



**DR. GLADSTONE H. ATWELL
MIDDLE SCHOOL 61
2009-10
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 17K061
ADDRESS: 400 EMPIRE BLVD., BROOKLYN, NY 11225
TELEPHONE: (718) 774-1002
FAX: (718) 467-4335**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*As you develop your school’s CEP, this table of contents will be **automatically** updated to reflect the actual page numbers of each section and appendix.*

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE 3

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE..... 4

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE..... 5

Part A. Narrative Description 5

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot 7

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT 10

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS 14

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN 16

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010..... 22

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM Error! Bookmark not defined.13

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)..... 25

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION 17

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS 18

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT 23

APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURR)..... Error!
 Bookmark not defined.24

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.....25Error! Bookmark not defined.

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10 Error!
 Bookmark not defined.35

APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH) Error!
 Bookmark not defined.36

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 061 SCHOOL NAME: Dr. Gladstone H. Atwell Middle School
61

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 400 Empire Boulevard, Brooklyn, NY 11225

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (718) 774-1002 FAX: (718) 467-4335

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Mr. S. O'Donoghue EMAIL ADDRESS: sodonoghue@schools.ny.gov

<u>POSITION/TITLE</u>	<u>PRINT/TYPE NAME</u>
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON:	<u>Ms. Shantay Danzy</u>
PRINCIPAL:	<u>Ms. Sandra Taylor</u>
UFT CHAPTER LEADER:	<u>Mr. Andrew Rison</u>
PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT:	<u>Ms. Antoinette Green</u>
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE: <i>(Required for high schools)</i>	<u></u>

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 17 SSO NAME: ICI

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Ms. Julia Bove

SUPERINTENDENT: Ms. Rhonda Taylor

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
MS. SANDRA TAYLOR	*Principal or Designee	
MR. ANDREW RISON	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
MS. ANTOINETTE GREENE	*PA President	
MS. J. FLETCHER	Parent/PAC	
MS. CAMILLE ORTA	SECRETARY	
MS. MARY GIBBS	PARENT	
MR. DAVE DARBY	PARENT	
MS. AVA LANGRIN	TEACHER	
ALICIA BENTON LEWIS	Member/HEALTH TEACHER	
SHANTAY DANZY	Member/SLT CHAIR	
MS. ROMONA BARKER	Member/Parent	
ANGELA NEWBALL	TEACHER	

(Add rows, as needed, to ensure all SLT members are listed.)

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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.

OUR VISION

The MS 61 school community envisions a culture of successful students. Through collaboration of family, staff, students and a rigorous instructional program, high expectations, opportunities for exploration, self-empowerment, and exposure to the best that education has to offer, all students will achieve greatness in whatever endeavors they pursue.

OUR MISSION

The Dr. Gladstone H. Atwell Middle School 61, is part of a culturally diverse community. It is dedicated to having all students including English Language Learners and Special Education achieve academic and social excellence. Through Performance Standards driven instruction, family support, a safe and nurturing environment, our children will develop into life-long learners and productive citizens.

Gladstone Atwell Middle School 61, a nucleus of learning, is nestled in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn at the corner of Empire Boulevard and New York Avenue. This middle school serves a culturally diverse population of 1,162 students. Ninety-one (91%) percent are African American, which includes first generation descendants from English and Haitian/Creole speaking Caribbean countries. Eight (8%) percent are of Hispanic ancestry, one (1%) percent is of Asian or White ancestries. Approximately thirteen percent (13%) of our population is Special Education students and another four point eight (4.8%) percent of our population are English Language Learners (E.L.L.). Eighty-four (84%) percent of the school's population is eligible for free lunch. We are now part of the Universal Lunch Program.

For school year 2009-2010, Middle School 61 will continue to be structured into four academies. The Leadership and Performing Arts and Technology (LAPAT) academy, the Communication Arts and Technology (CAT) academy, the Math, Science and Technology (MAST) academy, and the Britou-Moore Academy. Each academy is comprised of sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students to specifically address the needs of its students as they strive toward achieving the school's goals. The LAPAT Academy is focused on the performing arts; the CAT Academy has a special emphasis on communication; the MAST Academy concentrates on Math and Science. Britou-Moore Academy focuses on Regents Preparation in an accelerated program. Students are placed in the academy through entrance exams. In each academy there will be an accelerated program for sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students.

Currently, there are thirteen grade 6 classes, twelve grade 7 classes, ten grade 8 classes, seven special education classes, one ELL class, and an inclusion class in each grade. The average class size is thirty students. The LAPAT Academy occupies the first floor and lower level. The CAT Academy occupies the second floor, and the MAST and Britou-Moore Gifted Academies occupies the third floor. English Language Learners and students of Special Needs are part of each academy. An Assistant Principal, Coordinator and Intervention Specialist are assigned to each floor.

The 2009 School Report Card indicated that we met A.Y.P. in all categories for ELA and Math for participation and performance except for Students with Disabilities. We did not qualify for the “Safe Harbor” A.Y.P. in ELA nor Math for Students with Disabilities since this sub-group did not make their target number on the Science assessment. As a result, our school is still identified as a School In Need of Improvement. Our current State status with regard to N.C.L.B. is **Corrective Action Year 2**.

M.S. 61 will continue to emphasize a seamless integration of technology into its instructional program. At present, we have three mobile laptop laboratories, a standing computer laboratory, and state-of-the-art ‘smart’ boards and overhead projectors (ELMO) in selected classrooms and the library. In addition, MS 61 enjoys continued collaboration with several Community Based Organizations (CBOs) including Grand Street Settlement, 21st Century, Computers for Youth (CFY), Brooklyn College Talent Search, and Medgar Evers Talent Search. Grand Street Settlement provides attendance services that are aligned with the projected attendance goals of the school through the Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention Program (AIDP). These include youth development, case management, and support services to sustain the academic engagement of the AIDP participants.

21st Century consists of the STARR, LEADERSHIP, SAFE HORIZON, REGENTS PREPARATION, and Specialized High School Preparation. These programs provide: Critical Thinking exercises that challenge student’s ways of thinking about self and others; Team Building activities that address group dynamics; and Community Awareness opportunities that involve research, development and implementation of projects that benefit the community. They also provide sports and recreation extra-curriculum activities such as, Hip Hop Dance, Double Dutch, Arts & Craft, Chess, Mural Drawing, and Film Making, and Peer Mediation.

Grand Street Settlement, a Community Based Organization (CBO), has collaborated with M.S. 61 for a number of years to assure that attendance services are aligned with the projected attendance goals of the school through the Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention Program (AIDP). Each school year, Grand Street Settlement addresses the absenteeism and academic underperformance of a targeted population by providing AIDP interventions that include youth development, case management, and support services to sustain the academic engagement of the AIDP participants. In an effort to address the academic underperformance of the AIDP population, the CBO has provided one-to-one and group tutoring in science, ELA and math by organizing after-school programs.

M.S. 61 has been the recipient of the ‘Computers for Youth’ (CFY) grant for three years in succession. CFY is an organization which provides free PC computers for our incoming 6 graders to take home. To date, over three hundred computers were given to families.

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:		M.S. 061 Dr. Gladstone H. Atwell					
District:		17	DBN:	17K061	School BEDS Code:	331700010061	
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	0	0	0		90.0	90.4	TBD
Kindergarten	0	0	0				
Grade 1	0	0	0	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 2	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 3	0	0	0		93.9	95.4	TBD
Grade 4	0	0	0	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 5	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 6	270	378	398		84.8	90.3	80.3
Grade 7	325	315	360	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 8	407	292	307	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 9	0	0	0		11	8	TBD
Grade 10	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
Grade 11	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 12	0	0	0		10	24	17
Ungraded	3	4	4	Special Education Enrollment:			
Total	1005	989	1069	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
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	77	73	74	Principal Suspensions	25	29	TBD
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	27	35	35	Superintendent Suspensions	17	14	TBD
Number all others	32	30	38	Special High School Programs - Total Number:			
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:			
(BESIS Survey)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)			
(As of October 31)							
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	18	20	22				
# in Dual Lang. Programs							

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2008-1A - March 2008)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	3	0	3	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	10	20	18
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	5	4
Average Students (# entering students average for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	98.6	98.7	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	79.7	89.5	85.5
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	75.7	75.0	78.9
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher			
(As of October 31)				% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)			
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.7	0.1	0.4				
Black or African American	91.5	91.2	92.1				
Hispanic or Latino	6.5	7.6	5.7				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.5	0.4	0.5				
White	0.8	0.7	0.8				
Male	48.3	50.2	50.6				
Female	51.7	49.8	49.4				
2008-10 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							
SURRE School (Yes/No)		If yes, area(s) of SURRE Identification:					
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2008-10) Based on 2008-08 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 3						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level				
ELA:	Restructuring Y 3		ELA:				
Math:	PFR		Math:				
Science:	IGB		Graduation Rate:				
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
		<u>Elementary/Middle Level</u>			<u>Secondary Level</u>		
Student Groups		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate
All Students		√	X	√			
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native		-	-				
Black or African American		√	X	√			
Hispanic or Latino		√	X	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		-	-				
White		-	-	-			
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities		√SH	X	-			
Limited English Proficient		√	X	-			
Economically Disadvantaged		√	X	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject		5	0	3	0	0	0
CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
Progress Report Results – 2008-09				Quality Review Results – 2008-09			
Overall Letter Grade:	TBD	Overall Evaluation:		TBD			
Overall Score:	TBD	<u>Quality Statement Scores:</u>					
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data			TBD		
School Environment:	TBD	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals			TBD		
(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals			TBD		
School Performance:	TBD	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals			TBD		
(Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise			TBD		
Student Progress:	TBD						
(Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)							
Additional Credit:	TBD						
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			
* = 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?
-

In looking at our school's Progress Report, we find that in the category of Student Performance in ELA we are 127% above the maximum score (as compared to our Peer Horizon) for percentage of students at Levels three or four. In mathematics, we are approximately 74% toward the maximum score for the same group as compared to our Peer Horizon.

Three Year Trends Analysis of ELA Performance

Grade 6

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	17	6.4	130	49.2	114	43.2	3	1.1
2008	7	2.0	139	39.4	204	57.8	3	0.8
2009	1	0.3	71	18.6	298	78.0	12	3.2

Grade 7

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	24	7.8	161	52.6	119	38.9	2	0.7
2008	5	1.7	123	42.3	162	55.7	1	0.1
2009	1	0.3	82	23.2	261	73.9	9	2.5

Grade 8

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	24	6.0	219	54.6	155	38.7	3	0.7
2008	13	4.7	146	52.3	118	42.3	2	0.7
2009	7	2.4	139	47.1	149	50.0	0	0.0

In turn, according to DOE data, the percentage of sixth grade students in Level 1 for ELA decreased from 6.4% to 0.3% between 2007 and 2009. For the same time period and grade, the percentage of students in Levels 3 and 4 increased from 44.3% to 81.2%. Gains were also made by our seventh and eighth graders between 2007 and 2009. The percent of Level 1 students decreased in seventh and eighth grades from 7.8% to 0.3% and 6.0% to 2.4%, respectively.

In addition, both grades made increases in the percent of students in Levels 3 and 4 as follows:

- **The percentage of 7th grade students in Levels 3 and 4 increased from 39.5% to 76.5%, while our eighth graders increased from 39.4 to 50.5%.**

Three Year Trends Analysis of MATH Performance

Grade 6

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	61	23.1	91	34.5	107	40.5	5	1.9
2008	17	9.5	28	15.6	116	64.8	18	10.1
2009	32	8.3	88	22.9	240	62.5	24	6.3

Grade 7

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	38	12.5	130	42.9	123	40.6	12	4.0
2008	35	11.4	102	33.3	157	51.3	12	3.9
2009	7	2.0	66	18.7	245	69.4	35	9.9

Grade 8

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	66	16.6	174	43.7	153	38.4	5	1.3
2008	22	7.9	100	35.7	142	50.7	16	5.7
2009	18	5.9	105	34.4	168	55.1	14	4.6

The percentage of sixth grade students in Level 1 for Math decreased from 23.1% to 8.3% between 2007 and 2009. For the same time period and grade, the percentage of students in Levels 3 and 4 increased from 42.4% to 68.8%. Gains were also made by our seventh and eighth

graders between 2007 and 2009. The percent of level 1 students decreased in seventh and eighth grades from 12.5% to 2.0% and 16.6% to 5.9%, respectively.

In addition, both grades made increases in the percent of students in Levels 3 and 4 as follows: The percentage of 7th grade students in Levels 3 and 4 increased from 42.4% to 68%, while our eighth graders increased from 39.7% to 59.7%.

The data concerning our ELL subgroup indicates that:

Sixth-Grade Students

- There were no Level 1 students
- nine out of eighteen students scored in Level 2
- nine out of eighteen students scored in Level 3

Seventh-Grade Students

- There are no Level 1 students
- Sixteen out of twenty-four students in Level 2
- Eight out of twenty-four students in Level 3

Eighth-Grade Students

- One out of twenty-two students in Level 1
- Nineteen out of twenty-two students in Level 2
- Two out of twenty-two students in Level 3

The data concerning our **Special Education** subgroup indicates that:

Sixth-Grade Students

- one out of forty-five students scored in Level 1
- twenty-seven out of forty five students scored in Level 2
- seventeen out of forty-five students scored in Level 3

Seventh-Grade Students

- one out of thirty students scored in Level 1
- seventeen out of thirty students scored in Level 2
- twelve out of thirty students scored in Level 3.

Eighth-Grade Students

- six out of forty-seven students scored in Level 1
- thirty-five out of forty-seven students scored in Level 2
- six out of forty-seven students scored in Level 3

According to the New York State School Report Card Accountability Report, Students With Disabilities did not make AYP in both ELA and Math. They did not make AYP in science and as a result, they did not qualify for Safe Harbor.

Overall, M.S. 61 has continued to demonstrate progress in reducing the percentage of students performing at Level 1 while significantly making strides in the percentage of our students in Levels 3 and 4.

In perusing our “Quality Review Report,” there are four areas in need of improvement:

1. Ensure opportunities are provided for all students to experience a broader curriculum especially in the arts.

First, the report speaks of the need to “ensure opportunities for students to experience a broader curriculum with emphasis on the Arts.” In order to address the above-stated need, we hired a dance/drama instructor an art teacher, Violin Program, and Rhythm Band Program. Also, teachers are instructing students to utilize project based activities across the content areas. In addition, we added several after-school programs: Band, violins, chess, arts and crafts, fine arts, double-dutch, filmmaking, mural painting, Hip Hop Dance, mediation . . .

2. Evaluate the effectiveness of professional development in improving differentiated instruction.

We sought technical assistance from the ICI Network and Deborah Jones Riley to introduce some of the strategies of differentiated instruction. This was followed up by an in-house study group who learned about differentiated instruction through reading and discussing Carol Ann Tomlinson’s book, The Differentiated Classroom. The members of our study group then demonstrated what they learned by incorporating various strategies into their classroom practice. We then engaged in an interdisciplinary ‘Lesson Study’ between Math, Language Arts, and science teachers to complete one cycle. The Math and Literacy coaches continue to provide professional learning opportunities regarding differentiated instruction while monitoring the classroom instruction of the staff.

3. Develop detailed and specific personal education plans to raise the achievement of the growing numbers of students operating at level 3.

The ICI Network staff provided technical assistance through workshops and classroom demonstrations. Professional Development learning sessions in the use of ACUITY to move students from Level 3 to Level 4 were also provided. Students and staff are encouraged to analyze data set goals and create their own plans to improve their scores.

4. Develop rigorous systems of data analysis to monitor the performance of ethnic and gender groups, as well as the school’s progress against similar schools.

At Middle School 61 we have common preparation periods built into our school day. These preparatory periods are scheduled in an effort to build capacity with an emphasis on developing professional learning communities. The focus for these communities is the study analyze of student data. Data is defined as, but not limited to, New York State assessments, periodic assessments – such as Acuity and Scantron; and formative assessments, such as student work gathered from classwork, homework and teacher developed exams.

Throughout the year, these “mini” data teams will meet to examine student work using forma protocols (for example, using the book “Looking Together at Student Work”), Acuity item analysis, and Inquire from the Department of Education’s website. Each team will have a “data leader” who will act as the facilitator for the meeting. The data specialist and assistant principals will visit these meetings and monitor

their progress. The position of data leader will be rotated with the groups, in an effort to have teachers share the responsibility of leadership.

In addition to examining student work, the groups will receive professional development in identifying “student learning problem” and then transform it into a “problem of practice.” The “problem of practice” becomes a pathway to support students who are experiencing academic difficulties. By employing other methods of delivering instruction, for example, by employing differentiated instruction in the classroom, we expect to see improving results for our students.

Our “Learning Environment Survey Report” for 2006-2008, indicated that there was an increase in each category:

- Academic Expectations (74%)
- Communication (63%)
- Engagement (72%)
- Safety and Respect (64%)

These percentages are compared to the maximum value of the City Horizon score. Another bright spot is that 99% of our staff is highly qualified and assigned to our school with very little turnover from year-to-year.

In summary, we are a school on the rise with a dedicated and knowledgeable staff. Despite this, we have several areas which require breaking through barriers. We must continue to focus on our Special Education students especially with regard to math. In addition, we did not make AYP for our ELL students in English Language Arts.

In response to our students’ needs, we purchased Achieve 3000 online programs. The technological tool offers scaffolding to our ELL students as they transition toward English Proficiency. ELL students have worked in tandem with their instructors two-to-three times per week to support the acquisition of vocabulary and improve their comprehension skills. Achieve 3000 is particularly useful because it adapts the difficulty level of the reading slightly above the students’ level. In addition, the program began with a Spanish component and now has a Haitian Creole component with a parent section.

In order to increase our participation rate on NYS Assessments, we are utilizing a combination of various methods, such as, auto dialing, initiate home visits through AIDP, parent workshops, and student-to-student telephone chains. In an effort to support the performance of SWDs in Science, our students work with the Science Specialist in a “hands-on” Science Lab. Also, Glenco Science videos and teacher common prep meetings to discuss students’ weaknesses, etc.

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, all students, including Students With Disability and English Language Learners, will increase their performance achievement in English Language Arts by 5%.

After conducting our needs assessment, the SLT found that there was a need to decrease the achievement gap among the different sub-groups, specifically Students With Disability and English Language Learners. .As a result, we have made closing the achievement gap a prime focus of our inquiry teams, professional learning community discussions, and professional development sessions.

Goal 2: By June 1010, all student populations, including Students With Disability and English Language Learners, will improve their rate of progress from 61.8% to 66.8% as measured by the ELA Assessment and Progress Report.

After conducting our needs assessment, the SLT found that there was a need to increase the number of students achieving at high level two, high level three, and level four. Many students showed minimal movement within levels and therefore showed minimal progress on the NYC Progress Report.

Goal 3: By June 2010, all students, including Students With Disability and English Language Learners, will increase their performance achievement in Social Studies by 5% as measured by the NYS assessment and teacher generated exams.

After conducting our needs assessment, the SLT found that there was a need to decrease the achievement gap among the different sub-groups, specifically Students With Disability and English Language Learners. .As a result, we have made closing the achievement gap a prime focus of our inquiry teams, professional learning community discussions, and professional development sessions.

Goal 4: By June 2009, student achievement in Science, including Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners, will improve by 5% as measured by the NYS Assessment and teacher generated exams.

After conducting our needs assessment, the SLT found that there was a great need to increase the number of 8th grade students achieving at levels three and above. MS 61 did not make AYP Safe Harbor due to the low participation rate and the low performance index on the Science Assessment test for Students With Disabilities.

Goal 5: By June 2010, 90% of grade 8 students, including Students With Disability and English Language Learners, will graduate.

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): ELA

<p>Annual Goal #1 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, all students, including Students With Disability and English Language Learners, will increase their performance achievement in English Language Arts by 5%. There will be an overall increase in Levels 3 and 4 from 70.4% to 75.4%.</p>	
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Teachers will constantly assess, analyze, monitor, and create targeted action plans based on student data. Teachers will differentiate and scaffold instruction according to the needs of the students. Through class discussion, individualized and group conferencing, teachers will assist students in writing long and short term goals, documenting these goals, achieving and refining the goals when necessary. The following activities will be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of balanced literacy to address performance indicators in the NYS Standards. ▪ Collaborative effort to develop a rigorous curriculum that will provide differentiation, intervention and enrichment instruction for all students. ▪ Engaging students in Reading/Writers workshop, vocabulary study, Metacognitive strategies, high order and critical thinking strategies. ▪ Academic Intervention Strategies, that include, Destination Reading, Read 180, Acuity ▪ Integration of Technology programs ▪ Enrichment activities such as, debate team, college prep. ▪ Regents preparation and specialized HS preparation. 	
<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><u>Support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assistant Principal of Literacy ▪ Team Leaders of Literacy ▪ Librarian: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ Computer Teacher: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ AIS Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ Mentor Teacher: TL Fair Student Funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESL Teachers ▪ Title III Extended Day Grant ▪ ELA/Math Institute Grant ▪ ELL Success Grant ▪ John Hopkins Accelerated Program ▪ External and Internal Professional Development
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Three Periodic Assessments ▪ Numerous Teacher made exams ▪ On-going teacher observations ▪ Morning study groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weekly focused learning walks with immediate feedback ▪ Analyzing and monitoring student work ▪ Progress Reports ▪ Observations

Subject/Area (where relevant): SCIENCE

<p>Annual Goal #2 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2009, student achievement in Science will improve by 5% as measured by the NYS Assessment and teacher generated exams. .</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Workshop model ▪ Hands-on science lab experimentation and data analysis ▪ Differentiated instruction ▪ Exit project for grades 6, 7, and 8 ▪ Field trips that align coursework with State standards ▪ Integration of computer technology
<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>Lab Technician: TL Fair Student Funding Teachers: TL Title I SWP Computer Teacher: TL Fair Student Funding</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students will be given teacher-generated assessments and departmental mid-year exam. ▪ Growth in student performance on assessments and projects. ▪ New York State Assessment for students in grade 8.

Subject/Area (where relevant): MATH

<p>Annual Goal #3 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 1010, all student populations, including Students With Disability and English Language Learners, will improve their rate of progress from 61.8% to 66.8% as measured by the ELA Assessment and Progress Report. There will be an increase in levels 3 & 4 from 58.7% to 63.7% as measured by the NYS Mathematics Assessments and Periodic Assessments</p>	
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Teachers will constantly assess, analyze, monitor, and create targeted action plans based on student data. Teachers will differentiate and scaffold instruction according to the needs of the students. Class discussion and individualized conferencing, teachers will assist students in writing long and short term goals, documenting these goals, achieving and refining the goals where necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of balanced mathematics to address performance indicators in the NYS Standards. ▪ Collaborative effort to develop a rigorous curriculum that will provide differentiation, intervention and enrichment instruction for all students. ▪ Engaging students in The Stock Market Game and other Scholastic Math Competitions, Math Vocabulary Study, Metacognitive Strategies, High Order and Critical Thinking Strategies. ▪ In cooperating ELA in Mathematics through literature and vocabulary. ▪ Integration of technology programs using Study Island, Gizmo, and BrainPop. ▪ Implementation of Academic Intervention Services (AIS). ▪ M.A.P.P., CITE, ACUITY, and Scranton ▪ Academic Intervention Strategies that include 'Destination Math' ▪ Enrichment activities such as, College Prep, Regents Preparation and Specialized HS Preparation ▪ Individualized teacher support using extended day, lunchtime and early morning periods. ▪ Instructors will utilize ARIS to; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connect with other practitioners Use data to inform instructional practices Create relevant class reports ▪ Instructors are encouraged to use "INQUIRE" and "Thinkfinityny.org" to find strategies and resources to enhance instruction. ▪ In small professional learning communities, instructors will; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan curriculum Look at student work to inform instruction Item and distract analysis 	
<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><u>Support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assistant Principals of Mathematics ▪ Team Leaders of Mathematics ▪ Math Coach/Data Specialist ▪ Computer Teacher: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ AIS Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ Mentor Teacher: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ ESL Teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title III Extended Day Grant ▪ ELA/Math Institute Grant ▪ ELL Success Grant ▪ Counseling ▪ Parent Meetings ▪ John Hopkins Accelerated Program ▪ External and Internal Professional Development

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

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

- Three Periodic Assessments
- Numerous Teacher Made Exams
- On-going Teacher Observations
- Morning Study Groups

- Weekly Focused Learning Walks with immediate feedback
- Analyzing and monitoring student work
- Progress Reports

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

<p>Annual Goal #4 <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, all students, including Students With Disability and English Language Learners, will increase their performance achievement in Social Studies by 5% as measured by the NYS assessment and teacher generated exams.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Use of instructional strategies that are scientifically based</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Workshop Model ▪ Integration of Computer Technology ▪ Exit Project for Grades 6, 7, and 8 ▪ Field trips that align coursework with State Standards
<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>Teachers TITLE I SWP Computer Teacher: TL Fair Student Funding</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Administration of teacher generated assessments and departmental mid-year exam ▪ Growth in student performance on assessments and projects ▪ New York State Assessment for students in Grade 8

Subject/Area (where relevant): GRADUATION RATE

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, 8th grade students graduation rate will increase from 85% to 90%, as measured by periodic assessments, Standardized Test, 4 report cards, and attendance records.</p>	
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 8th grade students will be monitored closely via, targeted instruction, weekly assembly programs, and analyzing of assessment. ▪ Students will pass major subjects, such as ELA, Math, Social Studies, Science, including – foreign language, physical education and performing arts. ▪ Students daily attendance will be monitored and followed up through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generated daily reports on attendance, (RCUL) - Counseling sessions - Intervention strategies - Principal’s Honor Roll ▪ Students will be exposed to various career professionals and college fairs ▪ Students will attend several High School fairs throughout the year ▪ Teachers will work closely with parents to provide the necessary information students need to graduate ▪ Students will participate in discussions with teachers about graduation through representation of student government officers, weekly assemblies, parent meetings, community meetings. 	
<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><u>Support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assistant Principals of Literacy and Math ▪ Team Leaders of Literacy and Math ▪ Librarian: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ Computer Teacher: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ AIS Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ Mentor Teacher: TL Fair Student Funding ▪ ESL Teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title III Extended Day Grant ▪ ELA/Math Institute Grant ▪ ELL Success Grant ▪ Counseling ▪ Parent Meetings ▪ John Hopkins Accelerated Program ▪ External and Internal Professional Development
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Three Periodic Assessments ▪ 4 Report cards monitoring ▪ 4 Progress reports ▪ Conferencing with Students ▪ Observations of 8th grade classes ▪ Weekly walkthroughs of 8th grade classes ▪ Counselor’s reports ▪ Parent meetings 	

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			N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								
5								
6	72	120	120	72	85	13	5	5
7	83	73	73	83	67	7	4	3
8	146	123	123	146	74	9	5	2
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>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.).</p>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p>Services are provided to students using the following research-based programs, which will take place before school, after school, during the school day, and during the summer:</p> <p><u>The Wilson Reading System</u> - Provides a step-by-step sequential system to help teachers implement a multi sensory structured language program to students who are struggling with decoding and encoding.</p> <p><u>Great Leaps Reading</u> - Great Leaps Reading uses proven instructional practices to assist students who are having difficulty in phonic awareness, phonics and fluency. Great Leaps is divided into three major areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phonics 2. Sight Phrases 3. Reading Fluency <p><u>Rewards</u> - Rewards teaches students a flexible strategy for decoding long words and improving their oral and silent reading fluency. Students will read content area passages more fluently and accurately.</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>AIS Services will be given to those students who fail to meet the promotional criteria in Science. Teachers will work with small groups during the school day.</p>
<p>Social Studies:</p>	<p>AIS Services will be given to those students who fail to meet the promotional criteria in Social Studies. Teachers will work with small groups during the school day.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<p>At-risk services will be provided by guidance counselors. Counselors will work in small groups and individually with students. Group work and social skills are emphasized.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</p>	<p>At-risk services will be provided by the school psychologist. These services will include intervention, consultation, referral, behavior modification, and testing.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</p>	<p>At-risk services will be provided by the social worker. These services will include intervention, consultation, referral, behavior modification, and testing.</p>
<p>At-risk Health-related Services:</p>	<p>At-risk students will receive health-related services.</p>

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.

Program Delivery for English Language Learners (ELLs)

2009-2010

Part I: School ELL Profile

A. LAP Team Composition

- _____, **Principal, Sandra Taylor**
- _____, **Assistant Principal, Selassie O’Donoghue**
- _____, **AP (Math)**
- _____, **ESL Teacher, Doreen Marvin**
- _____, **ESL Teacher**
- _____, **AIS Coordinator**
- _____, **Parent Coordinator**
- _____, **AP (Science)**
- _____, **Math Teacher**
- _____, **Guidance Counselor**
- _____, **Related Service Provider/AIS Teacher**

MS 61 is located in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn. There are 1162 students currently enrolled at the school. The school houses three academies (LAPAT, CAT, and MAST) of 6th, 7th, and 8th graders. The ethnicity of the school’s population is primarily black. The ELL (English Language Learners) population is 56 or approximately .5% of the student population. The largest ELL population is from Haiti. The second largest ELL population speaks Spanish and come from Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and Mexico, etc. There are also some students from Yemen and various countries in Africa.

B. Teacher Qualifications

There are:

- Two NYS certified ESL teachers;
- 5 NYS certified bilingual Teachers (Haitian-Creole)
- 2 NYS certified FL teachers (Spanish)

- 2 teachers are considering to attain an ESL extension to their current license via Touro College's Intensive Teacher Institute (ITI) ESL Program
- One teacher is completing her ESL License Extension at City College

C. School Demographics

There are 1162 students currently enrolled, and there are 56 ELLs or approximately .5% of student population. There is no TBE program this year. This year, the Free-Standing ESL program is a push-in/pull-out program. Currently, there are:

- 5 SIFE (4 Newcomers, 0-3 years and 1 4-6 year)
- 12 Special Education (includes 4 x-coded students)
- 26 Newcomers (0-3 years)
- 15 4-6 years of ESL Service
- 10 Long-Term (LT) – 6+ years of service

Part II: ELL Identification Process

1. *Describe the steps followed for the initial identification of those students who may be possibly be ELLs.*

- When any student is registered and the student is a new student to the NYC public school system, the parent completes the HLIS (Home Language Survey) form in the appropriate language. If the HLIS form clearly indicates the student speaks a language other than English, the student will take the LAB-R test within ten days of admission. In addition, at the time of registration, an informal oral interview of the student also takes place. The interviewer, a pedagogue, will informally ascertain if the student is dominant in English or another language. Based on availability, the interviewer will speak the student's native language or ask another staff member to help translate. Once it is decided the student will take the LAB-R, the student's LAB-R score will decide whether or not s/he will receive ESL services. Moreover, the Lab-R results will also decide if the ELL student needs 180 or 360 minutes of ESL services per week.
- At the end of April/beginning of May, parents are notified in English and their native language of the annual NYSESLAT test. This standardized test formally measures the gains all ELLs have made in the four modalities of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The Speaking Test is given over a three-week period to individual students. In turn, The Listening, Reading, and Writing tests are given during a three-day period in early May. In conjunction with the Testing Coordinator, the ESL Coordinator, and the Testing AP, lists of current ELLs and former ELLs who have become proficient in the past two years are prepared; modifications are in place; and the school building is in "lock-down" to maximize all mandated testing conditions.

2. *What structures are in place at your school to ensure that parents understand all three program choices?*

Since the school does not house a TBE or dual-language program, parents are approached at registration and are presented with the school options of ESL or possible transfer. Parents view DVD and learn about their various choices at registration. Staff translators are available when necessary. Parental choice letters in English and the native language are given to parents at registration. Meetings are held with parent coordinator for parents of ELLs in the first quarter of the school year. Throughout the academic year, other workshops are held for ELL parents. During these workshops, parents are introduced to their children's teachers and learn more about their upcoming test, graduation requirements, tests, content-area subject matter, etc.

3. *Describe how your school ensures that entitlement letters are distributed and Parent Survey and Program Selection forms are returned?*

After the initial LAB-R testing and ESL groups are formed, entitlement letters are distributed in the first quarter of the school year. Parent Selection Forms are returned to the main office, attention ESL teacher.

4. *Describe the criteria used and the procedures followed to place identified ELL students in bilingual or ESL instructional programs; description must also include any consultation/communication activities with parents in their native language.*

If the student is new to the NYC public school system or the English language system, a pedagogue will speak to the parent at registration in the native language and informally assess the student's English skills. As stated earlier, this child will take the LAB-R. If the student is coming from another NYC public school, an exam history is requested to ascertain if the student has a current LAB-R/LAT score. If there is a LAB-R/LAT score, the child will be placed into an appropriate class. Parents are informed there is no TBE program in place, and they are informed of their alternative choices. (See # 2, Page 3). Once the parents decide they prefer their child to remain in an ESL program, an appropriate class is chosen based on the student's age, ELA/Math scores, general linguistic proficiency, and student peers who speak the same language. After several months and if the student shows signs of great struggle, the school will request a consultation with the student's parents. At the meeting, parents, principal/AP, ESL teacher(s) meet and discuss the need for a possible transfer to TBE program. Translators are on hand if their services are required.

5. *After viewing Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, what is the trend in program choices that parents have requested?*

- 100% of incoming students from Haiti who have little or no English skills chose the TBE bilingual program. Effective September 2009, there is no available TBE program in Haitian-Creole.
- Except for two Spanish-speaking parents, these parents refuse to transfer to a Spanish bilingual program in another school. They prefer to keep their child(ren) at MS 61 because: it is nearby; their neighbors' children attend this school and can accompany these children to school; or there are siblings/cousins who already attend MS 61
- Parents who speak other languages (Arabic, Chinese, various African languages, etc.) prefer to have their children at MS 61 because it is a nearby school, and their children easily travel or walk to school.

TBE: No Program

Number of ELLs in Each Language Group (Free Standing ESL):

Spanish

- 6th grade – 4
- 7th grade – 4
- 8th Grade – 7
- **TOTAL = 15**

Arabic

- 6th grade – 0
- 7th grade – 1
- 8th grade – 1
- **TOTAL: = 2**

Haitian Creole

- 6th grade – 6
- 7th grade – 13
- 8th grade – 14
- **TOTAL = 33**

French

- 6th grade – 0
- 7th grade – 0
- 8th grade – 2
- **TOTAL = 2**

Other

- 6th grade – 3
- 7th grade – 0
- 8th grade – 1
- **TOTAL = 4**

Grand Total

- **TOTAL = 56**

NOTE: There is no Dual-Language program at MS 61.

Programming and Scheduling Information

The Free Standing ESL program is a Push-in/Pull-out program. Whenever possible, the pull-out program is a homogeneous model based on current LAB-R/ NYSESLAT scores. The push-in model is heterogeneous. As per NYS CR Part 154, Beginners and advanced students receive 360 minutes of ESL instruction/week (8 45-minute periods). The advanced students receive 180 minutes of ESL instruction per week (4 45-minute periods). NLA instruction is not available this year, but NLA support is used in the classroom via: bilingual dictionaries and glossaries in the content area; libraries; translated textbooks; buddy system of students who speak the same language; involvement of various staff members who speak more than one language.

Extra instruction is given to newcomers and SIFE students during the school day, and in extended-day, morning/afternoon/Saturday programs. ESL instructional approaches are rigorous and systematic. They incorporate Q-TEL methods, CALLA, and scaffolding. Emphasis is placed on social and academic vocabulary in the content areas; comprehension and test-taking strategies; problem solving and critical thinking; and developing English language skills in the four modalities (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing). Moreover, art is incorporated into instruction as a culminating project to reflect learned academic skills. LTE's and Special Ed. Students also receive all mandated services and are invited to participate in any supplemental program.

Since MS61 only has a Free-Standing ESL program, all school-wide instruction is in English. Content area teachers of ELLs are encouraged to use five “essential key vocabulary words” and understand the ELL’s the need for a rich academic vocabulary in each class. These teachers are also encouraged to attend basic and content-area Q-TEL training. ESL teachers provide support for content area within their own classrooms. Thematic units on science (volcanoes, seeds, and tsunamis) and social studies (mummies) are presented. After conferencing with content area teachers, ESL teachers provide additional scaffolding by helping ELL/former ELL students with their various projects and reports. This support is often help on finding research, formulating ideas, and organizing material.

Students who have attained proficient scores on the NYSESLAT within the past two years are invited to attend these various programs to support their growing English skills. In addition, these students take all standardized tests with NYS approved modifications. They hear the Listening section of the ELA three times; have access to

translated tests; can use NYS bilingual glossaries/word-for-word bilingual dictionaries; and receive extra time on these tests (time-and-a-half). Informally, these students also know the ESL/Bilingual teachers are available to provide extra help on their various assignments/projects.

SIFE students are encouraged to attend all supplementary programs and Extended Day to reinforce skills they have learned during the school day/week. In general, these smaller groups are more effective learning environments for these SIFE students. Whenever possible, ESL teachers will work individually with the SIFE student to support reading and writing skills.

The Free Standing ESL program reflects differentiation based on LAT scores and CR Part 154 mandates. In addition, Beginner level students are pulled out individually or in small groups to receive extra instruction. Once an ELL student is in the school system for a year, s/he must take the ELA. Since the LAT is patterned on the ELA, ESL instruction incorporates the various strategies that are found in both tests. Moreover, both tests require students to write essays. In reality, writing is the most difficult modality to master. Therefore, great focus is placed on developing ALL ELL writing skills. The greatest number of advanced students (Level A) is found in the 4-6 year group and the LT group. Again, by examining the LAT sub-scores, most students show their greatest strengths in Listening/Speaking modalities. In fact, some are even at Proficient level. On the other hand, their greatest weaknesses lie in reading and, more so, in writing. Consequently, the thrust of instruction is focused on the development of writing skills and the clear organization of ideas, supporting arguments, and the use of details. Many of the special needs ELLs are LT or 4-6 year ELLs. Like their general education counterparts, their strengths are verbal. Some have difficulty with listening skills, but all struggle with reading and writing. Most of all, these students have great difficulty with organization. Guidance from their IEPs and great stress on basic test-taking techniques are quite helpful.

All ELLs and former ELLs can participate in school-wide programs as Extended Day, Kaplan program, Newton Learning, etc. Title III Summer Program is open to students who have been in the country for less than two years. Title III after-school/morning program is available for all ELLs in which the primary focus is on developing English and Math skills. If funds become available, the school will reapply for the ELL Success Grant. This year, all ELLs are reenrolled in the Achieve 3000 Reading Program. When necessary, ELL students will attend the Wilson Reading Program. Most programs are in English, but native language support is available in Newton Learning, Title III, Achieve 3000, and the ELL Grant..

Extra services in math and English are available for all ELL's and former ELLs, and they have equal access to the following services:

- Extended day with ESL or Bilingual teachers
- Newton Learning
- SES After-School Reading/Writing programs
- Scholastic 180
- Wilson Program for newcomers and SIFE students
- ELL Success Grant
- Title III morning/afternoon programs
- Title III summer program for newcomers
- GGE program
- Kaplan program
- Achieve 3000 Reading Program
- Bilingual counselors
- Resource Room
- Peer Tutoring
- Music/dance/sports programs (including soccer and a girls basketball team)
- Chess Club
- Steel Band

- Theater trips
- Trips of cultural and educational interest

Moreover, the former ELLs are given all testing modifications as per NYS mandates:

- 1 ½ time (all tests)
- Word-for-Word bilingual glossaries (content areas)
- Three readings on ELA Listening section
- Availability of translated tests/Translators (content area)
- Separate testing areas (all tests)
-

For the upcoming year, the school will re-subscribe to the Achieve3000 program. With the most recent training, teachers of ELLs will use both the reading and writing programs more effectively to improve their students' skills for the ELA, NYSESLAT, and their general course work.

In turn, the funding from Title III will reinforce students' ELA and math skills. Students will also be encouraged to participate in the variety of SES programs and other morning/after-school/ Saturday programs that become available.

Any programs that will be discontinued will be solely based on population and funding. In general, the school's programs and services work and provide valuable support to the ELL population. It will be with great regret to cut any services/programs for the upcoming year.

All ELLs can participate in all school programs These include:

- Regents classes/tests
- Title III programs
- All after school/morning/Saturday academic programs
- Drama
- Assemblies
- Music/ choir/ band
- Art-and-craft programs
- Debating teams
- Spelling bees
- Sports
- Chess club
- CUNY Intensive English program
- Theater
- Writing contests
- Etc.

As a Middle school (grades 6,7, 8) , the students' average age is 11 – 14, the “tween” years and early adolescence. As a result, the school's academic and social programs center on pushing the 6th graders from their “elementary-school mentality” and introducing them to the realities of middle school. In addition, the thrust of the 7th and 8th grades is to prepare the students for high school, college, careers, and adulthood. As a result, the ELLS:

- Meet representatives of general and specialized high schools
- Receive translated NYC high school directories
- Attend general and bilingual career fairs
- Encouraged to attend CUNY's Intensive English Program

- Participate in community outreach programs
- Are actively involved in fundraising for Haitian earthquake relief
- Attend local poetry contests
- Participate in writing/art contests
- Take Regents
- Etc.

Heinle and Heinle *Visions* and *Milestones*; *Side-by-Side series*; *High Point series*; *Achieve 3000*; *American Short Stories*, etc. are materials and programs used to develop ELL students' English reading/writing and vocabulary skills. The goal for 2009-2010 is to focus on ELL math skills. If funding becomes available, the use of *Destination Math* (English, Haitian-Creole, and Spanish) will help develop ELLs' math skills and *Bra!nchild* (English, Spanish, and Haitian-Creole) will help develop both English and math skills. *Achieve 3000*, *Destination Math*, and *Bra!nchild* all have the capability to present material/information in Spanish and Haitian-Creole, the two largest language groups in the school. In turn, *Achieve 3000* is an excellent leveled reading program that offers native language support. Required services and support for ELL students are geared for young adolescents. These materials are age appropriate and follow NYC standards for grades six – to- eight.

Native language support is found Free Standing ESL model. The ESL programs have bilingual dictionaries and picture dictionaries in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole. NYS Bilingual content glossaries are also available. High beginners and intermediate ELLs can use the Longman Classics, and the Penguin abridged classic series. *Milestone* and *Visions* are leveled ESL series in which fiction, nonfiction, and ESL language reinforcement is presented to the reader. CALLA and Q-TEL methodologies are also applied in the classroom.

Students are also encouraged to translate for each other when the need occurs. Although ESL classroom libraries are available, bilingual classroom libraries will be ordered in both Haitian-Creole and Spanish. If funding becomes available, the Spanish bilingual library will also reinforce the Saturday Spanish NL program. The school library houses a variety of picture books that many newcomer ELLs enjoy, and there is currently a variety of books/picture books/dictionaries in Spanish and other languages. If funding becomes available, more age appropriates bilingual libraries in the content area will be added to the library.

In addition, all teachers of ELLs are encouraged to have bilingual dictionaries in class. Word-for-Word bilingual dictionaries are used during standardized content area testing. In turn, native language is also used as a support tool. If the teacher/classmate knows a word or phrase in the student's native language, he/she will use the translate the word or phrase to the ELL who does not comprehend the English,. As a result, the native language becomes a temporary scaffold. Moreover, the librarian has made available different bilingual dictionaries and has been encouraged to purchase translated material/libraries once funding becomes available. It is the school's goal to increase the number of translated/bilingual books in the school/classroom library(ies) and have a wider diversity of topics and reading levels of these translated/bilingual books.

Professional Development

This year, teachers of ELLs will attend of reading, writing, and math workshops offered by the OELL (Office of English Language Learners). "In-house" training will be also offered twice by *Achieve 3000*. Morning ESL workshops will be given via the Data Specialist's study groups. Professional development is open to ALL staff members. In turn, Parent Coordinator and available staff attend parent workshops that the ESL teachers provide on an ongoing basis.

ESL teachers confer with teachers of ELLs and other staff members as guidance counselors, etc. about the student's (s') academic, social, and emotional issues:

- ESL teachers confer with ELLs content- teachers about assigned reports and projects. ESL teacher will also recommend necessary modifications based on the ELL's (s') linguistic ability(ies).

- ESL teacher will work individually or in small groups to guide students, so they can produce a final product of quality that will meet the content teacher's/department's requirements.
- ESL teachers will contact the appropriate counselor or request special counseling if none is available "in house" to address ELL's (s') social/personal issues
- ESL teachers will provide necessary information to staff members to facilitate student evaluations

"Turn-key" training occurs during formal PD days and during departmental/academy meetings to teachers/staff members of ELLs.. Focus is centered on monolingual teachers/staff of ELLs; however, the goal is that ALL teachers/staff members will have the NYS mandated 7.5 hours of ESL training. Topics will include:

- Academic vocabulary
- Thematic units of instruction
- Scaffolding
- Various ESL methodologies
- Cognates in the content areas
- Testing modifications for ELLs and former ELLs
- Social and academic English (BICS and CALP)
- NYSESLAT and LAB-R
- Four Modalities of Language
- Language acquisition
- How to modify academic demands to the linguistic reality of ELLs
- Teaching writing to ELLs
- Etc.

ESL teachers assist ELL's to complete high school applications and invite school representatives and former MS 61 students from Brooklyn International HS to address ELLs who meet the school's criteria. ELLs are taken to various career workshops in which the presenters speak their native language. Students can also speak to bilingual counselors on staff.

Parental Involvement

Parents of ELLs are invited to participate in **all** parent functions and workshops. Title III Workshops are held every semester. These various workshops inform the parents of ELLs about: upcoming standardized tests (including the NYSELAT); graduation requirements; math workshops; etc. If needed, translators are available. In turn, all parent notifications are translated into several languages. The school partners with Community Based Organizations (CBO's), and the parent coordinator circulates translated information to the parents of ELLs about these diverse community organizations that will meet the parents of ELLs' specific needs. In the beginning of the year, the parent coordinator surveys parents about issues that concern them in relationship to their children in school. All surveys are translated. As of a result of these initial surveys and subsequent ones, the parent coordinator tailors her program to meet the needs of the **ALL** parents. When necessary, she will bring issues to the attention of the principal.

V. Assessment Analysis

Part A: LAB-R and NYSESLAT: Levels

Beginner

- 6th grade – 3
- 7th grade – 2
- 8th grade – 5
- **TOTAL = 10**

Intermediate

- 6th grade – 5
- 7th grade – 4
- 8th grade – 11
- **TOTAL = 20**

Advanced

- 6th grade – 5
- 7th grade – 12
- 8th grade – 9
- **TOTAL = 26**

NYSESLAT: Sub-scores

Listening/Speaking – 6th Grade

- Beginner – 0
- Intermediate – 0
- Advanced – 9
- Proficient – 4
- **Total = 13**

Listening/Speaking – 7th Grade

- Beginner – 1
- Intermediate – 1
- Advanced – 11
- Proficient – 5
- **Total = 18**

Listening/Speaking – 8th Grade

- Beginner – 1
- Intermediate – 5
- Advanced – 11
- Proficient – 8
- **Total = 25**

Reading/Writing - 6th Grade

- Beginner – 2
- Intermediate – 4
- Advanced – 7
- Proficient – 0
- **Total = 13**

Reading/Writing - 7th Grade

- Beginner – 1
- Intermediate – 6
- Advanced – 8
- Proficient – 3
- **Total = 18**

Reading/Writing – 8th Grade

- Beginner – 6

- Intermediate - 8
- Advanced - 9
- Proficient – 2
- **Total = 25**

Part C: Content Areas

Content area (science and social studies) 2009 test scores are not available, for those 8th grade students have graduated.

ELA

Level 1

- 6th grade – 0
- 7th grade – 0
- 8th grade – 0
- **TOTAL - 0**

Level 2

- 6th grade - 8
- 7th grade – 7
- 8th grade – 16
- **TOTAL = 31**

Level 3

- 6th grade – 1
- 7th grade – 9
- 8th grade – 8
- **TOTAL = 18**

Level 4

- 6th grade – 1
- 7th grade - 0
- 8th grade - 0
- **TOTAL = 1**

MATH

Level 1

- 6th grade – 2
- 7th grade – 6
- 8th grade – 2
- **TOTAL = 10**

Level 2

- 6th grade – 5
- 7th grade – 2
- 8th grade – 10
- **TOTAL = 17**

Level 3

- 6th grade – 6
- 7th grade - 11
- 8th grade - 11
- **TOTAL = 28**

Level 4

- **No Students at Level 4**

Part D: Review of Data

1. Examination of Student Results

In light of the ELA scores, there were no Level 1's. Several of the Level 2 were former bilingual students who were new admits in the fall of 2007, and this was their first ELA test. The many of the former bilingual Level 3's were a combination of students who were LTs and students who were in an English language system for 4-6 years. In turn, the students in Free-Standing ESL classes primarily followed this same pattern. This overall configuration for most of the ELL's in the former TBE and Free-Standing ESL programs follow Cumming's view of BICS and CALP (social and academic English). Social English is achieved within one year. The majority of the ELL's who took the ELA for the first time scored a Level 2. In reality, academic English takes much longer to achieve (4-7 years). Consequently, the majority of the Level 3 ELL's are students who have been in an English language system for 4-6 years or are LT's (long-term learners).

In light of the math scores, there were a greater number of students in Level 1 (10 math versus 0 ELA). This larger number reflects the number of SIFE and Special Ed. Students. Interestingly, there are 28 Level 3's in math in comparison to 18 ELA Level 3's. This number reflects the number of ELLs (especially the former Bilingual students) who took the Math test in their native language. Consequently, when students are taught content area in their native language and take the state tests in their native language, their numbers are higher in Level 3 than their counterparts in Free-Standing ESL classes.

The NYSESLAT and the LAB-R are the two primary tools to measure early literacy of the school's ELLs. There is no clear indication on the ATS about the number of ELLs who took content area tests in his/her native language. The NYSELAT scores show a strong pattern. 8 former 7th graders attained Proficient Level (P) on the 2009 NYSESLAT. Except for one student, all students were either 4-6 year or LT ELLs. The 10 Beginning Level students were either recently admitted, 2 Special Needs students, or SIFE (Students with Interrupted Formal Education) students. The Intermediate level students are primarily 0-3 years or Special Needs students. The Advanced Level students are primarily 4-6 or LT ELLs. There are two Special Needs who scored an A Level. All four X-Coded (students with IEPs that no longer recommend ESL, but they have not reached proficiency level on the NYSESLAT) students are in the advanced level. Most interestingly, the sub-scores reflect 17 students who have reached proficiency in listening and /speaking; however, only 5 students reached proficiency in reading/writing.

ELL Interim Assessment and School Leadership

This year, teachers can directly obtain valuable information from the ELL Interim Assessments through NYC's internal computer systems. Consequently, the scores are more available. With the recent training offered to District 17/18 teachers, access to these scores and the greater understanding of this data is a stronger reality. During this current year, ongoing PD will be available for teachers of ELL's. With this updated information, instruction will be more data driven; and teachers can focus on individual and class-wide strengths and weaknesses. This will aid differentiated instruction for the ELL students. Moreover, many teachers in the building are familiar with ARIS and ACUITY and can obtain and utilize ELA and

Math data from these Interim Assessments. Therefore, this knowledge and the easier availability of the ELL Interim Assessments present stronger and continuous “feedback” to the ELL teachers.

Research clearly shows when ELLs are literate in their native language; the transfer to a second language is much easier. Students in the former TBE program were given formal NLA instruction. This instruction strengthened their skills in the NL and English. This is especially true for the bilingual SIFE students. Assessments show a steady rise in their reading and writing skills in English. On the other hand, students in the Free-Standing ESL programs do not have access to NLA. If they are SIFE students, English-language instruction is more difficult. Consequently, their assessment scores rise more slowly.

To address this problem, an NL Spanish program was established via the ELL Success Grant. Spanish NL instruction was provided to strengthen Spanish-speaking ELLs. Many of these students speak fluent Spanish, but they have been in an English-language system for 4-5 years. As a result, their Spanish literacy skills are weak. The basis of this program was to build their Spanish literacy skills which will also aid these students to become proficient in English. If funding becomes available again, a Spanish NL program will provide this needed support. In turn, this NL support will also be offered to the former TBE students and any other ELL who speaks Haitian-Creole.

VII. Resources

One of the goals of the ESL teacher is to assist students as they transition from elementary school or exit into high school. The ESL classroom is “safe haven” for incoming sixth graders. This is especially true for sixth graders who have recently entered an English language system. ESL teachers help students with English skills, assignments, contact parents, and provide an environment in which these children feel comfortable while they adjust to a new school, language, and culture. In turn, the ESL teachers take eighth grade Haitian-Creole speakers to Brooklyn College to attend HABETAC’s Haitian Career Day Fair. Students listen to representatives from various metropolitan colleges and meet many high school students; many of whom are former MS 61 graduates. Eligible eighth-grade ELL students are encouraged to apply to CUNY’s Summer Intensive English Language Institute. Since its inception over ten years ago, MS 61 ELL students have attended this program and even attended its Saturday school-year program when they were/are in high school. In addition, in October, ESL teachers individually meet with ALL eighth-grade eligible ELLs and help guide them to apply to the various International high schools or bilingual programs. The ESL teachers also invite representatives of these schools, so they can speak to interested/eligible ELLs about their schools and programs. As a result, students have a greater understanding of the diverse programs that are available in the NYC school system. Finally, the ESL teachers work closely with the other teachers of ELLs, so the eighth- grade students can complete assignments and exit projects.

Evaluation

MS 61 ESL program provides a safe environment for ELLS in which students learn both social and academic English. Our students succeed. Academic English takes at least 5-7 years to master (Cummings). Most of our proficient students are 4-6 year ELLs or LT. The primary ESL goal is that 85-90% of the school’s ELL population will increase NYSESLAT scores by ½ - to – one whole score. The majority of the ELLS have met these goals. However, most LT students are “stuck” in the Advance level. The area in which they must concentrate on is reading/writing. In reality, most of these students do much better in reading than writing. SIFE students need more small group/individual attention. They are encouraged to attend Extended Day/After-school/Morning/Saturday programs. Special Needs ELLs must master a new language and face difficulties posed by their unique learning challenges. Consequently, the ESL teachers must work with the Special needs teacher and be aware of information found in their individual IEPs.

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) 6-8 **Number of Students to be Served:** 56 LEP _____ Non-LEP _____

Number of Teachers 5 **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.

MS 61 is located at the corner of Empire Boulevard and New York Avenue in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn. The middle school serves a culturally-diverse population of 1162 students. At MS 61, there are 56 ELL students in the ESL program. All ELLs are offered to participate in Title III extended –day programs. The Title III summer program focuses on students who have been in an English-language system for two years or less. LEP students (6, 7, 8) who are provided extra services (Title III) in both extended-day and summer Title III programs. In turn, these extended-day and summer programs focus on developing Basic English language skills and honing skills for the ELA, NYSESLAT, and State Math exams. The methods and strategies to improve mathematics, native and English language learning incorporate: Q-TEL/CALLA methodologies, scaffolding, content-based instruction, and thematic units of instruction. Some materials are: Heinle and Heinle's *Visions* series, *Word-by-Word* series, and the English-only and bilingual *Longman Dictionaries*. A pull-out/push-in program is used. The program runs from September-to-June. The duration of weekly instruction is based on the Spring NYSESLAT scores. Both ESL teachers are licensed and state certified, and there are five certified bilingual teachers on staff. All teachers are encouraged to take Q-Tel training offered by the city/region. Trips include visits to sites of cultural interest in the five boroughs, celebration of Haitian Independence Day festivities, and travel to nearby schools of higher education.

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

To meet the needs of the school's ELL population, the school will continue to provide/plan the following professional development activities. The school's certified ESL teachers and Achieve 3000 presenters will present some PD activities. Workshops will be given during PD days, faculty meeting, and bi-monthly morning/afternoon per sessions, in conjunction with the Data Specialist. There will be a minimum of five sessions of 45-60 minutes in duration. These sessions will especially support the monolingual content area teacher who has ELLs in his/her classroom. Coverages for Achievement 3000 PD will be obtained from Title III funds. Special emphasis will be placed on Academic vocabulary in the content areas:

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.

MS 61 has received funding to pay accepted translators to transcribe notifications and on-going events into various languages. The primary translations are done in Haitian Creole and Spanish. However, this funding is not used for material/notifications that have been already translated by DOE central office. As a result, the parent co-coordinator has been greatly aided through the availability of this funding, and the non-English speaking parents are better-included and informed about events/general information about the school community.

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.

At least 50% of ELL parents are not proficient in either written or spoken English. Consequently, a definite need has arisen that parents need translated notifications, letters, and other forms of written communication to be effectively included and involved in these school community activities. In turn, oral translators are a necessity priority when parents attend meetings, activities, and parent/teacher conferences.

These findings were classified through the School Leadership Team, PTA meetings, parent coordinator, and faculty. Money for translations and oral/written translators has been met by City funding which is sent to the school in the fall semester.

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.

Oral interpretation(s) will be provided on an ongoing basis from the in-house staff and parent volunteer(s). These people will be available during school hours, after-school activities, and parent/teacher informal/formal meetings. A parent/staff survey is planned to ascertain the oral/written capabilities of staff and parent volunteers.

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.

The school provides ongoing oral/written translations/translators by in-house school staff and parent volunteers.

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>.

- Notifications and parent letters will be translated by teachers / volunteers
- Will use available OELL translation of brochures, notifications, etc.
- School will contact OELL Interpretation Services for standardized content area test if there is not pedagogue available who can translate according to NYS Mandates.
- Survey to staff and volunteer parents will aid in the identifications of which languages are spoken within the school community
- Information will organize the availability of these translators
- Use of ATS Home language reports will indicate which different languages are spoken by the families of the entire student body. This information will clarify if any outside translators are needed and create a wider pool of parent volunteers

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:	\$929,846	\$324,755	\$1,254,601
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	\$19,298		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		\$3,247	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	\$46,490		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		\$16235	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	\$92,980		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		\$32,470	

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: 88.4

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.

As part of our support to have 100% HQT, we provide Title I Set- Aside 5% funds for tuition reimbursement. We also encourage our teachers to become HQT through the HOUSSE online certification. We check the BEDS frequently to ensure that we provide our teachers with the appropriate and timely support. 98.7% of our teachers are fully licensed and are permanently assigned to M.S. 61. Ninety two percent (92%) have obtained a Masters degree or higher. Additionally, we are recruiting graduates at specific Teacher Education Programs such as Medgar Evers College, Columbia University, and Brooklyn College.

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.

Region 6 - District 17

Middle School 61 Star Academy - Parent Advisory Council

Parent Involvement Policy

Mission Statement:

The mission of Middle School 61 Parent Advisory Council is to guarantee parent participation, leadership and technical support in the formation of policies to ensure quality education for all children to develop visionary goals and standards for educational excellence for all children by holistically teaching the child. In order to accomplish our mission, we as a body will assume the following responsibilities:

Provide an environment to foster higher expectations for student growth and achievement. Promote collaborative partnerships through our professional development workshops for parents with members of our school and community connections. Act as advocates for all parents in our school. Work towards encouraging multi-cultural awareness, ethical behavior and access equality in our school. Promote better communication between parents and school personnel. Challenge our school with the support of the principal, to offer meaningful parent involvement activities.

Parent Involvement Goals:

The PAC of Middle School 61 has established the following goals to support and promote parent activities for increasing the involvement of parents. Work to increase communication between the home, school and community by offering social gatherings to forge better relationships. Implement family literacy workshops to help parents help their children at home. Provide opportunities to increase our reading and writing scores by encouraging parents to read by setting up a book club for parents.

The Principal and staff will work jointly with the parent representatives (PAC) to strengthen the voice of parents as it relates to academic excellence for all children. A process will be put in place so that parents will have an opportunity to share their concerns and gather information as it pertains to their child’s education.

Definition of Parent:

The term “parent” includes in addition to a natural parent, a legal guardian or other person standing in *loco parentis* (such as a grandparent or stepparent with whom the child lives, or a person who is legally responsible for the child’s welfare). Section 910 (31) . ESEA

Building Capacity For School & Parent Involvement:

The PAC’s will work to strengthen the parent voice on the school leadership teams and the redesign and or corrective action planning teams. The parent involvement policy must be included in the school level comprehensive educational plan. The parent’s of participating students must have an opportunity to share their concerns and ideas for changes and recommendations.

The parents Advisory Council representatives must provide information to families within their respective schools regarding the Title 1 programs, activities and expenditures. They will also provide information and support to those parents who have children in Special Education ELL and Bi-Lingual programs.

The term “*parental involvement*” means the participation of parents in regular, two-way, meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring:

- That parent’s are encouraged to be actively involved in their child’s education at school;
 - That parent’s play an integral role in assisting their child’s learning;
 - That parent’s are full partners in their child’s education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child;
- and

The carrying out of other activities, such as those described in section 1118 of the ESEA. (Section 9101(32).ESEA.)

Annual Meeting:

The PAC will convene an annual meeting each year to discuss the title program and make recommendation for ratification in the reauthorization. They will prepare workshops, forums and other school events during the year. To increase parent participation and improve avenues for communicating better with families and school personal.

Professional Development:

Parents of Middle School 61, including the Parent Coordinator should attend in and out of town conferences, meetings and forums to obtain additional resources and knowledge to help support and influence educational change.

Duties and Responsibilities of DPAC Representatives Include:

Incentives to foster increased attendance and participation of parents at conferences and workshops. Increase parent participation in school activities through the PA, PAC and Parent Coordinator’s meetings. Build better relationships between the home and school through via phone, auto-dial,

mailings, letters and flyers. Improve communication between families and school through social gatherings, our Men Empowerment Forum, conferences and workshops.

- * Provide information in a timely manner
- * Host on-going professional development training on such topics as; special education, bi-lingual, standards/assessment, strategies for increasing test scores, title I program.
- * Circle of Sisters (book club)
- * Men Empowerment Forum
- * Annual Title I Conference(s)
- * Develop a Title I newsletter (bi-annual)
- * Develop avenues for obtaining grants and outside financial support
- * Provide cultural enrichment opportunities for parents
- * Participate at various in and out of town conferences
- * Prepare notices and other documents of interest in other languages (where possible)
- * Build positive relationships between staff and parents
- * Help to expand our communication between the home and school
- * Develop family events for building cohesiveness within the family unit
- * Host opportunities for staff and parents to interact socially

The Parent Coordinator should work as a supporter on committees to help strengthen and support parent activities.

Professional Development Training Topics:

The parent workshops, forums, conferences, and events will be held at various times and day's to accommodate parents and families.

Notification letters, flyers and mailings will be sent in advance of meetings to increase and encourage parent participation. Packets of educational and community materials will be distributed and or available at parent events. Refreshments, door prizes, books and other incentives will be provided for participants at meetings.

Title I - NCLB
Special Education Program
ELL/Bi-Lingual Program
Circle of Sisters (Book Club)
Men Empowerment Forum
Women Empowerment Forum
Title I Conferences
Motivational Skills/Self Esteem
Movie Night
Meet and Greet (social events)

SES-Supplemental Educational Services
School Choice/SES
State Standards/Curriculum
Family Involvement – Cultural Enrichment Activities
And other topics of interest.....

District Level Representations:

The PAC Representative or PAC Alternate will attend the (DPAC) District Parent Advisory Council meetings to represent out school.

Title I Budget:

Resources/Cost/Source: - 1% of Title I Parent Involvement budget

1% of the Title I funds for Parent Involvement is given to schools to develop meaningful parent involvement activities. The PAC will develop a budget and present it to the parents for their input before presenting the final document to the Principal.

Title 1 funds can be used for transportation (metro cards), stamps for mailing letters, newsletters and other notifications, hotel fees, conference registration fees, purchasing books, supplies, lending library, literary programs, refreshments, reimbursements, childcare, incentives and other items.

Annual Evaluation:

Intervals of Periodic Review

Evaluations will be distributed after each workshop to determine the effectiveness of professional development training. Attendance sheets and agendas are to be used to determine an increase in the numbers of participants and for the purpose of documentation.

The PAC will meet with the Title I school representatives to discuss/determine and review the overall effectiveness of the Title I program. Parents will have an opportunity to make recommendations for improving the program and to make sure that we meet our AYP.

Major Tasks/Activities - Participate on the School Leadership Team and its Sub-committees. Establish regularly scheduled events such as; workshops, forums, conferences to inform parents of content area expectations. Activities will be geared towards helping parents to understand state standards and test preparation pertaining to their child/ren education.

Term of Office

All officers may serve a term of (2) two consecutive years. Elections will be held every two years. Newly elected officers will assume responsibilities starting September 1st school year. It is recommended that during the transition period between July and October, the existing new board and former board will work together to exchange and give technical assistance for a smooth transition. For roles and responsibilities of each officer see DPAC Plan for Parent Advisory Councils.

This policy was adopted and approved on the following date _____

Committee Members:

Alisa Diallo
Antoinette Greene
Marie Lawrence
Joyce Richardson
Teresa Rodriquez
Claudette Waldman
Natalie Walker
Pearl Williams
Sandra Williams

Facilitator: Ailene Thompson, Parent Coordinator

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.

SCHOOL - PARENT COMPACT

THE SCHOOL AGREES

THE PARENT/GUARDIAN AGREES

- To convene an annual meeting for Title I parents to inform them of the Title I program and their right to be involved.
- To offer a flexible number of meetings at various times, and if necessary, and if funds are available, to provide transportation, child care or home visits for those parents who cannot attend a regular school meeting.
- To actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and improving the Title I programs and the parental involvement policy.
- To provide performance profiles and individual student assessment results for each child and other pertinent individual and school district education information.
- To provide parents with timely information about all programs.
- To provide performance profiles and individual student assessment results for each child and other pertinent individual and school district education information.
- To provide high quality curriculum and instruction.
- To deal with communication issues between teachers and parents through:
 - parent-teacher conferences at least annually
 - frequent reports to parents on their children's progress
 - reasonable access to staff
 - opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class
 - observation of classroom activities
- To assure that parents may participate in professional development activities if the school determines that it is appropriate, i.e., literacy classes, workshops on reading strategies.

- To become involved in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the school-parent involvement policy and school-parent compact..
- To participate in or request technical assistance training that the local education authority or school offers on child rearing practices and teaching and learning strategies.
- To support his/her child(ren) by reviewing their homework assignments. Including providing time for reading.
- To monitor his/her child(ren)
 - attendance at school
 - homework/study time
 - reading
- To share the responsibility for improved student achievement.
- To communicate with his/her child's/children's teachers about their educational needs.
- To request information and assistance in supporting their child(ren) in the educational process.
- To survey parents to find out what information or type of training or assistance they would like and/or need to help them be more effective in assisting their child/children in the educational process.

----- PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN TO THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL -----

We agree to work together, to the best of our abilities, as educators and parents to fulfill our common goal of providing for the successful education of our children.

AGREED TO: _____
SANDRA TAYLOR, PRINCIPAL

Signature of Parent/Guardian

AGREED TO: _____
 PRESIDENT P.A.

 Type/Print Name of Parent/Guardian

AGREED TO: _____
 , PAC REP.

 Telephone Number

 Teacher's Name

 Class

 Best time to contact

A.M. P.M.

 Date

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.

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.

In looking at our school's Progress Report, we find that in the category of Student Performance in ELA we are 127% above the maximum score (as compared to our Peer Horizon) for percentage of students at Levels three or four. In mathematics, we are approximately 74% toward the maximum score for the same group as compared to our Peer Horizon.

Three Year Trends Analysis of ELA Performance

Grade 6

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	17	6.4	130	49.2	114	43.2	3	1.1
2008	7	2.0	139	39.4	204	57.8	3	0.8
2009	1	0.3	71	18.6	298	78.0	12	3.2

Grade 7

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	24	7.8	161	52.6	119	38.9	2	0.7
2008	5	1.7	123	42.3	162	55.7	1	0.1
2009	1	0.3	82	23.2	261	73.9	9	2.5

Grade 8

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	24	6.0	219	54.6	155	38.7	3	0.7
2008	13	4.7	146	52.3	118	42.3	2	0.7
2009	7	2.4	139	47.1	149	50.0	0	0.0

In turn, according to DOE data, the percentage of sixth grade students in Level 1 for ELA decreased from 6.4% to 0.3% between 2007 and 2009. For the same time period and grade, the percentage of students in Levels 3 and 4 increased from 44.3% to 81.2%. Gains were also made by our seventh and eighth graders between 2007 and 2009. The percent of Level 1 students decreased in seventh and eighth grades from 7.8% to 0.3% and 6.0% to 2.4%, respectively.

In addition, both grades made increases in the percent of students in Levels 3 and 4 as follows:

- **The percentage of 7th grade students in Levels 3 and 4 increased from 39.5% to 76.5%, while our eighth graders increased from 39.4 to 50.5%.**

Three Year Trends Analysis of MATH Performance

Grade 6

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	61	23.1	91	34.5	107	40.5	5	1.9
2008	17	9.5	28	15.6	116	64.8	18	10.1
2009	32	8.3	88	22.9	240	62.5	24	6.3

Grade 7

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	38	12.5	130	42.9	123	40.6	12	4.0
2008	35	11.4	102	33.3	157	51.3	12	3.9
2009	7	2.0	66	18.7	245	69.4	35	9.9

Grade 8

	Level 1 #	Level 1%	Level 2 #	Level 2%	Level 3#	Level 3%	Level 4#	Level 4%
2007	66	16.6	174	43.7	153	38.4	5	1.3
2008	22	7.9	100	35.7	142	50.7	16	5.7
2009	18	5.9	105	34.4	168	55.1	14	4.6

The percentage of sixth grade students in Level 1 for Math decreased from 23.1% to 8.3% between 2007 and 2009. For the same time period and grade, the percentage of students in Levels 3 and 4 increased from 42.4% to 68.8%. Gains were also made by our seventh and eighth graders between 2007 and 2009. The percent of level 1 students decreased in seventh and eighth grades from 12.5% to 2.0% and 16.6% to 5.9%, respectively.

In addition, both grades made increases in the percent of students in Levels 3 and 4 as follows: The percentage of 7th grade students in Levels 3 and 4 increased from 42.4% to 68%, while our eighth graders increased from 39.7% to 59.7%.

The data concerning our ELL subgroup indicates that:

Sixth-Grade Students

- There were no Level 1 students
- nine out of eighteen students scored in Level 2
- nine out of eighteen students scored in Level 3

Seventh-Grade Students

- There are no Level 1 students
- Sixteen out of twenty-four students in Level 2
- Eight out of twenty-four students in Level 3

Eighth-Grade Students

- One out of twenty-two students in Level 1
- Nineteen out of twenty-two students in Level 2
- Two out of twenty-two students in Level 3

The data concerning our **Special Education** subgroup indicates that:

Sixth-Grade Students

- one out of forty-five students scored in Level 1
- twenty-seven out of forty five students scored in Level 2
- seventeen out of forty-five students scored in Level 3

Seventh-Grade Students

- one out of thirty students scored in Level 1
- seventeen out of thirty students scored in Level 2
- twelve out of thirty students scored in Level 3.

Eighth-Grade Students

- six out of forty-seven students scored in Level 1
- thirty-five out of forty-seven students scored in Level 2
- six out of forty-seven students scored in Level 3

According to the New York State School Report Card Accountability Report, Students With Disabilities did not make AYP in both ELA and Math. They did not make AYP in science and as a result, they did not qualify for Safe Harbor.

Overall, M.S. 61 has continued to demonstrate progress in reducing the percentage of students performing at Level 1 while significantly making strides in the percentage of our students in Levels 3 and 4.

In perusing our “Quality Review Report,” there are four areas in need of improvement:

5. Ensure opportunities are provided for all students to experience a broader curriculum especially in the arts.

First, the report speaks of the need to “ensure opportunities for students to experience a broader curriculum with emphasis on the Arts.” In order to address the above-stated need, we hired a dance/drama instructor an art teacher, Violin Program, and Rhythm Band Program. Also, teachers are instructing students to utilize project based activities across the content areas. In addition, we added several after-school programs: Band, violins, chess, arts and crafts, fine arts, double-dutch, filmmaking, mural painting, Hip Hop Dance, mediation . . .

6. Evaluate the effectiveness of professional development in improving differentiated instruction.

We sought technical assistance from the ICI Network and Deborah Jones Riley to introduce some of the strategies of differentiated instruction. This was followed up by an in-house study group who learned about differentiated instruction through reading and discussing Carol Ann Tomlinson’s book, The Differentiated Classroom. The members of our study group then demonstrated what they learned by incorporating various strategies into their classroom practice. We then engaged in an interdisciplinary ‘Lesson Study’ between Math, Language Arts, and science teachers to complete one cycle. The Math and Literacy coaches continue to provide professional learning opportunities regarding differentiated instruction while monitoring the classroom instruction of the staff.

7. Develop detailed and specific personal education plans to raise the achievement of the growing numbers of students operating at level 3.

The ICI Network staff provided technical assistance through workshops and classroom demonstrations. Professional Development learning sessions in the use of ACUITY to move students from Level 3 to Level 4 were also provided. Students and staff are encouraged to analyze data set goals and create their own plans to improve their scores.

8. Develop rigorous systems of data analysis to monitor the performance of ethnic and gender groups, as well as the school's progress against similar schools.

At Middle School 61 we have common preparation periods built into our school day. These preparatory periods are scheduled in an effort to build capacity with an emphasis on developing professional learning communities. The focus for these communities is the study analyze of student data. Data is defined as, but not limited to, New York State assessments, periodic assessments – such as Acuity and Scantron; and formative assessments, such as student work gathered from classwork, homework and teacher developed exams.

Throughout the year, these “mini” data teams will meet to examine student work using forma protocols (for example, using the book “Looking Together at Student Work”), Acuity item analysis, and Inquire from the Department of Education’s website. Each team will have a “data leader” who will act as the facilitator for the meeting. The data specialist and assistant principals will visit these meetings and monitor their progress. The position of data leader will be rotated with the groups, in an effort to have teachers share the responsibility of leadership.

In addition to examining student work, the groups will receive professional development in identifying “student learning problem” and then transform it into a “problem of practice.” The “problem of practice” becomes a pathway to support students who are experiencing academic difficulties. By employing other methods of delivering instruction, for example, by employing differentiated instruction in the classroom, we expect to see improving results for our students.

Our “Learning Environment Survey Report” for 2006-2008, indicated that there was an increase in each category:

- Academic Expectations (74%)
- Communication (63%)
- Engagement (72%)
- Safety and Respect (64%)

These percentages are compared to the maximum value of the City Horizon score. Another bright spot is that 99% of our staff is highly qualified and assigned to our school with very little turnover from year-to-year.

In summary, we are a school on the rise with a dedicated and knowledgeable staff. Despite this, we have several areas which require breaking through barriers. We must continue to focus on our

Special Education students especially with regard to math. In addition, we did not make AYP for our ELL students in English Language Arts.

In response to our students' needs, we purchased Achieve 3000 online programs. The technological tool offers scaffolding to our ELL students as they transition toward English Proficiency. ELL students have worked in tandem with their instructors two-to-three times per week to support the acquisition of vocabulary and improve their comprehension skills. Achieve 3000 is particularly useful because it adapts the difficulty level of the reading slightly above the students' level. In addition, the program began with a Spanish component and now has a Haitian Creole component with a parent section.

In order to increase our participation rate on NYS Assessments, we are utilizing a combination of various methods, such as, auto dialing, initiate home visits through AIDP, parent workshops, and student-to-student telephone chains. In an effort to support the performance of SWDs in Science, our students work with the Science Specialist in a "hands-on" Science Lab. Also, Glenco Science videos and teacher common prep meetings to discuss students' weaknesses, etc.

2. School wide reform strategies that:

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

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			N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								

5								
6	72	120	120	72	85	13	5	5
7	83	73	73	83	67	7	4	3
8	146	123	123	146	74	9	5	2
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	<p>Services are provided to students using the following research-based programs, which will take place before school, after school, during the school day, and during the summer:</p> <p><u>The Wilson Reading System</u> - Provides a step-by-step sequential system to help teachers implement a multi sensory structured language program to students who are struggling with decoding and encoding.</p> <p><u>Great Leaps Reading</u> - Great Leaps Reading uses proven instructional practices to assist students who are having difficulty in phonic awareness, phonics and fluency. Great Leaps is divided into three major areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Phonics 5. Sight Phrases 6. Reading Fluency <p><u>Rewards</u> - Rewards teaches students a flexible strategy for decoding long words and improving their oral and silent reading fluency. Students will read content area passages more fluently and accurately.</p>
Science:	AIS Services will be given to those students who fail to meet the promotional criteria in Science. Teachers will work with small groups during the school day.
Social Studies:	AIS Services will be given to those students who fail to meet the promotional criteria in Social Studies. Teachers will work with small groups during the school day.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	At-risk services will be provided by guidance counselors. Counselors will work in small groups and individually with students. Group work and social skills are emphasized.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	At-risk services will be provided by the school psychologist. These services will include intervention, consultation, referral, behavior modification, and testing.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	At-risk services will be provided by the social worker. These services will include intervention, consultation, referral, behavior modification, and testing.

At-risk Health-related Services:	At-risk students will receive health-related services.
---	--

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

As part of our support to have 100% HQT, we provide Title I Set- Aside 5% funds for tuition reimbursement. We also encourage our teachers to become HQT through the HOUSSE online certification. We check the BEDS frequently to ensure that we provide our teachers with the appropriate and timely support. 98.7% of our teachers are fully licensed and are permanently assigned to M.S. 61. Ninety two percent (92%) have obtained a Masters degree or higher. Additionally, we are recruiting graduates at specific Teacher Education Programs such as Medgar Evers College, Columbia University, and Brooklyn College.

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.

M.S.61 will continue to follow the America's Choice School Design (ACSD). We will continue to build capacity and strengthen our professional development program by examining "best practices" already in place and use those practice to scaffold our professional development program. There will be ongoing professional development for teachers, the administrative team and the paraprofessionals, in an effort to help all children meet the State's student academic standards. Professional development will be provided in-house, and will include classroom visits by the Literacy and Math coaches, as well as the administrative team. These interventions will be done during common preparation periods, before school and after school. Additional technical support will be provided by the Integrated Curriculum Instruction (ICI) staff.

5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

As part of our support to have 100% HQT, we provide Title I Set- Aside 5% funds for tuition reimbursement. We also encourage our teachers to become HQT through the HOUSSE online certification. We check the BEDS frequently to ensure that we provide our teachers with the appropriate and timely support. 98.7% of our teachers are fully licensed and are permanently assigned to M.S. 61. Ninety two percent (92%) have obtained a Masters degree or higher. Additionally, we are recruiting graduates at specific Teacher Education Programs such as Medgar Evers College, Columbia University, and Brooklyn College.

6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as workshops, forums, and family events.

The parent coordinator, the PA and PAC representatives will assist in coordinating activities to increase parental involvement. They include:

- Participation in School Leadership team and sub-committees.
- Establishing regularly scheduled workshops to apprise families of various educational strategies.
- Activities geared towards helping students meet the State standards as it pertains to their child's education.
- Guest speakers and parent conferences.
- ELA strategies: (Training on ARIS, book club etc.)
- Math strategies

- Review Attendance records to determine increase in parental involvement in school activities and conferences.
- Give incentives to foster increased parent attendance and participation at conferences, workshops and at the PA/PAC meetings.
- Increase interaction with teachers via phone, personal visits, letters, flyers and e-mail.
- Increase communication between families and school through social gatherings, Men and Women's Empowerment Forum, Family Night activities, conferences, forum events to engage families and increase communication between the home and school.

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.

N/A

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.

See pages 21-22

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.

Using the information gained from the periodic assessments, teachers will differentiate instruction according to the needs of the students. They will analyze the data and create a personal plan for individual students and groups of students. Periodic assessments, used in conjunction with regular formative assessments, will aid the teacher in helping students increase in proficiency.

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.

As a School Wide Program School, MS 61 will use funds to support student learning in all areas. Violence prevention, nutrition and housing programs will be supported with these funds.

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: Corrective Action Year 2 **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.

Students with disabilities did not make AYP in ELA, Math, and Science, as well as they did not qualify for Safe Harbor due to low attendance rate and performance.

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.

There will be ongoing Professional Development by Teacher’s College that is sustained, intensive, and content-focused. It will be a job–embedded professional development that supports teachers in the use of research-based instructional practices.

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.

The school will take the following actions to ensure that information related to the school and parent-programs, meetings, and other activities, is sent to the parents of participating children in an understandable and uniform format in other languages feasible, including alternative formats upon request, and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand. Parents will be notified on a regular basis about each event by mail, phone (auto-dial), e-mail, and by students. Flyers and notices will be sent out in other languages as feasible. Staff translators are also available at our school.

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 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

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.

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 team of ELA teachers and administrators have created a curriculum map that is aligned to the State standards. The model of the curriculum is based on the American Choice School Design with specific outcomes of what students know and should be able to do. The curriculum addresses skills to be mastered and the strategies to be utilized.

The materials are available, but not adequate to meet the needs of all learners.

M.S. 61 will conduct a needs assessment of the ELL program to determine the quality of the instruction that the students receive. A committee of teachers and administrators will be formed to assess the alignment of each grade's curriculum and instruction to the New York State Learning Standards for ESL.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The school provides for 360/180 minutes of ESL, and the bilingual program also follows NYS mandates. However, since many of the ELL's are located in diverse classrooms throughout the building, and many of them have attained Social English (BICS), many monolingual teachers of ELL's do not fully comprehend the needs of the ELL students nor NYS Standards of ELLs. This is especially true of the Intermediate and Advanced ELL students.

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.

There is a need for additional technological tools in the classroom. These include: computers, smart boards, ELMOs, LCD Projectors, and a variety of software.

Much of this problem can be eliminated through on-going in-and-out-of-house ELL training. The best and most consistent out-of-house training is the City-wide Q-TEL training. In particular, this training is vital for monolingual ELA/Math teachers for ELL's. In turn, in-house training must be ongoing and present consistent topics that definitely impact ELLs and their monolingual teachers.

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.

We compared the New York State Standards to the Impact Curriculum to determine if an alignment problem existed.

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?

In carefully perusing the Impact Math Curriculum we realized that a number of areas were not covered, and therefore required us to search for outside resources to bridge this gap.

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.

We addressed this issue by using other resources such as “Comprehensive Assessment Prep,” “Math Assessment Prep,” and Kaplan materials. Additional support will be provided by the I.C.I. Network.

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.

Professional Development has been ongoing in the use of differentiated instruction. Implementation is monitored through observations, walkthroughs, and classroom displays.

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?

Implementation of differentiation is evident in most classes where teachers assess and set goals based on students’ need.

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.

M.S. 61 continues to assess and maintain assessment binders from students and teachers. They will continue to differentiate their lessons through content, process, and product so all students can achieve success. We will continue to receive support from the ICI network.

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.

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.

We continually engage in assessing our educational program by classroom walkthroughs, visits by the math coach, and observations by the math assistant principal.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

We strive for consistency amongst teachers of math in using instructional strategies that are hands-on and highly motivational. Although utilization of these methods and strategies is high, we must ascertain that all staff is employing them. In addition, while there is a willingness among math faculty to incorporate technology into their classrooms, we have found that there is either a lack of available equipment, or they are in disrepair.

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.

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.

In order to improve our math instruction, the math coach will continue to co-teach and provide demonstration lessons where applicable. In addition, professional learning opportunities are available in the form of before school workshops, lunch and learns and outside support from the City and the ICI Network. WE have recently purchased new desktop computers for classroom use and provided training in “Geometrics Sketchpad” for out staff.

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.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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.

During the 2008-2009 academic school year, M.S. 61 provided funding for quality professional development. Several of the effective PD sessions that were attended included a five-day workshop teaching “writing” to ELL’s and the PD for Achieve 3000. In turn, the principal encouraged teachers to

attend the OELL PD's. Printed notifications from HATETAC and other organizations were also sent to teachers.

SEE APPENDIX 7 NO. 1A

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The school has provided ample information and resources to the staff. In reality, based on the diversity of the staff's professional and personal schedules, the most effective way of providing PD is "in-house." The school plans to provide PD during Professional Development Day in June.

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.

For the following year, it is recommended that the school seek more support from ICI to develop a stronger Professional Development program.

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.

SEE APPENDIX 2

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

MS 61 uses the LAB-R and the results of the NYSESLAT, and Acuity to assess students' progress. The school will continue to report to all teachers involved in instructing ELLs on a quarterly basis. The data will be disaggregated by proficiency level of ELL student, and students' time in the United States.

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.

Ongoing Professional Development will be provided to monitor students' progress and create plans to drive the instruction. Additional support will be sought from the DOE and the ICI.

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.

The school will examine the various types of professional development that are being provided and observe implementation of strategies into the classroom. General Ed and Special Ed teachers will also be surveyed to investigate their knowledge of the IEP's and accommodations for SWD's.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Ongoing Professional development is being provided for administrators, general Ed teachers and Sp. Ed teachers to fully implement the range and types of instructional approaches that will improve student performance. However, many General Ed and special ed teachers remain unfamiliar with the contents of the IEP's of their SWD's and are not familiar with their accommodations. In addition, they are not familiar with the behavioral support plans for these students.

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

After evaluating students through assessment scores, portfolios and observations, it was determined that there was a need for additional training and support. Ongoing professional development will be provided in-house through peer collaboration and professional home study. Additional support will be sought from the DOE as well as the ICI. The Inquiry Team also assesses data and provide additional training and support for teachers.

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.

Ongoing support and training is provided by the ICI to ensure quality IEPs are generated for all mandated students. IEPs for all students are monitored on a regular basis to ensure educational benefit for each student. IEPs do consistently specify accommodations and/or modifications for the classroom environment (including instruction) Page 3 of the IEP allows for academic management needs to be addressed and tailored to meet each student's academic needs and learning styles.

The use of grade specific performance indicators to determine each student's promotional criteria allows for alignment between the goals and objectives on the IEP and those content area skills which students are assessed on grade level state tests.

Although IEP goals may be modified to each student's instructional level, they are aligned with State standards and the content area which students are assessed on, on standardized tests, as well as in the classroom.

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?

For the most part, the constant gains in standardized test scores for students with IEPs, dispels the relevance of this finding in relation to educational benefit. The school's educational program ensures continued alignment of IEP goals and objectives to State standards, however, the majority of Level 1 students are students with IEPs.

This finding is supported by the fact that Page 11 of the IEP allows for behavior intervention plans to be developed, however not every student with behavioral issues has a Page 11 attached to the IEP. Page 11 of the IEP includes goals and objectives designed to address specific behaviors for individual students in need of intervention strategies to modify inappropriate behaviors.

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.

Ongoing professional development and training by the ICI and DOE has been and will continued to be offered to teachers and related service providers to ensure that students' IEPs will contain a behavior intervention plan, if deemed necessary. In addition, teachers will be able to use functional behavior assessments to develop behavior intervention plans for these students.

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.)

There are currently twenty-one (21) students on register who are in temporary housing at Middle School 61.

2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.

Funds will be available to support these families in various ways, such as; purchasing gym uniforms, school supplies, agenda books, and school uniforms when needed. In addition, we will provide financial opportunities for these students to attend educational field trips and participate in school activities. We are very mindful of the confidentiality of these families.

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).
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.