Queens Conservatory of Music (music instruction within the school day as well as lunchtime band and chorus); arts partnerships which enhance our offerings in both visual and performing arts (e.g. Dancing Classrooms, the New Victory Theatre, Citilore, BAM, the Metropolitan Opera Guild); chess program through Let's Play Chess; Food and Farming initiative, which offers both a nutrition/wellness component, complementing our efforts as a School Food Plus school (i.e., we have a daily salad bar which, season permitting, serves vegetables harvested from our schoolyard garden) as well as hands-on experiential learning in our science curriculum; and lunch time sport teams, including a running team and basketball league.

P.S. 29 is fortunate to have a wonderfully diverse student body—a student body that ethnically, culturally, and socio-economically reflects the world into which we send our students. Through the community building efforts of our Diversity Committee, we continuously look for opportunities to learn from and understand our differences and celebrate our shared vision, reaching out to make sure all families feel included and supported in our learning environment. Our commitment to Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT), where we now have CTT classes on every grade from K-5, also reflects our efforts to create an inclusive educational environment for all.

Finally, our shared vision and sense of purpose among our teachers, staff, children and families is one of the hallmarks of who we are. All members of the PS 29 community are invested in the ongoing success of the school. All voices are heard and valued. Opportunities for involvement and contributing to the school in meaningful ways are available to all. Children start recycling programs and write letters encouraging social action; parents share their knowledge and passions, teaching enrichment clusters, organizing our running team, shoveling soil for our edible garden, running food drives; teachers attend outside-of-school fundraising and community building events hosted by our PTA, mingling with parents and children on their own time.

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.

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2009-1A - March 2009)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
School Name:	P.S. 029 John M. Harrigan						
District:	15	DBN:	15K029	School BEDS Code:	331500010029		
DEMOGRAPHICS							
Grades Served:	Pre-K	√	3	√	7		11
	K	√	4	√	8		12
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded
	2	√	6		10		
Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09
Pre-K	54	54	54		95.3	95.5	95.2
Kindergarten	79	96	99	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 1	129	90	100	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 2	109	117	95		98.0	98.4	98.8
Grade 3	94	83	108	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 4	132	83	108	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 5	122	127	81		28.3	29.3	30.3
Grade 6	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 7	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 8	0	0	0		2	0	10
Grade 9	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 11	0	0	0		0	0	0
Grade 12	0	0	0	Special Education Enrollment:			
Ungraded	1	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Total	720	677	648		0	0	0
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Self-Contained Classes	26	15	11	Principal Suspensions	13	8	11
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	17	33	Superintendent Suspensions	4	5	2
Number all others	52	34	30	Special High School Programs - Total Number:			
These students are included in the enrollment information above.				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
(BESIS Survey)				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:			
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0		44	48	45
# receiving ESL services only	14	22	20	Number of Teachers	44	48	45

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2009-1A - March 2009)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	1	5	4	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	7	8	8
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	4	4
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	54.5	68.8	66.7
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	43.2	47.9	53.3
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher	93.0	96.0	96.0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	90.0	86.8	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4	0.2	0.0				
Black or African American	14.0	11.1	10.5				
Hispanic or Latino	24.0	24.4	22.1				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	6.2	6.9	8.0				
White	55.3	57.5	57.3				
Male	47.1	48.9	49.7				
Female	52.9	51.1	50.3				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
√	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2008-09) Based on 2007-08 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2009-1A - March 2009)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:	IGS			ELA:			
Math:	IGS			Math:			
Science:	IGS			Graduation Rate:			

This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
Student Groups		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate
All Students		√	√	√			
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American		√	√	-			
Hispanic or Latino		√	√	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		-	-	-			
White		√	√	√			
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities		√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient		-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged		√	√	-			
Student groups making AYP in each subject		6	6	2	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
Progress Report Results – 2008-09				Quality Review Results – 2008-09			
Overall Letter Grade:	A			Overall Evaluation:	√		
Overall Score:	72.7			Quality Statement Scores:			
Category Scores:				Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	√		
School Environment:	10.8			Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	√		
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	√		
School Performance:	17.2			Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	√		
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	√		
Student Progress:	40.9						
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	3.8						

KEY: AYP STATUS				KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE			
√ = Made AYP				Δ = Underdeveloped			
√ ^{SH} = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target				▶ = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features			
X = Did Not Make AYP				√ = Proficient			
– = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status				W = Well Developed			
				◇ = Outstanding			
				NR = No Review Required			

* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.

Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools; NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Directions: Conduct a comprehensive review of your school's educational program informed by the most current quantitative and qualitative data available regarding student performance trends and other indicators of progress. Include in your needs assessment an analysis of information available from New York State Education Department and New York City Department of Education accountability and assessment resources, i.e., School Report Cards, Progress Reports, Quality Review and Quality Review Self-Assessment documents, periodic assessments, ARIS, as well as results of Inquiry Team action research, surveys, and school-based assessments. (Refer to your school's Demographics and Accountability Snapshot in Part B of Section III, and feel free to use any additional measures used by your school to determine the effectiveness of educational programs) 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 implications 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?
-

- We have seen consistent gains at PS 29 in **NYS reading and math scores, grades 3-5**. Specifically, back in **2001**, 61.1% of our students scored at or above grade level in **ELA**, **85.4% in 2008**, and **most recently, 87.9% in 2009**. In 2001, 62.2% of our students scored at or above grade level in **Math**, compared to **89.2% in 2008**, and **95.2% in 2009**. **These gains reflect our total population**, both special and general education students. Our students are also high performing when looking at **other measures of success**, including teacher developed assessments, pre- and end of unit assessments, our DY0 assessments, and our School Progress Report Grade of A. Our work, which is highly differentiated, is data driven—data that goes beyond standardized test scores. As expressed in the Inquiry Team Handbook (NYC DOE 2008), assessments that provide us meaningful data include assignments, observations, note-taking, running records and so much more. Our continued challenge is to keep our eyes and our attention focused on continuing to improve instruction for all children, bringing children who are less successful into the sphere of success, and, of course, to maintain the extraordinary level of dedication, professionalism and rigor in our staff and the exemplary level of parental trust and involvement.
- We are confident from the Learning Environment Survey, the School Quality Review, and other informal feedback, such as inquiries regarding “variances” and “exception to placements” that our **teaching practice and curricula are highly satisfactory and have a positive impact on student learning**. Our approach and philosophy includes high expectations for students, supporting an academically rigorous and differentiated curriculum in reading, writing, math, social studies, science, the arts, technology and physical education. Our **curriculum is broad and diverse** in that it reaches beyond these curricular areas and into the realm of enrichment, multicultural education and diversity, health and wellness, and a food and farming initiative.
- All quantitative and qualitative measures, including our NYS test scores, our SQR, and School Report Card, and interim assessments, convince us that the pedagogy at PS 29 is rigorous and differentiated to meet the needs of all learners and that the way we work together is one of the major underpinnings of our success. Our school is a **community of reflective practitioners**. We continue to provide professional development in service of a shared philosophy with the deep understanding that it is our responsibility to continue on a learning curve and that the work is never quite done. Professional growth is an outstanding feature at PS 29, as we have many structures in place to support ongoing learning. As the DOE states in the LES survey's Academic Expectations, schools should be encouraged to do their best work by developing rigorous and meaningful academic goals. This is evidenced by the fact that our teachers and administration work closely together in the area of quality of practice. Our 2008-2009 LES shows that 97% of our teachers agree with this statement: “Most teachers in my school work together to improve their instructional practice.” Further, the 2008-2009 LES indicates 100% agreement on the part of teachers with the statement “curriculum instruction and assessment are aligned within and across grade levels at this school.”
- We continue to use **school-wide assessments in literacy** and this year, we have advanced our work with a Teachers College-developed data entry system called *AssessmentPro*, developed specifically for schools utilizing the TC DY0 running records assessments. In previous SQRs it was noted that “Very good use is

made of data to differentiate instruction.” Through *AssessmentPro* this data is now further analyzed, and gives staff a closer look at each student’s literacy progress, as well as at class and school trends, therefore helping us to further plan for individual and small group needs in each of our classrooms. We enter data from running record assessments as well as early childhood indicators of reading progress such as concepts of print, letter/sound identification and word recognition. We also enter data on spelling/vocabulary/phonics development, which is explained below.

- Our pilot implementation of a new differentiated **word study program** (*Words Their Way* by Donald Bear) last year in grades K-3 proved extremely successful, and we are now implementing the program in Grades 4 and 5. It is a highly differentiated approach that caters to each child’s specific phonics, spelling and vocabulary needs. *AssessmentPro* helps us to keep track of student progress in this area.
- We are especially proud of our efforts to build our **Collaborative Team Teaching** instruction. Last year we had doubled our CTT classes (from 2 to 4); this year we have a CTT class on every grade, K-5. We consider this model to be a strength in our school and a testament to our philosophy of inclusiveness.
- PS 29 prides itself on our **strong home school partnership** and exceptional parent involvement. Parent support goes far beyond fundraising as parents play an active role in decision making and in committee work. From helping to start our diversity initiative (six years ago) and food and farming initiative (two years ago) to leading Enrichment Clusters across grades, our families are involved on a wide range of levels. According to our 2008-2009 LES, 98% of parents feel welcomed at our school and 96% of parents agree that they have the opportunity to be involved in their children’s education.
- We have a very active **Diversity Committee** that over the past several years has worked around issues of diversity and multicultural education (MCE). Utilizing the results of a variety of data, such as gathered from our LES (both the teacher and parent survey), and school-developed parent, teacher and student surveys and studies, we have: created a peer mediation program to help empower our children at lunchtime to feel that they are part of the solution around conflict; developed strategies for teachers to help give children the tools they need to resolve their own conflicts; worked actively with parents to engage all members of our community, building bridges and breaking down barriers, especially those who despite our best efforts, feel marginalized; and providing ongoing professional development for staff.
- PS 29 places a very high value on **relationships among staff and families**. As our 2008 SQR states, “Relationships are excellent resulting in high standards of behavior and a real enjoyment of learning.” It additionally states, “Staff, students, and parents have high expectations for each other.” In our 2008-2009 LES, 97% of our parents report being either very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of their child’s teacher. As stated above, we continue to work on empowering children in their own conflicts both in the school and on the playground. In response to their needs, we continue to find ways to nurture the social/emotional development of children through a variety of methods and strategies; e.g., The Responsive Classroom teachings around the implementation of morning meeting. Most importantly, 99% of our families report that their children feel safe at our school, according to the LES.
- Beginning in 2000, the PTA and school administration and staff of PS 29, made the decision to phase out the self contained gifted and talented tracked program. In response to the diverse gifts and talents of all of our children, over the course of the past six years we have developed a **school-wide enrichment model**. This work is based on the studies of Joseph Renzulli and his associates (The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented) at UCONN that looks at differentiation of instruction and how we meet the talents, interests and abilities of all of our children. It includes brown bag lunches for students, school-wide enrichment clusters and use of the Renzulli Online System that profiles student interest areas and learning styles.
- To further our use of technology to improve communication and coordination, the PTA has updated our new school website, SchoolHub, where teachers and their class parents can post assignments, send newsletters, communicate effectively with families and interact with colleagues, sharing best practices. We are also using **technology more extensively in classrooms with our children and staff and supporting the use of technology at home**. For instance, our research and technology teacher has programmed times where she is in classrooms with teachers and students, demonstrating the use of technology as a learning tool, teachers use SmartBoards, and we have a part-time Tech Assistant this year through CUNY, who works with our research and technology teacher, trouble-shooting tech issues, assisting teachers in their classrooms with technology and updating our technology resources.
- Through our ESA network, it was identified that our rate of referral to special education exceeds the average rate of referral across all schools in all networks. The rate of referral for ELL children also exceeds averages across all schools in all networks. To address this, we have received ARRA (Federal stimulus) funds in (approximately \$5,000) to support a Coordinated Early Intervening Services program at PS 29. The money will be used to fund both after school support programs for students, workshops for classroom

teachers, and time for service providers and classroom teachers to work together to ultimately reduce the referral rate.

- One major new goal we have added for 2009-2010 stems from several sources including the finding from the LES that 86% of parents agree with the statement “my child’s teacher gives me helpful comments on my child’s homework and tests.” We believe this number needs to be higher, and have an extensive effort in place for this year to improve **student feedback to children and parents** in terms of both consistency and comprehensiveness.
- Finally, we continue to monitor the **ongoing impact of the budget cuts** for the 2009-2010 school year. While we know we are in tight fiscal times, the strengths of our school community—the things that we value and stand for, that are our mission, and that are endemic to PS 29’s extraordinary teaching and learning—like small class size, professional development, the arts, intervention and enrichment, all remain vulnerable. In 2009-2010, we’ve had to: cut funding for a two and a half day enrichment specialist; excess two of our school aides; cut back on professional development; cut spending on much needed supplies; and cut arts collaborations, relying on PTA support in this area. We will work hard to manage any additional cuts in the best possible way, in collaboration with staff, parents and children, to make sure that we stay true to our goals and to our vision.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

Directions: Based on the findings and implications from the comprehensive needs assessment (Section IV), determine your school's instructional goals for 2009-10 and list them in this section along with a few phrases of description. The resulting list should include a limited number of goals (5 is a good guideline), and the list as a whole should be a clear reflection of your priorities for the year. Good goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.

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

GOAL #1

- By June 2010, continue to build on best practices in literacy to ensure we meet the individualized reading and writing needs of all students.

GOAL #2

- By June 2010, continue to improve math instruction by differentiating our teaching practices to support students as they acquire mathematical knowledge, skills and confidence and further developing our math enrichment practices to help children at all levels of the learning spectrum become better mathematicians.

GOAL #3

- By June 2010, create and implement new initiatives that build upon best practices to provide feedback to students and families to support the improvement of student work and progress in three areas: literacy, math, and science.

GOAL #4

- By June 2010, continue to implement a variety of school-wide enrichment structures and practices to enhance the educational experience and help meet the needs, interests, and abilities of all learners (K-5).

GOAL #5

- By June 2010, continue to focus on issues of diversity and multiculturalism and its implications for classroom practice and school culture.

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 2009-10 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, Corrective Action, Restructuring, SURR or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Literacy

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By June 2010, continue to build on best practices in literacy to ensure we meet the individualized reading and writing needs of all students.
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will select literacy leaders for each grade level team. These leaders will meet with literacy supervisors to make plans for implementation of literacy goals and initiatives. Target Population: Classroom teachers in K-5; Responsible Staff Members: Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal and Frank Thomas, Assistant Principal; Implementation timeline: September-June. We will use vertical planning with teachers across grades across specific units of study to ensure the literacy work and goals are building from year to year. Target Population: Classroom teachers in K-5; Responsible Staff Members: Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal and Frank Thomas, Assistant Principal; Implementation timeline: September-June To support accountable talk in the service of comprehension, we will provide professional development and set up inter-visitations for teachers in all grades to observe and co-facilitate grand conversations during read aloud time to. Target Population: Classroom Teachers in K-5; Responsible Staff Member: Frank Thomas, Assistant Principal; Implementation Timeline: October-April. We will have opportunities for teachers to learn how to use running records and Assessment Pro data to set learning goals for individual students. Target Population: Classroom teachers in K-5; Responsible Staff Members: Susannah Sperry, Research & Technology Teacher, Frank Thomas, Assistant Principal and Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal; Implementation Timeline: September-March. Implementation of our differentiated word study curriculum “Words Their Way” (already

	<p>implemented in grades K-2) in grades 4 and 5. Responsible Staff Members: Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal and Frank Thomas, Assistant Principal, 4th and 5th grade classroom teachers; Implementation timeline: September-June</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We purchased additional calendar days at Teachers College so teachers can receive professional development on talk, word study and Assessment Pro. • We will use per diem money to pay for substitute teachers so teachers can attend meetings and workshops. • Purchase of additional curriculum materials to support upper grade implementation of “Words Their Way.”
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Teachers will verbally reflect about their work in these areas monthly during administrator-led grade meetings. On average, students will progress 3 reading levels during the course of the school year, in K and grades 2-5. On average students in Grade 1 will progress 6 levels. Review of notes from literacy leaders Development of cross grade curricula Informal and formal observation of implementation of grand conversations.</p>

Subject/Area (where relevant):

Mathematics

Annual Goal

Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.

- By June 2010, continue to improve math instruction by differentiating our teaching practices to support students as they acquire mathematical knowledge, skills and confidence and further developing our math enrichment practices to help children at all levels of the learning spectrum become better mathematicians.

Action Plan

Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.

- Grades have developed math pacing/curricular calendars with scheduled opportunities in each unit of study for building upon math enrichment. **Target population:** all students, grades K-5 **Responsible staff members:** K-5 teachers, Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal, Dawn Pender, Asst. Principal **Implementation timeline:** October-June
- Utilize pre unit assessments to help determine which students are able to step out of the unit of study and engage in a long term enrichment project or more advanced math activities (during either actual lessons or during Friday centers). **Target population:** all students, grades K-5 **Responsible staff members:** K-5 teachers, Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal, Dawn Pender, Asst. Principal **Implementation timeline:** October-June
- Incorporate “Friday Enrichment Centers” as part of the Friday daily agenda using resources and activities compiled by last year’s enrichment specialist as well as those compiled by this year’s classroom teachers **Target population:** all students, grades K-5 **Responsible staff members:** K-5 teachers, Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal, Dawn Pender, Asst. Principal **Implementation timeline:** October-June
- Use Monday Professional Studies, other PD sessions, and math leader meetings to continue to plan, develop and share math enrichment activities and strategies that build from one year to the next **Target population:** K-5 teachers, math leaders **Responsible staff members:** Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal, Dawn Pender, Asst. Principal, grade math leaders **Implementation timeline:** Septemberr-June
- Develop a document for parents explaining how math enrichment works at PS 29 **Target population:** PS 29 K-5 families **Responsible staff members:** Melanie Raneri Woods, Principal, Dawn Pender, Asst. Principal **Implementation timeline:** November

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using tax levy dollars, Dawn Pender and math leaders will participate in the Math Collective professional development run by Kate Abell, DOE math staff developer
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Classroom observations ○ Projects and samples of work of students who participate in Friday Math Enrichment Centers ○ Packets of materials developed and utilized by teachers ○ Student reflections/portfolio work from children and parents ○ Classroom record keeping/conference notes

Subject/Area (where relevant): Math, Literacy, and Science

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By June 2010, create and implement new initiatives that build upon best practices to provide feedback to students and families to support the improvement of student work and progress in three areas: literacy, math, and science.
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will complete a fall professional development survey that will guide this work. Target population: K-5 classroom teachers Responsible staff members: Melanie Woods, Frank Thomas, Dawn Pender Implementation timeline: September-June Schedule a cycle of seven administrative led grade meetings through one hour lunches (SBO) Target population: K-5 classroom teachers Responsible staff members: Melanie Woods, Frank Thomas, Dawn Pender Implementation timeline: September-June Create and share rubrics and assessments for student work Target population: PS 29 children and families Responsible staff members: K-5 teachers and science teachers Implementation timeline: September-June Implement redesigned lower and upper grade report cards reflecting greater specificity in the breakdown of skills and competencies in reading, writing, and math and providing families more detailed information around student work in each area. Target population: PS 29 children and families Responsible staff members: K-5 teachers, administrative team Implementation timeline: November, March and June
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>SBO one hour lunch periods for administrative led meetings Network Principal Literacy Study Group Visits to other schools Teacher participation in TC leadership groups and inquiry teams</p>

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains

- Teachers on every grade level team (K-5) will design and implement feedback in the form of minimally 4 writer's notebooks assessments (Grades 3-5 only), 3 math assessments, and 3 published piece assessments that will be shared with families.
- Science teachers will develop at least 2 rubrics/assessments that will be shared with families
- Notes from administrative led grade meetings (once a month) and other grade leader led grade meetings (every week)
- Samples of rubrics by grades across notebooks, published pieces. end of unit math and science assessments.
- Feedback from parents on the Learning Environment Survey

Subject/Area (where relevant): Schoolwide Enrichment

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By June 2010, continue to implement a variety of school-wide enrichment structures and practices to enhance the educational experience and help meet the needs, interests, and abilities of all learners (K-5).
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to implement three ten-week cycles of enrichment clusters. Target Population: Students in Grades K-5. Responsible Staff Members: Frank Thomas, Assistant Principal Implementation Timeline: (Oct.-Dec: Grades 1 & 2, Jan.-March: Grades 4 & 5, March-May: Kindergarten). Continue to implement brown bag lunch seminars. Target Population: Students in Grades K-5; Responsible Staff Members: Nina Jalowayski, Parent Coordinator; Implementation Timeline: Nov-June. Continue to survey our students to collect data on their strengths, interests and learning styles. Target Population: Students in Grades K-5; Responsible Staff Member: Susannah Sperry, Research & Technology Teacher; Implementation Timeline: September-March Build on our food and farming/school garden initiative as both a hands-on science enrichment program and a component of our nutrition-wellness activities through the ongoing use of the garden and the scheduling of major schoolwide events and opportunities around the garden (e.g. Harvest Day and our summer gardening program). Target Population: all students and families Responsible Staff Members: Melanie R. Woods, Principal, Emily Freund, VISTA worker, Tina Aprea-Reres and Abe Ammary, Science Teachers Implementation Timeline: July-June
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will continue to use a variety of professional texts about SEM to support us in this work including Nora Friedman's <i>The Art of Schoolwide Enrichment</i>. Meetings will be scheduled for all teacher and parent facilitators who will be leading enrichment clusters. Using PTA funds, we have hired an AmericaCorps VISTA worker, Emily Freund, to oversee our garden and our Food and Farming Initiative for the 2009-2010 school year.

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains

Students will complete reflection sheets at the end of each enrichment cluster cycle (3x/year).

Enrichment cluster facilitators will complete a reflection sheet which will be reviewed by the administration to inform future enrichment cycles.

Ongoing Food and Farming Initiative surveys and feedback will be collected and analyzed.

Subject/Area (where relevant): School Climate/Diversity and Multiculturalism

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By June 2010, continue to focus on issues of diversity and multiculturalism and its implications for classroom practice and school culture.
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A survey of classroom teachers will be conducted to collect data on which families do not reimburse the PTA for classroom supplies (a fixed amount per student is requested in each grade and teachers buy the materials in bulk in lieu of individual families making the purchases), as requested at both the end of the school year and in the summer prior to the beginning of school. The purpose of the survey is to understand which cases are economic (matched against free lunch and other indicators) and which may be stemming from other reasons (cultural barriers, language barriers, values, etc.) Target population: K-5 Classroom teachers. Responsible staff members: Diversity Committee will administer and analyze survey results. Parent coordinator will liaison with implementation of action plan based on results. Implementation timeline: October 2009 administration of survey; ongoing followup through June 2009. Our Peer Mediation Program will continue to serve as a means to alleviate conflicts during recess and to empower students with the skills necessary to solve their own conflicts. To measure the success of the program a longitudinal study will be done where students will be given a recess climate survey in Fall 2009 and in June 2010. Target population: children in grades K-5. Responsible staff: Cara Turnbull, School Counselor. Implementation timeline: September –June. Working with the PTA, the Diversity Committee will sponsor an evening event for our families to continue to build bridges and break down barriers resulting from socio-economic, ethnic, and cultural differences within our community (building on the success of our Family Film, Food, and Fun night last year). Target population: PS 29 families. Responsible staff: Diversity Committee, PTA Executive Board, Parent Coordinator. Implementation timeline: March 2009 for the event; October-February for planning. Throughout the year, professional development and staff conversations will continue to be infused with issues of diversity and multiculturalism. From these conversations and the ongoing professional development, diversity and multicultural issues will become an interwoven component of classroom practice. Target population: classroom teachers. Responsible staff:

	<p>Melanie Woods, Principal, classroom teachers Implementation timeline: September-June</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will continue to monitor the representation of multicultural themes in our classroom libraries and in our monthly School-wide Read Alouds. Target population: All students. Responsible staff: Administrative team, classroom teachers, Diversity Committee. Implementation timeline: September-June • Implement a Coordinated Early Intervening Services program at PS 29, based on the finding that our special education referral rate and our ELL referral rate exceeds the average referral rate for other schools in our network and across the city. Create both after school support programs to work with identified students as well as contract service providers to work with teachers to ultimately reduce the referral rate. Target population: students; Responsible staff: Melanie Woods, Cara Turnbull, school counselor, Implementation timeline: November-June
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>We will continue to consult with Mary Coakley, TC, an expert in diversity issues in the classroom, as a professional development resource.</p> <p>Through our PTA and fundraising committees, we will seek grants to support our diversity/multicultural efforts, particularly our evening Family Event in March.</p> <p>PTA funding for the purchase of classroom copies of Schoolwide Read Aloud books.</p> <p>Major initiatives are overseen by our Diversity committee, a subcommittee of our SLT comprised of teachers, parents, and administrators. We will also continue to utilize the services of the DOE Office of Translation Services for written translation of major school notices and event announcements; parent volunteers and school staff for oral translation needs.</p> <p>ARRA (Federal stimulus) funds in the amount of approximately \$5,000 to support the Coordinated Early Intervening Services program.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>We will track parent participation levels in both Diversity committee sponsored events and school-wide events (Families as Learning Partners, PTA-sponsored events) through attendance sign in sheets, with observations as to how well participation reflects the demographic profile of the school.</p> <p>Evaluation forms will be distributed at all Diversity committee sponsored events to elicit feedback on the success of the program, identify areas for improvement, and generate ideas for future events from the community.</p> <p>Reduction in the referral rate to Special Education will indicate successful results from the Coordinated Early Intervening Services program at PS 29. The money will be used to fund both after school support programs as well as service providers to work with teachers to ultimately reduce the referral rate.</p>

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

Directions: All schools must complete Appendices 1, 2, 3, & 7. (Note: Appendix 8 will not be required for this year.) All Title I schools must complete Appendix 4. All schools identified under NCLB or SED for School Improvement, including Improvement – Year 1 and Year 2, Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1 and Year 2, and Restructured Schools, 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 SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT

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

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

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10 – SED REQUIREMENT FOR ALL C4E-FUNDED SCHOOLS (NOTE: APPENDIX 8 WILL NOT BE REQUIRED FOR THIS YEAR)

APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING – 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				
K	0*	* (see note)	N/A	N/A		0		0
1	24	*	N/A	N/A		0		0
2	26	*	N/A	N/A	TBD	0	TBD	0
3	20	*	N/A	N/A		0		0
4	33	*	N/A	N/A		0		0
5	35	*	N/A	N/A		0		0
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

*** Note: Numbers given reflect children receiving AIS in both ELA and math in our Early Risers program; we do not disaggregate.**

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	Small group and one-to-one instruction before school
Mathematics:	Small group and one-to-one instruction before school
Science:	N/A
Social Studies:	N/A
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	Small group and one-to-one instruction before school
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	N/A
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	Small group and one-to-one instruction before school
At-risk Health-related Services:	N/A

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) – Attach a copy of your school's current year (2009-2010) LAP narrative to this CEP.

Part I: School ELL Profile

A. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

<i>Principal:</i>	Melanie Raneri - Woods	<i>ESL Teacher:</i>	Nicole Nadeau
<i>Assistant Principals:</i>	Frank Thomas	<i>Parent Coordinator:</i>	Nina Chan Jalowsky
<i>Guidance Counselor:</i>	Cara Turnball		
<i>Classroom Teacher:</i>	Kristin Beers		
<i>CTT Special ED Teacher:</i>	Melissa Bandes		

B. Teacher Qualifications

PS 29 has a permanently certified ESL teacher with a common branch license servicing the ELL population in grades K-5.

C. School Demographics

PS 29, *The John Harrigan School*, is located in the community of Cobble Hill in Brooklyn, New York. Our school has a library/media center, cafeteria, auditorium, schoolyard with children's community garden, and a gymnasium. At this point in time, 112 students are eligible for free lunch.

PS 29 currently has a student population of 668 students from culturally diverse backgrounds in Pre-Kindergarten through the 5th Grade of which 26 are designated English Language Learners (ELL). ELLs comprise .039 of our student population (4%). Arabic and Spanish are the two most prominent first languages of our ELL students. We offer a Freestanding ESL program in grades K-5. Of our 26 students, 8 are new to our program this fall. Four of these new students entered in Kindergarten this year, one new ELL entered in the 3rd grade, one in the 4th grade, and the last two entered our ELL program for the first time in the 5th grade. We have five returning ELLs in the 1st grade, three in the 2nd grade, three in 3rd grade, two in the 4th Grade and two in 5th grade. Five have an Individualized Education Plans (IEP's). One of these ELL's with an IEP is in a 1st Grade Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) class. The other four ELLs with an IEP are in a self-contained Special Education bridge class and are serviced per their IEP's. Therefore, the ESL teacher provides support by working with the special education teacher. One of these four special education students is in the fifth year of ESL services, one is in their sixth year, and two are considered long-term ELL's and are in the seventh year of ESL services. In total, three of our 26 ELLs have been in the ESL program for six or more years and all three of these students have an IEP and are in the Special Education class.

Part II: ELL Identification Process

When a student is admitted to the NYC school system, parents are actively involved in the decision-making process. This multi step process ensures the identification, the appropriate placement and educational services for every child in the New York City educational system. Parents are given a *Home Language Survey (HLIS)* at registration by Maureen Monaco, School Secretary, to identify the child's language or languages. If a child is identified as an eligible candidate for LAB R testing to determine ESL service eligibility, screening and an informal oral interview in English is conducted by Nicole Nadeau, ESL Teacher, in the spring or at registration. Interviews are conducted in the home language by appropriate staff (e.g., Miriam Roldan, Spanish speaking Family Worker) when necessary. In the fall, within the first 10 days of registration, the *Language Battery Assessment (LAB-R)* is given by Nicole Nadeau to identify the child as an English Language Learner or English Proficient. An *entitlement letter* is provided to parents to inform them about the child's identification and the child is enrolled in the appropriate program within 10 days.

In order to enable parents to make sound educational decisions as to which program best meets the needs of their child, parents participate in several activities before they make a decision. Parents participate in an *orientation* facilitated by Nicole Nadeau who describes the three program choices for ELLs. As part of the orientation, parents also *view a parent information CD* where the three program placement options are presented with clarity and objectivity. This *parent orientation CD* is available in nine languages. *Parent brochures* are disseminated in their native language to enrich the understanding each available program. Parents complete the parent selection form and the school will conform to the parental choice selections. Nicole Nadeau insures that the entitlement letters are distributed and Parent Survey and Program Selection Forms are returned and stored/secured in the ELL classroom. At PS 29 the trend has been that parents choose the freestanding ELL program.

PS 29 implements a freestanding English as a Second Language (ESL) Program. The primary goal of the program is to assist students in achieving English Language proficiency within three years. In order to accomplish this goal PS 29 takes steps to:

- Amplify the literacy and academic skills of ELLs who participate in the ESL program
- Incorporate recognized and researched based ESL instructional strategies across content subject areas.
- Give students the skills to perform at city and state grade level in all subject areas

Part III: ELL Demographics

A. ELL Programs

In the Freestanding English as a Second Language Program at PS 29, we have 26 students in grades K-5. Beginners and Intermediate students receive 360 minutes of ESL Pull-out/Push-in classroom support a week. Advanced ESL students receive 180 minutes of ELA in the classroom and 180 minutes of ESL Push-In/Pull-out a week. Four ELLs with an IEP are in a self-contained Special Education self contained class and are serviced per their IEP's. Therefore, the ESL teacher provides support by working with the special education teacher. The other 22 students are directly serviced by the ESL teacher. The ESL teacher who services the ELLs at PS 29 is fully certified.

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs

22 of our ELL Students (21 Gen Ed and 1 Special Ed) are in our Freestanding ESL Program. The remaining 4 students are serviced as per their IEP. 20 of our 26 students are classified as newcomers as they have been in the program from 0-3 years. 6 ELLs have been in the program 4-6 years.

C. Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs

The following represents the number of ELLs by grade in each language group:

- 5 Kindergarteners—2 Spanish, 1 Arabic and 1 Other (Swedish)
- 5 Grade 1 students—1 Spanish, 1 Urdu, 2 Arabic and 1 Albanian
- 3 Grade 2 students—2 Spanish, 1 Arabic
- 4 Grade 3 students—2 Spanish, 1 Arabic, 1 Other (Swedish)

- 3 Grade 4 students—2 Spanish, 1 Other (Swedish)
- 3 Grade 5 students—1 Spanish, 2 Other (Portuguese, Uzbek)
- Note: our 4 Grade 5 Special Education ELL students are serviced as per their IEP and they are all Spanish speaking students

D. Programming and Scheduling Information

There are two tests that determine eligibility and the proficiency level of a student. New students to the program take the LAB R within 10 days of registration to first determine eligibility. In the spring ELL students take the NYSESLAT to determine continued entitlement. According to the Fall 2009 Lab R hand scores for each of the 8 new ELL students who entered PS 29's ELL program this 2009-2010 school year, all four of the kindergarteners are considered Beginner/Intermediate because each scored at or below 17, the cut score for this level for Kindergarten. Our new 3rd grader to the program is also considered a Beginner/Intermediate scoring within the 0 - 37 (out of 64) range which designates a 3rd grader at this level. The new 4th grader and two new 5th graders are designated Advance because they all had a hand score that fell within the designated range for being considered Advance for their grade levels, 30-54 for 4th grade and 34-50 (out of 70) for 5th grade. According to the Spring NYSESLAT scores for the 17 out of our 18 returning students who took it, two students in grades 1st through 5th are Beginners, 9 are Intermediate, and six are Advance. One out of the 18 returning students was absent for the entire spring '09 NYSESLAT test. According to this student's LAB R score she is considered Advance making the total seven for returning students. Of the 17 returning students who took the NYSESLAT, one of the beginners is in the 1st grade and the other is in the 5th grade Special Education Bridge Class in their 7th year of ESL services and is served per the IEP. The other two first graders are Intermediate. Two out of the three 2nd graders are Intermediate, and the other one is Advance. Out of our three 3rd grade one student is Intermediate and the other two are Advance. Both of our 4th graders are Advance and our one returning 5th grader who is in a general education class is Intermediate. He is only in his second year of our ELL program as he came from another country in the middle of his 3rd grade year. The last three of our seven 5th graders are in the Special Education Bridge Class. They are at the Intermediate level and are serviced per their IEP's as is the other Beginner 5th grade student in their class already mentioned.

According to the NYSESLAT scores most of our students scored higher on the listening/speaking modality versus the reading/writing. Because of these results the ESL teacher works with the ELLs in small groups and one to one conferring in order to give extra support in these two areas.

The goal of our ESL program is to foster full English proficiency in a supportive classroom environment. Both the ELA and ESL teachers that work with our ELLs in the ESL program are fully certified. In order to help students to progress, we utilize the following practices:

- Collaborative planning between ESL and ELA teachers for each unit.
- Scaffolding is an essential part of the instructional delivery, such as Modeling, Bridging, Schema Building, Contextualization, Text Representation and Metacognition.
- Assisting students during work periods, conferencing with students in and out of class, informal assessments, and running records.
- Additional small group AIS sessions for each grade prior to all state assessments, to focus on literacy and academic language.

Beyond explicit ESL, collaboration between teachers means that there is a consideration for the language needs of ELLs. Some aspects of this policy include:

- Content area teachers monitor the understanding of linguistically challenging material and use a variety of phrasings and synonyms to clarify meaning.
- During Math teachers devote extra class time to untangling difficult word problems, and require students to make verbal explanations of the problems they work on.
- During Social Studies teachers scaffold their instruction with visual aids such as maps, atlases, and illustrations to increase comprehension.

The Freestanding ESL program does not use a particular text, using literacy instruction as an element within the framework of the Teachers College Workshop Model. This includes the use of leveled texts. The exception to this pattern is where materials are used to familiarize students with the state assessments, including:

- New York State Testing Program: NYSESLAT *Sampler*
- New York State Testing Program: Review of Previous ELA exams

- New York State Coach: Mathematics

E. Schools with Dual Language Programs

N/A

F. Professional Development and Support for School Staff

Professional development is provided by school staff and by community learning support personnel organizations.

- School Staff: Within the schools Professional Development program, the focus is on:
 - The literacy needs of our ELL population within the prescription of Teachers College.
 - Math and Science in scaffolding instruction through the use of manipulative and experiments.
 - Technology sessions to instruct teachers how to use online resources to make instruction more comprehensible.
- Support Personnel: Workshops taken by teachers on our ESL staff have included:
 - Scaffolding in the content areas
 - Differentiation in the reading and writing for ELLs
 - Differentiation in Mathematics for ELLs
- Our ELL teachers attend off-site workshops at TC to promote collaboration with classroom teaches:
 - I. "Practical Help Providing ELL and Low Language Kindergarteners the Vocabulary, Word Study Support They Need"-Friday, November 14, 2008
 - II. "Practical Help Providing ELL and Low Language Students the Vocabulary, Word Study Support They Need"-Friday, February 27, 2009

G. Parental Involvement

In order to support learning and foster community involvement, we use a portion of our funding to create supplementary programs for ELLs and their families. This includes:

- **Translation and Interpretation Services:** These services are offered to increase the involvement of parents. Additional funding is available to translate important policy documents. Additionally, interpretation services are a daily help in communication between school staff and parents.
- **Families as Learning Partners:** From the first Friday of October to the first Friday of May, PS 29 invites all families to come to school first period to take part in a learning activity. There is generally a different topic each month.

Part IV: Assessment Analysis

The NYSESLAT data shows that most ELLs are making incremental gains in sub-categories on the assessment on their way to becoming proficient in both conversational and academic English. Six out of our 13 ELLs who took the NYSESLAT in the spring of 2008 and then again in 2009 went up one overall proficiency level. Of these six, three went from Beginner to Intermediate. Five stayed at the same proficiency level, Intermediate or Advance, and two went down a level. One of the two students who went down a level is in their 7th year of ESL in the 4th/5th grade bridge class and is serviced per his IEP. This student is the only Beginner out of 13 who took the test the previous year. The other student is in 3rd grade and took the 2nd to 5th grade NYSESLAT last spring in 2nd grade. 12 out of the 13 students are Intermediate or Advance.

After reviewing the NYSESLAT data, the patterns reveal:

- Listening and Speaking sub-test scores were at least one proficiency level higher than the total NYSESLAT score for all Beginners and Intermediate students. Apparently, it is the Reading and Writing sub-scores that are holding these students back from an overall higher level of proficiency with the exception of one student. This is extremely similar to the pattern from last year.

After analyzing the ELA scores of the small number of ELLs who took the test:

- It appears that generally speaking the higher the NYSESLAT Speaking and Writing sub-scores the higher the ELA score

Implications for Instruction

The implications for the school's LAP and instruction are derived from the strengths and needs noted in the NYSESLAT and other assessments (LAB-R, TC Running Records, DY0, teacher assessments, and informal observations). Adjustments and improvements to our program this year include:

- Continue to strongly target language development across the grades and content areas, creating opportunities for active meaningful engagement.
- Additional support in listening skills for newcomers, including increased use technological activities in the classroom.
- Utilization of technology to meet students' needs at their level of performance.
- Small group Academic Intervention classes in ESL to target language modalities according to their needs.
- Academic Intervention Services for those performing below grade level during the school day as well as extended hours.
- Smaller class sizes to better meet the needs of students.

All activities and additional support offered to our ELL population is focused on their acquisition of language proficiency and academic progress.

Implications for LAP in English Language Arts Area

In order to assist our students in both academic achievement and assessment, there are a variety of solutions that we are working with this year. They include the following:

- Ensure adequate licensed personnel to deliver instruction as stipulated by NCLB and CR Part 154
- Collaboration between classroom and the ESL teacher to create a learning community which is knowledgeable and experienced in researched based instructional strategies
- Analyze ELLs data to become well informed about the performance of each ELL in order to make sounded educational decisions.
- Provide opportunities for students to be involved in purposely conversations
- Incorporating all language modalities during the lesson, e.g. group discussions, journals
- Ensure that teachers analyze students' data to identify strength and weakness and utilize the findings to drive and differentiated instruction.
- Encourage teachers to participate on professional development opportunities focusing in instructional strategies for ELLs; such as, Quality Teaching for English Learners and Community Support Learning Organization.
- Ensure that TC staff developers work closely with teachers to support rigorous instruction
- Implement a print rich environment, use of ESL dictionaries and glossaries in classrooms.

Implications for LAP in Mathematics Content Area

In order to assist our students in both academic achievement and assessment, there are a variety of solutions that we are working with this year. They embrace the following:

- Ensure adequate licensed personnel to deliver instruction as stipulated by NCLB and CR Part 154
- Analyze ELLs data to become well informed about the performance of each ELL in order to make sounded educational decisions.
- Provide opportunities for students to negotiate with mathematics academic language, e.g. reading and solving word problems, interactive word wall
- Incorporating writing as a component of the mathematics lesson, e.g. journals
- Provide opportunities to convey to others problem solving strategies and the justification of their answer
- Ensure the identification and analysis of student strength and weakness to drive and differentiated instruction
- Collaboration between the classroom and ESL teacher to map out students specific needs.
- Encourage Math teachers to participate on professional development opportunities focusing on ELL instructional needs; such as, Quality Teaching for English Learners and Community Learning Support Organization.
- Ensure that Math staff developers work closely with teachers to support rigorous instruction

Plan for Newcomers

This year our “new” students to the ELL program were those students who entered Kindergarten and most of these students were in the Pre-Kindergarten program at PS 29 last year. However, when any new student registers at our school, we provide the following resources to facilitate the transition:

- An informal student orientation
- Buddy system identifying a similar student in his/her class that will assist during the day
- Encourage student to participate after school activities
- An informal assessment is provided to identify possible academic intervention programs
- Home school communication

Plan for SIFE

At this moment in time, PS 29 does not have any SIFE students. However, if we did we would understand the urgency to provide academic intervention services as an extension of the regular school program and provide both push in and pull out services:

- Making an individualized student needs assessment
- Creation of an AIS plan for the student in literacy and math
- Grade appropriate instructional support materials
- Differentiation of instruction in all areas

Plan for Long Term ELLs

An analysis of their scores on the NYSESLAT, ELA and Math assessments suggests that the main area of need is in reading and writing. An after school program, targeting reading and writing two days during the week.

- Monitoring the progress of students in all content areas to differentiate instruction for literacy needs.

Plan for Special Needs Students

Out of our 22 ELLs, 8 have IEP's and all but one (7) are in the 4th and 5th Grades. Our policy for special needs students includes:

- Teachers of students with an IEP are familiar with students' particular needs and all services are provided accordingly to the IEP mandates.
- Collaboration between the ESL teacher and IEP contact person.
- Monitoring of newcomer and SIFE student for possible special needs status.
- The delivery of AIS services after school.

Part B: Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students – School Year 2009-2010

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) K-5_____ **Number of Students to be Served:** 26 **LEP** _____ **Non-LEP**

Number of Teachers 1 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

N/A

School: _____ BEDS Code: _____

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) - Per session - Per diem	(e.g., \$9,978)	(Example: 200 hours of per session for ESL and General Ed teacher to support ELL Students: 200 hours x \$49.89 (current teacher per session rate with fringe) = \$9,978.00)
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.	(e.g., \$5,000)	(Example: Consultant, Dr. John Doe, working with teachers and administrators 2 days a week on development of curriculum enhancements)
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional	(e.g., \$500)	(Example: 1 Books on Tape, Cassette Recorders, Headphones, Book Bins, Leveled Books)

materials. - Must be clearly listed.		
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	(e.g., \$2,000)	(Example: 2 Rosetta Stone language development software packages for after school program)
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL		

Number of Teachers and Support Personnel for 2008-2009

A-5

School (DBN): Public School 29, Brooklyn, NY

Enter the number of FTE's in each school building in the Bilingual Education and ESL Programs in the appropriate column. FTE's for staff serving more than one building must reflect the portion of time spent in each building.

School Number 29	Number of Teachers 2008-2009				Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals***		Sub-Total
	Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**				
	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
School Name John M. Harrigan	_____	1 _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_1_
TOTALS							Grand Total _1_

* The number of teachers reported must represent the number of teachers holding an appropriate license for the subject area being taught (i.e., language arts and content area.)

** 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.

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

Translation needs are overseen by our parent coordinator. A survey of classroom teachers was conducted in September to elicit home language information based on the Home Language Survey and to identify which families require written translation and/or oral interpretation services. Our Parent Coordinator maintains a database of these families by classroom, by language, and makes this information centrally available through our website so that others (school counselor, school nurse, PTA) can access the data.

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

Our data revealed that our translation needs are: Spanish, Arabic, Urdu, and Albanian. There are 38 families receiving written translation services and 8 families in need of oral interpretation services have been identified.

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 rely on the DOE Translations and Interpretations unit to provide us with written translations of our general event announcements (such as parent-teacher conferences, Families as Learning Partners, etc.) and report card comments, and as necessary, more specific schoolwide notices and time-sensitive materials. When timeliness is an issue, our Parent Coordinator oversees the use of in-house multi-lingual parents or school staff to insure these documents are provided to families in the appropriate languages.

2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Indicate whether oral interpretation services will be provided by an outside contractor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

Oral interpretation for parent-teacher conferences and the ESL orientation for parents is provided by parent volunteers and school staff, and is coordinated by our parent coordinator.

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

Our Parent Coordinator is introduced at the September orientation for ESL families held by our ESL teacher. At this time, the parent coordinator informs families about the DOE translation unit and the ability for school communication to be sent out for translations for families who need this service. Families request that duplicate documents are still sent home in English, due to the translation component not being exact (either their children or another adult can clarify the information using both documents). In addition, classroom teachers inform our parent coordinator about other families requiring translation services.

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

	Title I	Title I ARRA	Total
1. Enter the anticipated Title I Allocation for 2009-10:			
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:			
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):			
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:			
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):			
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:			
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):			

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: _____
9. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2008-2009 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year.

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

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

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

2. School-Parent Compact - Attach a copy of the school’s School-Parent Compact.

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
 - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
 - Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.
3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.
8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.

10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT

This appendix must be completed by all Title I and Non-Title schools designated for NCLB/SED improvement, including Improvement – Year 1 and Year 2 schools, Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1 and Year 2 schools, Restructured schools, and SURR schools. Additional information on the revised school improvement categories under the State’s new Differentiated Accountability System will be released in late spring 2009.

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

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

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

2. Describe the focused intervention(s) the school will implement to support improved achievement in the grade and subject areas for which the school was identified. Be sure to include strategies to address the needs of all disaggregated groups that failed to meet the AMO, Safe Harbor, and/or 95% participation rate requirement. Note: If this question was already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified. Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development (amounts specified in Part A of Appendix 4) will be used to remove the school from school improvement.

2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school’s strategy for providing high-quality professional development.

3. Describe how the school will notify parents about the school’s identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

SURR Group/Phase: _____ **Year of Identification:** _____ **Deadline Year:** _____

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.

– **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 engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

A review of resources, materials, curricular calendars, and student work indicates that this finding is NOT relevant to our school's educational program. Ongoing professional development, curriculum writing, sharing of best practices, and study groups insure that in fact, our curriculum is tied to NYS standards and the needs of our ELL students are met.

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

Applicable X 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?

Evidence that dispels the relevance of this finding:

- Detailed curricular calendars that are aligned with state standards are created across the school year in reading and writing K-5
- These calendars are based on research and findings of the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project
- Each unit of study contains outlines of lesson plans with angles for each week's focus and is in alignment with NYS standards
- Weekly grade meetings deliver a mechanism for systematic co-planning of every unit of study among grade level teachers
- Monthly grade leader meetings where the focus is curriculum is another institutional system which allows for communication and support across grades
- ELL teacher co-plans with relevant grades and co-teaches by pushing-in in addition to pulling out
- Vertical alignment is further reinforced through cross grade study groups, formed to look at and share best practices
- A huge classroom library exists in every classroom with many books at the children's varied levels across the school year

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

1B.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Based on a review of the TERC Investigations curriculum, curricular calendars, student work, and support materials this finding is not relevant to our schools educational program. We continually align our instruction with NYS standards and through our curriculum provide opportunities for our students to foster a deeper conceptual understanding of mathematics.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Teachers use TERC, Investigations as the primary mathematical program in the school. This curriculum approaches mathematics with a constructivist approach and is designed to encourage students to make sense of mathematical ideas through hands on activities, discussions and demonstrations.

Additional support materials are added to the primary program to assure that the school has a balanced mathematical program that addresses all NYS performance standards.

Curricular calendars are created by teachers to outline the mathematical curriculum. These calendars identify TERC, Investigations benchmarks and NYS standards that are covered within the unit.

Teachers use the workshop model and encourage students to generate their own strategies and models for solving problems based on what students know.

We engage students in mathematical problems that require inquiry, investigating, discussing and constructing ideas.

Students use manipulatives where appropriate to help solve problems.

Discussions about the curriculum best practice and student work is ongoing through grade meetings, and math leader meetings.

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

2A.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

We are always, as educators at PS 29, reflecting on best practices and research-based practices through formal and informal classroom observation, walkthroughs of classrooms by grade and across grades, and review of notetaking systems. Differentiation of instruction is at the core of our instructional practice. This audit finding is not applicable to P.S. 29

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

- As we stated above, the use of assessment-based and differentiated instruction is the heart of the workshop model that we employ at PS 29
- The bulk of the teaching time during a lesson is spent on small group work and individual conferences
- Documentation of teaching through conference notes as well as notes and plans from strategy lessons and guided reading lessons provide further evidence that direct instruction and individual seatwork are not the predominant instructional strategies used by our teachers
- Students read books according to their independent level, therefore across a classroom children are at a wide range of levels based on their running record assessments(which are ongoing and indicate reading with accuracy, fluency and comprehension).
- Every child has individual goals for both reading and writing depending on their specific needs and strengths, and this is evident in looking at the writing and reading across any one of our classrooms.
- Evaluation of on demand writing and writing about reading (post-its and notebooks) all help teachers plan for differentiated groups.
- The use of writing partners who work together to peer edit, revise and edit.

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.

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

2B.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Based on administrative walkthroughs, grade meetings and formal and informal observations this finding is not relevant in our school's educational program.

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

Applicable XX 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?

TERC Investigations is a hands-on constructivist approach to mathematics.

Teachers use the workshop approach to lessons and are engaged in discussions and activities that involve exploration.

Lessons are connected with computer technology that is available for teacher use.

Benchmarks and standards are outlined for each unit. Teachers listen to student discussions, look at student work, and observe student interactions to assess what they know and where they need to move. This leads to individual goals and the teaching of strategy lessons for small groups and individual students

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 engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Each May, our hiring committee assesses teacher turnover. Using a staff organization list, we look at two numbers: the number of teachers who were new to the school that year, and the number of teachers who are leaving the school. In this way we are able to track the percentage of new teachers each year, as well as the percentage of staff leaving the school.

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

Applicable XX 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?

P.S. 29 is seeing growth in teacher retention and a shift towards hiring fewer new teachers. In May of 2003 eleven teachers left P.S. 29 (26% of the teaching staff). and 12 new teachers joined the staff in September 2003, representing 28% of the teaching staff. In May of 2004, seven teachers left P.S. 29 (14% turnover). In May of 2008, the hiring committee reported there were 6 new teachers (15% of the staff), with only four teachers (9%) leaving P.S.29 in June of 2008. Of those four teachers, one became a Teachers College staff developer and two moved for family reasons. The data show our turnover rate declining and our retention rate improving over the past five years.

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

4.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Teachers were informally surveyed by our ELL teacher in order to assess the relevance of the finding that professional development opportunities regarding curriculum, instruction, and monitoring progress for ELLs offered by the district are not reaching a large audience.

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

XX 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?

According to teachers surveyed, it is clear that these opportunities seem not to be readily available. However, there is extensive professional development for teachers around ELL needs at the school level and our affiliation with the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project. For instance, our ELL certified teacher works closely with classroom teachers of ELLs, meeting with them regularly both formally and informally. The most significant barrier to this work is clearly the issue of time. On the other hand, this kind of collaboration is highly valued as is the work with the TCRWP.

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

We feel that better communication from the district level is needed for classroom teachers of ELLs so at least they are aware of opportunities. Whether or not they would want to avail themselves of these is a question that could only be addressed when the opportunities are afforded.

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 engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Our administrative team and ELL teacher met to review data that is shared with classroom teachers of ELLs.

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

Applicable XX 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?

Classroom teachers of ELLs received the proficiency level of their ELL students in the fall, after the NYSESLAT results were made available on ATS and after the LAB-R tests were hand scored for new students. The ELL teacher also discussed which sections of the NYSESLAT students demonstrated more proficiency and in areas where students needed to be provided with more support. Classroom teachers with ELLs have ongoing communication with the ELL teacher who pushes into most classes. The administration, the classroom teachers and the ELL teacher share the data they receive concerning all ELLs when appropriate.

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

6.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Our administrative team continues to talk with teachers about their instructional approaches with students who have special needs. Teachers respond frankly about what is working and what is not working. Also, we have ongoing meetings with our IEP Teacher who is responsible for meeting with the classroom teacher before the IEP is implemented.

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

Applicable XX Not Applicable

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

Our special education teachers and related service providers work closely with all classroom teachers to provide strategies for students struggling with the curriculum. Our child study team schedules meetings with individual teachers to discuss a student who is struggling academically and/or socially in the classroom. At these meetings, specific strategies and learning modifications are given to the teachers to implement. Also, monthly CTT study group meetings have been implemented and are an opportunity for all CTT teams to study a focused topic (appropriate environmental modifications, writing student centered goals and objectives, utilizing students' strengths to help with areas of difficulty, how to modify and adapt learning tasks to meet the needs of individual learners)

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

7.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

The Administrative team and IEP Teacher reviewed IEP's written in the last few years. These include IEP's written by current and former staff members, as well as IEP's that were not written by a P.S. 29 staff member.

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?

Extensive professional development for special education teachers and service providers has vastly improved the quality of our IEP's, which include information specific to accommodations and modifications for the classroom environment for students with special needs..

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.

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

Please Note: Since the system-wide expectation is that schools will maintain effort for 2008-09 programs funded with Contract for Excellence 09 (HS) dollars in 2009-10, schools will not be required to complete a new version of CEP Appendix 8 this year. Please see the FY10 SAM #6 "Contracts for Excellence Discretionary Allocations" for details about other documentation that schools may be required to complete in conjunction with the spending of their C4E dollars.

(THIS SECTION WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK FOR 2009-10)

APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

- All Title I schools must complete Part A of this appendix.
- All Non-Title I schools must complete Part B of this appendix.

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

As included in your Office of School and Youth Development Consolidated Plan STH Section and in accordance with the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and Chancellor's Regulation A-780, schools must identify, serve, and report on students living in temporary housing (STH). For more information on using Title I set-aside funds to support your STH population, please refer to the Frequently Asked Questions document on DOE's website: <http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/9831364D-E542-4763-BC2F-7D424EBD5C83/58877/TitleIPartASetAsideforStudentsinTemporaryHousing.pdf>

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school. (Please note that your current STH population may not be the same as officially reported in DOE systems and may change over the course of the year.)
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year).
0
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
3. Some Non-Title I schools receive a specific allocation based on the reported number of students living in temporary housing. If your school received an allocation (please refer to the current Title I Funds Summary of School Allocation Memorandum), include the amount your school received in this question. If your school did not receive an allocation and needs assistance in identifying resources to assist STH students, please contact an STH liaison in the borough Integrated Service Center (ISC) or Children First Network.