



**PS 154
MUSEUM ALLIANCE FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

**2009-2010
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 15K154
ADDRESS: 1625 11TH AVENUE, BROOKLYN NY 11215
TELEPHONE: 718-768-0057
FAX: 718-832-2573**

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..... 6

Part A. Narrative Description 6

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability SnapshotError! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT 10

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS 11

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN 12

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010..... 15

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

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs).....Error! Bookmark not defined.

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 (SURRE)..... 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..... 2528

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: 154 **SCHOOL NAME:** Museum Alliance for Science and Technology

DISTRICT: 15 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** ESO Network 22

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 1625 11th Avenue

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-768-0057 **FAX:** 718-832-2573

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Samuel Ortiz **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Sortiz5@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON

Samuel Ortiz

PRINCIPAL

Sandra Callahan

UFT CHAPTER LEADER

Deborah Caputo

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT**

Neal Opromalla

NETWORK LEADER

Anita Skop

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT**

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
Samuel Ortiz	*Principal or Designee	
Sandra Callahan	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Deborah Capone	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
Anne McBrearty	Member/	
Melinda Fought	Member/	
Stefanie Concannon	Member/	
Laura Varriale	Member/	
Rosemary Graham	Member/	
Suzie Treinen	Member/	
Dierdre Corcoran	Member/	
Eva Lewendowski	Member/	
Annette Taconelli	Member/	
Kira Smith		

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

PS 154, Museum Alliance for Science and Technology, is a small Pre-K to 5 school in the Windsor Terrace section of Brooklyn. The building is a landmark in the community having been erected in 1909. The school houses 450 students with ethnic backgrounds including; White, Black, Latino, and Asian. As the Windsor Terrace community has grown in recent years, so has the school. To accommodate the growing numbers of students, PS 154 has added classes in Kindergarten and first grade as well as Kindergarten and first grade collaborative team teaching classes. PS 154 emphasizes community. We have monthly and annual community building events like Parents as Enrichment Partners, the Spring Carnival and Ice Skating in Wollman Rink.

PS 154 is a high performing school. About 90% of students are performing at or above grade-level standards on standardized exams in literacy and math. The analysis of this data has shifted our school-wide focus to enrichment. With teachers and administration working in partnership with parents and local politicians, PS 154 strives to enrich the lives and learning of our students through various arts programs, a science rich curriculum and the infusion of technology into our daily learning experiences. Relationships with the Brooklyn Conservatory of Music, the Brooklyn Museum, the American Museum of Natural History and programs like Family Science Night and "Meet the Author" help us to achieve our enrichment goals.

PS 154 has had many great accomplishments over the last couple of years. Some of our accomplishments include:

- Awarded \$760,000 grant from local politicians to build environmentally-friendly school playground
- We are the first New York City public school to abandon the use of Styrofoam lunch trays making the switch to a biodegradable lunch tray made from sugarcane
- Standardized test scores have risen each year from 60% at levels 3 & 4 in ELA and 58.4% in Math in 2003 to 86% and 93.3% respectively in 2009
- Received an A on the New York City Progress Report for the 2008-2009 school year

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT									
School Name:		Magnet School for Science & Technology							
District:		15	DBN:	15K154	School BEDS Code:		331500010154		
DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served:	Pre-K	√	3	√	7		11		
	K	√	4	√	8		12		
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded		
	2	√	6		10				
Enrollment					Attendance - % of days students attended:				
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09		
Pre-K	54	54	56		94.4	94.7	TBD		
Kinderqarten	60	74	87	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:					
Grade 1	57	59	74	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 2	61	46	57		96.5	97.0	TBD		
Grade 3	57	51	63	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:					
Grade 4	75	51	63	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 5	41	74	52		34.1	34.5	29.2		
Grade 6	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:					
Grade 7	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 8	0	0	0		0	0	TBD		
Grade 9	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 11	0	0	0		2	1	2		
Grade 12	0	0	0	Special Education Enrollment:					
Ungraded	0	3	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Total	405	422	438						
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	20	11	8	Principal Suspensions	0	0	TBD		
# In Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	7	14	Superintendent Suspensions	5	0	TBD		
Number all others	38	43	39	Special High School Programs - Total Number:					
These students are included in the enrollment information above.				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0		
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0		
# In Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:					
# In Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
# receiving ESL services only	21	21	24	Number of Teachers	28	34	33		

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	1	5	1	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	3	6	7
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	3	3
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	67.9	64.7	72.7
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	57.1	67.6	57.6
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		93.0	94.0	88.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.7	1.7	1.6	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)			
Black or African American	12.1	11.8	11.2		87.8	95.6	97.4
Hispanic or Latino	28.6	25.6	25.8				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	4.9	5.2	6.8				
White	52.6	55.7	53.0				
Male	48.6	48.1	47.3				
Female	51.4	51.9	52.7				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)		If yes, area(s) of SURR Identification:					
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10) Based on 2008-09 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year						

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:	IGS			ELA:			
Math:	IGS			Math:			
Science:	IGS			Graduation Rate:			
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
Student Groups		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate
All Students		√	√	√			
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native		-	-	-			
Black or African American		-	-	-			
Hispanic or Latino		√	√	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		-	-	-			
White		√	√	-			
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities		√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient		-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged		√	√	-			
Student groups making AYP in each subject		5	5	1	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			Quality Statement Scores:			
Category Scores:				Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	TBD		
School Environment:	TBD			Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	TBD		
<i>(Comprises 16% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	TBD		
School Performance:	TBD			Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	TBD		
<i>(Comprises 26% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	TBD		
Student Progress:	TBD						
<i>(Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)</i>							
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			
				0 = 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

Student Performance Trends

- The percentage of students performing at or above grade level in English language arts in grades 3, 4, and 5 rose from 78.9 to 86.
- The percentage of students performing at or above grade level in math in grades 3, 4, and 5 rose from 88.2 to 93.3.
- The percentage of students making a year's progress in English language arts in grades 3, 4, and 5 rose from 57.4 to 65.1.
- The percentage of students making a year's progress in math in grades 3, 4, and 5 rose from 75.7 to 78.3.
- The percentage of students performing at or above grade level in Social Studies on the NYS Social Studies exam in grade 5 rose from 78% in 2007 to 81% in 2008.
- The percentage of students performing at or above grade level in science on the NYS Science exam in grade 4 rose from 78% in 2008 to 89% in 2009.

Greatest Accomplishments

- Continuous rise in students performing at or above grade level in English language arts and math from 2003 to 2008
- Raising our progress report score from a D in 2006 – 2007 to a B in 2007 – 2008 and now to an A in 2008 - 2009.
- Making exemplary proficiency gains with our special education students and Hispanic students

Aides to Continuous School Improvement

- Relationships with community based organizations to support science and social studies curriculums
- Support from local and state politicians to bolster technology use
- Small class size in the lower grades
- Strong partnership with parents to support enrichment goals
- Supportive and collaborative staff members

Barriers to Continuous School Improvement

- Small building with a growing population of students.
 - As the community has grown, the school has opened new classes to accommodate these students. However, the school has closed its library and a Pre-K classroom to accommodate more lower grades classes and will be forced to eliminate other programs (Pre – k class, science lab, or computer lab) as we continue to grow.
- Part-time Support Staff
 - The school is funded for part-time support staff. Our guidance counselor, school psychologist, social worker, and ESL teacher are all part-time
- No gymnasium

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.

- **To enrich the social studies curriculum with a focus on inquiry-based learning as measured by the creation of one inquiry based social studies unit in grades K through 5 by June 2010.**
- **To promote a positive school atmosphere through use of the Caring School Community Program as measured by an increase in the Safety and Respect section of the 2009 – 2010 Learning Environment Survey.**
- **Staff will participate in literacy professional development opportunities throughout the school year and demonstrate their learning through their delivery of instruction by June 2010**

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Subject/Area (where relevant): Social Studies

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enrich the social studies curriculum with a focus on inquiry-based learning as measured by the creation of one inquiry based social studies unit in grades K through 5 by June 2010.
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers in grades K to 5 will engage in grade-level planning to map curriculum in social studies • Teachers in grades K - 2 will attend professional development with Social Studies consultant. • Teachers in grades K - 5 will meet in grade level teams to plan curriculum in social studies • A parent volunteer will be identified to schedule trips for each grade. Field trips will be aligned to social studies units. • Grades 3, 4, & 5 will partner with the Brooklyn Museum to enrich their social studies curriculum
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common preparation periods for teacher planning • \$14,000 for professional development with S.S. staff developer • \$3,500 for upper grades partnership with Brooklyn Museum
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal and informal observations by school administration

Subject/Area (where relevant): Caring School Community

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote a positive school atmosphere through use of the Caring School Community Program as measured by an increase in the Safety and Respect section of the 2009 – 2010 Learning Environment Survey.
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers in grades Kindergarten to 5 will engage in professional development around the implementation of the Caring School Community program • Pairing of classes for Cross Age Buddies component • Creation of a schedule for cross age buddies component • Parent workshop at fall PTA meeting
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade level common planning with teachers, once a month • Common planning time for teacher partners in cross age buddies program • State grant of \$7,000 to fund Book of the month program centered around community building themes
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal and informal observations by school administration • Learning Environment Survey

Subject/Area (where relevant): Professional Development

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By June 2010, grades K through 5 will participate in 12 literacy professional development sessions and demonstrate their learning through their delivery of instruction
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers College staff developer will lead professional development in planning and delivering reading and writing units • Teachers in grades K - 5 will meet in grade level teams to plan curriculum in literacy • Teachers will attend professional development sessions at Teachers College to support the units of study
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately \$34,000 for professional development from Teachers College • Schedule will be adjusted for common planning time across each grade
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations by school administration in January and March to monitor progress • Collection of teacher lesson plans • Student work related to workshop content

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

APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING – REQUIREMENT FOR ALL SCHOOLS

Appendix 1

ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS)- FOR ALL SCHOOLS

Appendix 1- Part A: Summary Form

Directions- On the chart below, indicate the total number of students receiving Academic Intervention Services in each area listed, for each applicable group. In Part 11 of this appendix, provide a brief description of each AIS program or strategy implemented in your school. 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. Note: Refer to Regional District Comprehensive Educational Plan (RDCEP) for a description of region\district procedures for providing AIS.

Identified Students	ELA Number of Students	Mathematics Number of Students	Science Number of Students	Social Studies Number of Students	At risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor	At Risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist	At Risk Services Provided by the Social Worker	At Risk Health Related Services
Group A K-3	52	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Group B 4-6	19	8	8	10	0	0	0	0
Group C 7-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Group D 9-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The following key describes identified groups of students, who have been targeted for AIS, and the established criteria of identification:

Group A: Early Childhood students (K-3) who are at risk for not meeting State standards as determined by their performance on identified assessments.

Group B, C and D: Students in the grades shown who are performing in Level 1 or 2.

Appendix 1- Part B: AIS Program Descriptions

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, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one to one, peer tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (e.g., during the school day, before or after school, Saturdays, etc.).
ELA: Guided Reading	Guided Reading is provided to small groups during the school day- no more than 5 students in a group for 20 minutes 3x per week.
Mathematics	Small math groups are ongoing in classroom
Science	Small group instruction
Social Studies	Small group instruction
At Risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	Guidance is provided to small groups 1x per week for 30 minutes
At Risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	
At Risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	

APPENDIX 1- PART B: AIS PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

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 of delivery of service (e.g. small group, one to one, peer tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (e.g. during the
--	--

	school day, before or after school, Saturdays, etc.).
AIS 37 1\2 Minutes – Small group work	Small group work before the school day for 37 1\2 minutes. Teachers are using various materials to support their children who are in need of intervention (Reader’s Theater, Guided Reading, Reading Games, Math Games, etc)
Guided Reading- Small group work where the children have a copy of the same book and strategies are taught to improve their reading skills.	Small Groups, during the school day for 20 minutes 3x per week
At Risk Speech- Small group work with students who have articulation, etc.	

Language Allocation Policy 2009 – 2010

The Language Allocation Policy Team Composition is as follows for PS 154:

Samuel Ortiz – Principal, Eric Havlik, Assistant Principal, Elana Rabinowitz - ESL Coordinator and Instructor, Kristin O'Rourke - Guidance Counselor, Diana Plunkett - Parent Coordinator, Irene Vazquez - Academic Intervention Specialist with Bilingual license.

PS 154 has one permanently certified ESL teacher who services all the English Language Learners in the school. In addition, there is one AIS teacher who possesses a Bilingual license.

PS 154 is located in the Windsor Terrace section of Brooklyn, New York. At present the school serves approximately 446 students, 6.7% are ELLs. The school's ethnic population is as follows: 55.63% White, 23.67% Hispanic, 7.35% Black, .91% American Indian and 7.12% Asian/Other. In compliance with the wishes of parents as expressed in the parent survey, PS 154 has a freestanding ESL (English as a Second Language) program for grades K-5. In the 2009-2010 school year PS 154 identified 30 ELLs (English Language Learners): 25 native Spanish speakers, 2, 3 Russian speakers, 1 Arabic speaker and 1 Serbo-Croatian speaker. Some of these ELLs include special education students from a 12-1-1 class as well as CTT classes. Based on the results of the 2009 NYSESLAT the school has 7 students at the Beginning level, 8 at intermediate and 7 as advanced. The ELL population at PS 154 performs lowest in the reading and writing strand of the NYSESLAT.

For the 2009-2010 school year, the numbers of students who receive ESL services by grade are as follows:

Grade	Number of Students
K	8
1	8
2	4
3	3
4	1
5	6

The parents of ESL students at P.S. 154 chose for their children to be enrolled in a Freestanding ESL program rather than a bilingual or dual language program based on the information obtained from the Home Language Survey. The choice for ESL instruction has been consistent across grades and within various language backgrounds.

The process for the identification of ELL students is as follows:

Once a child is admitted to the NYC school system, the parents are then involved in the decision-making process of the children. First, parents are given a Home Language Survey (HLIS) to identify the child's language proficiently. This survey is given in the language the parent or guardian is most proficient in by a licensed pedagogue. Translators are available to assist parent's who may need assistance in filling out the questions. A licensed pedagogue then conducts an informal interview (with the help of a translator if need be) to determine if a formal assessment is necessary. If the child is identified as being dominant in a language other than English, the child is given the Language Battery Assessment (LAB-R) within 10 days of enrollment by a pedagogue to determine if the child should receive ESL or Bilingual services. In addition, if a child is deemed eligible for ESL services, they are evaluated annually using the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) to determine their level of proficiency. The child takes the NYSESLAT exam until they are proficient in the English Language.

To assist the parents in making the most informed choice, an orientation is given by the ESL teacher in conjunction with the Parent Coordinator. This orientation describes the various programs available in New York City. These programs include: Free standing ESL, Dual Language and Bi-lingual. Parents are able to view a parent information video, where the various programs are presented in their native language. Translators are also available to answer parent's questions. Parent brochures are given out in a myriad of languages to assist in understanding of each available program. Parents then complete the parent selection form and parent survey and the school assists in finding the appropriate programs. If a parent is unable to attend the orientation a private meeting is set up with the ESL teacher to discuss the options available. These orientations are given twice a year.

The parents of ESL students at P.S. 154 chose for their children to be enrolled in an ESL program rather than a bilingual or dual language program based on the information obtained from the Home Language Survey. The choice for ESL instruction has been consistent across grades. If a parent prefers for their child to be enrolled in a bilingual or dual language program, information on these schools is presented as well.

During the 2009-2010 school year, the ESL teacher at P.S. 154 services 30 ELL students. The students are grouped by their level of English language proficiency and grade level, and are serviced by a combination of pull-out/push-in methods. This ESL program provides students with an ESL instruction, in addition to 120 minutes of literacy instruction in their mainstream classrooms. The ESL classes did not interfere with the ELA instruction already taking place in the mainstream classroom, but instead supplemented and scaffold the materials already being covered by the mainstream classroom teachers.

PS 154 uses a Free-standing English as a Second Language Program. The main goal of this program is to assist the students in achieving English Language proficiency within three years. The ESL classes are grouped primarily by English language proficiency level (i.e. beginner, intermediate, advanced), as determined by students' scores on the LABR\NYSESLAT exams. The students' grades, learning styles, and needs are also taken into consideration when forming groups. Group times are based on mandated hours.

The ESL curriculum, which is administered through a push-in and pull-out program, is based on the Teachers College curriculum; that is, ESL instruction corresponds with units of study. For students in the beginning stages of language acquisition, the focus of instruction is on

acquiring basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS). The emphasis of instruction is on language input, using strategies to help make input meaningful to students, and tapping prior knowledge to help students connect new language to familiar topics. The ESL teacher also uses the Balanced Literacy model of instruction by engaging student activities, such as guided reading, read aloud, and shared writing. Real objects, props, visuals and facial expressions or gestures are used to provide contextual support, helping to make messages in English more comprehensible. In addition, poems, chants and songs are used to involve students with language in a low-risk environment. These scaffolds give students ample opportunity to hear and internalize vocabulary, language patterns and structures.

The instructional materials used to support the learning of ELLs vary depending on grade and level. With more advanced ELLs; we mostly use the same classroom materials as the mainstream class. The ESL room contains additional instructional materials, including a large leveled library. Beginning ELLs use lower level books and the Leapfrog Learning Program for vocabulary development. Beginners also participate in games and small group activities that help with such skills as initial and ending sounds, rhyming words, and other phonics skills.

The Balanced Literacy Workshop Model is used as a guide in ESL instruction, in addition to other content instruction throughout the school. The program is modified to serve the needs of specific ELL students based on their LAB-R results and other assessments. The following is a summary of the methods used in ESL instruction:

- We provide large quantities of comprehensible input: visual aids, concrete objects, contextual clues, and gestures
- We emphasize communication skills wherein the new language is used in meaningful context
- We incorporate engaging and relevant topics to encourage communication
- We communicate using gestures, graphics, and pantomime when appropriate
- We use Total Physical Response (TPR) wherein the child acts out the language being acquired
- We use technology such as computers and audio-visual equipment to aid in instruction
- We integrate ESL methodologies within content area themes as well as ELA

The ESL teacher works in conjunction with the mainstream classes to ensure that teacher's differentiate instruction based on a child's level of proficiency. In addition, the use of a Bi-lingual Intervention Specialist assists specific students to use the child's native language to improve math and literacy skills. This same teacher works to assist ELLs with special needs as well as long term ELLs in giving them extra help and assessments.

When newcomers arrive they are immediately receive an informal orientation. They have access to a special listening center with user friendly materials as well as are given "language buddies" to help them in their initial stages of language development. There are currently no students who are termed SIFE at PS 154.

Long terms ELLs are a large number of ELLs in the upper grades. An analysis of their scores on the NYSESLAT, ELA and Math assessments suggests that their problem is one of reading and writing. Our action plan for this group involves:

- A morning AIS program, targeting literacy and math four days during the week
- Monitoring the progress of students in all content areas to differentiate instruction for literacy needs
- ELL students who reach proficiency in English continue to receive testing accommodations for two additional transitional years. They are also provided with bilingual dictionaries and glossaries for assistance on exams

We have three classes of special needs ELLs in our ESL program. Our policy for special needs students includes:

Ensure that teachers of students with an IEP are familiar with students' particular needs and all services are provided accordingly to the IEP mandates.

Collaboration between the ESL teacher and IEP contact person.

Monitoring newcomer and SIFE student for possible special needs status.

The goal of the ESL program at P.S. 154 is to scaffold mainstream instruction to aid in the English language development of ELLs. We focus on improving the accessibility of content through graphic organizers, visuals, hands-on activities, and the development of general and academic language. We believe that a combination of push-in/pull-out, designed to meet the English proficiency, grade level, and individualized needs of students, allows for a more cohesive learning process in which mainstream classroom content creates the base of all additional ESL instruction and students can miss as little as possible of their mainstream coursework.

In addition to the mandated hours already specified for our ELLs via the ELL push-in pull-out program, PS 154 also provides intervention services to all ELLs. We have a designated IEP teacher and reading specialist that work individually with ELL students that require additional assistance.

Our transitional ELLS also continue to receive testing accommodations that include extended time and separate location on statewide exams.

All classroom teachers have laptops and smart boards that provide additional visual and technological support to our ELLs.

PS 154 recognizes that ELLs require specialized materials. The ESL teacher uses books that are rich in content to promote language and conceptual development, and they are made accessible through the pictures or the print so that students at all levels can benefit. The ESL teacher uses large visuals, graphic organizers, and other materials essential to making content comprehensible. To ensure the effectiveness of ESL instructional delivery, the ESL teacher administers periodic assessments in which the students' products are compared with the standards. This information is also shared with the classroom teachers in an effort to create a support team for effectively meeting the needs of ELLs.

The instructional materials used to support the learning of ELLs vary depending on grade and level. With the more advanced ELLs, we mostly use the same classroom materials as the mainstream classes and supplement with graphic organizers and varied literature. Beginning

ELLs use lower level books and various programs to increase language development. Numerous language games, visuals, music and computer programs are used to focus on beginning and ending sounds, rhyming words and basic phonic skills.

Bi-lingual teachers, parent volunteers, parent coordinator and translation services are used to assist in providing native language support. Grade/age appropriate Bi-Lingual dictionaries, computer programs and dual language books are available for all students. Additional materials are provided in student's home languages when deemed necessary.

PS 154 currently does not offer any Dual Language Programs

The staff at PS 154 engages in ongoing professional development to improve their instructional strategies and align instruction with NYS learning standards. All mainstream classroom teachers attend ongoing professional development provided by Teachers College that emphasizes differentiated instruction and targeted strategy lessons within the literacy curriculum. This professional development includes in-school mentoring and strategic planning with a trained instructor, in addition to out of school seminars related to the literacy curriculum. Teachers at PS 154 also participate in ongoing professional development through AUSSIE, which includes mentoring on the Everyday Mathematics curriculum and specifically focuses on differentiated instruction for students at different math levels. Teachers of testing grades at PS 154 also engage in long-term professional development related to NYS testing standards. This professional development includes in-school meetings and strategic planning as well as inter-school seminars on test preparation techniques.

The ESL instructor at PS 154 also participates in ongoing professional development related specifically to ESL instruction and NYS learning standards for ELLs. Throughout the 2009-2010 school year she will participate in meetings and seminars offered by PS 154's Empowerment School Network, the topics of which include State requirements for identifying and placing ELLs, effective instruction through the push-in and pull-out ESL models, ELLs preparation for State testing on the NYSESLAT and content-area exams, and effective instructional strategies within the Balanced Literacy workshop model. The dates and times of these meetings are TBA, but they will take place on a regular basis throughout the school year. The ESL instructor will take part in all school-level professional development concerning content-area curriculum, test preparation, and Enrichment activities so that she can align her planning with the instruction-taking place in mainstream classrooms at PS 154.

Students at P.S. 154 are offered academic intervention, resource room, speech, guidance counseling, psychological services, occupational therapy, and nurse care as additional support services, and all services are available to ELLs as well as native English-speaking students.

PS 154 has an involved parent community. Each year in addition to the required orientations, we invite the parents of all the ELL parents to discuss the specific needs of their children as well as offer advice to newcomer parents.

Our parent coordinator often checks in with the parents in the community and assists them in meetings, obtaining translations for important school documents as well as serving as a liaison within groups in the community.

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

- Family Celebrations: Throughout the year, parents come to the school to take part in community celebrations, including holiday luncheons, international festivals and cultural days. At these events, the school and community can come together to recognize student achievements in arts and academics.
- After school – PS 154 offers after school programs that are available to ELL students. These programs are offered daily to augment and compliment the daily school curriculum. A special focus is given to the arts music and language, and in classes that will provide physical activity. In addition, we have introduced a homework help program, which specifically addresses the need of ELL students.

Curriculum Orientation Night is one of the most important events offered to all PS 154 parents at the beginning of the school year. During this event, the staff explains to parents/caregivers the instructional programs that will be covered during the course of the year for each grade level, and they offer advice on students' homework and other academic expectations for the school year. Parents of ELLs attend this Curriculum Orientation Night along with parents of native English-speaking students. In addition to Curriculum Orientation, parents of ELLs at PS 154 are also offered an ESL Parent Orientation meeting at the beginning of each school year. During this orientation the ESL instructor shows an informational video provided by the NYC Dept. of Education, informs parents/caregivers of their program options, describes the ESL curriculum at PS 154, and addresses any questions/and or concerns.

In addition to parent orientations, PS 154 also offers a number of events throughout the year to involve parents/caregivers in their children's education, and all parents are encouraged to attend. In order to involve parents of ELLs in the school community, many parent events and services are designed specifically to address issues related to ELLs. All parent events are organized principally by the parent coordinator, in collaboration with the ESL instructor and mainstream classroom teachers. A translator is available at any of these events when necessary to assist parents who do not understand English. The following is a list of the events and services offered to parents at PS 154 during the 2009-2010 school year:

Family Fridays (parents read with students every Friday morning)
Emergency medical care workshop
Writing process workshop
Workshops on state testing and promotional policy
Asthma awareness workshops
Winter and Spring Carnivals
Movie nights
Family skating
Student chess tournaments

Everyday Math training (workshop for parents on math curriculum)
School bulletin
Parent handbook (available in Spanish)
Weekly school-wide newsletter
Monthly newsletter by grade level
Curriculum explanations for ESL parents

PS 154 uses a variety of assessment tools to gather information regarding the needs of its students, including ELLs. The primary assessment tools are: DRA2, Fountas & Pinnell, TCRWP, and E-PAL. Once a year, the NYSESLAT exam is administered to assess the progress of the ELL population.

The NYSESLAT data shows that many ELLs are making incremental gains and moving to the next proficiency level to become language proficient. ELLs who are in the beginning level are mostly newcomers or in the early grades (K-1). After careful review of the NYSESLAT data, the patterns revealed were:

- 70% of students are advanced or Proficient in Speaking and Listening
- Students generally score higher in Speaking and Listening than in reading and writing
- Students who are former ELLs are on grade level and in many cases outperforming non-ells
- Long-term ELLs are making minimal progress on the NYSESLAT

The implications for instructional decisions based on the assessment data are as follows:

- Continue to strongly target language development across the grades and content areas, creating opportunities for active meaningful engagement
- Additional support for Newcomers, using technology and language buddies
- Provide additional support to long term ELLs through an after school academic intervention program
- Small group Academic Intervention classes in ESL to target language modalities according to their needs
- Differentiated instruction in the classrooms to work with the varied learning styles and needs of ELLs

The ESL program at PS 154 relies on data provided by the LAB-R, NYSESLAT, and New York State ELA and math exams to provide additional support to students identified as limited English language proficient, as well as students who require transitional academic intervention services after passing the NYSESLAT. At PS 154 there are currently 21 students who receive direct ESL services and 6 students who receive supplemental academic intervention for a transitional period after recent passage of the NYSESLAT exam.

Based on the data collected from the NYSESLAT exam, the majority of students (excluding long term ELLs) have increased at least one level of proficiency each year. This progress demonstrates that the freestanding ESL program is benefiting the needs of our ELLs.

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

1. Describe the data and methodologies used to assess your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs to ensure that all parents are provided with appropriate and timely information in a language they can understand.
 - Home language survey used to compile list of all families who's home language is other than English
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.
 - Spanish – 23 families
 - Bengali – 2 families
 - Chinese – 1 family

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.
 - Letters home are translated to Spanish by teacher, Irene Vasquez (In house)
2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Indicate whether oral interpretation services will be provided by an outside contractor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.
 - Oral translation in Spanish is done by our family worker, IEP teacher, and paraprofessionals on a needs basis
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>.
 - Parental notification of non English speaking parents is done through school personnel as mentioned above. The Principal's communications regarding rules, regulations as well as school information is done via translated memorandum. Our family workers who are on the school premises are available during the day for the Spanish speaking families. We also access the translation

unit's services for oral translation over the phone for languages other than Spanish. In this manner we are able to communicate to our non-English parents and students.

**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, these findings are not an end in themselves but will facilitate important conversations at (and between) the central, SSO, and school levels in order to identify and address potential gaps in ELA and math curriculum and instructional programs and ensure alignment with the state standards and assessments.

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

listening and speaking are addressed 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 also will also impact vertical and horizontal alignment within and between schools by creating gaps in the Grades K–12 curriculum. *Vertical alignment* is defined as the literacy knowledge addressed at a grade level that builds upon and extends learning from the previous grade level, whereas *horizontal alignment* refers to agreement between what is taught by teachers addressing a common subject across a single grade level.

ELA Alignment Issues:

- **Gaps in the Written Curriculum.** Data show that the written curriculum in use by many schools is not aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required. All reviewed curricula had gaps relative to the New York State ELA standards. The fewest gaps were found at Grade 2, but the gaps increased as the grade levels increased. Interviewed staff in a number of the schools that were audited reported less consistent and effective curriculum and instruction at the secondary level. These data further indicated that curricula were not adequately articulated—less articulated in secondary than elementary schools.
- **Curriculum Maps.** The curriculum alignment analyses noted that although a number of curriculum maps had been developed, the mapping has been done at a topical level only and does not drill down to an expected level of cognitive demand that will indicate to teachers what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. These curriculum maps addressed only content topics—not skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, or student outcomes to be attained.
- **Taught Curriculum.** The *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* (SEC)¹ data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to

¹ To examine whether instruction was aligned to the New York state standards and assessments, teachers in the district completed the *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* (SEC). Based on two decades of research funded by the National Science Foundation, the SEC are designed to facilitate the comparison of enacted (taught) curriculum to standards (intended) and assessed curriculum (state tests), using teachers' self-assessments. The data for each teacher consist of more than 500 responses. The disciplinary topic by cognitive-level matrix is presented in graphic form, which creates a common language for comparison and a common metric to maintain comparison objectivity.

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

– **English Language Learners**

Multiple data sources indicate that there is a great deal of variation in the curriculum and instruction that ELL students receive, by grade level, by type of ELL program or general education program, and by district. For example, some of the best instruction observed by site visitors was found in ELL program classrooms at the elementary level, which contrasted sharply with the generally lower quality of ELL program instruction at the secondary level. The auditors found that planning for ELL education at the city and even district levels did not percolate down to the school and teacher levels. Consequently, planning for ELL education in the audited schools generally occurred at the level of individual teachers or ELL program staff, contributing to the variations in curriculum and instruction observed across ELL and general education programs. Further, there is a general lack of awareness of the New York State Learning Standards for ESL.

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

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

Please note that PS 154 did not participate in the audit which led to Appendix 7.

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 154 uses a standards-based Balanced/Comprehensive Literacy program of study for all students including those for whom English is not their first language and for students who have special learning needs. Balanced Literacy stresses the essential dimensions of reading through explicit teaching of phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and expressiveness, vocabulary, and comprehension. Daily read-alouds, independent reading time, reading workshop, writing workshop, and systematic word study instruction are key features of the approach. Teachers demonstrate the habits and strategies of effective reading and writing through a variety of structures: read-aloud, guided reading, shared reading, interactive writing, and mini-lessons in reading and writing. By coaching students in individual or small-group conferences, teachers allow students to successfully and independently apply those strategies to their own reading and writing.

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

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

- Standardized test scores have risen each year from 60% at levels 3 & 4 in English language arts in 2003 to 78.9% in 2008

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

NA

1B. Mathematics

Background

New York State assessments measure conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem solving. In the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, these are represented as *process strands* and *content strands*. These strands help to define what students should know and be able to do as a result of their engagement in the study of mathematics. The critical nature of the process strands in the teaching and learning of mathematics has been identified in the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, revised

by NYS Board of Regents on March 15, 2005: The process strands (Problem Solving, Reasoning and Proof, Communication, Connections, and Representation) highlight ways of acquiring and using content knowledge. These process strands help to give meaning to mathematics and help students to see mathematics as a discipline rather than a set of isolated skills. Student engagement in mathematical content is accomplished through these process strands. Students will gain a better understanding of mathematics and have longer retention of mathematical knowledge as they solve problems, reason mathematically, prove mathematical relationships, participate in mathematical discourse, make mathematical connections, and model and represent mathematical ideas in a variety of ways. (University of the State of New York & New York State Education Department, 2005, p. 2) When curriculum guides lack precise reference to the indicators for the process strands, then explicit alignment of the curriculum to the process strands is left to the interpretation of the individual classroom teacher.

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

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

PS 154 is an elementary school. The findings speak to gaps in middle school curriculum and, therefore, do not apply to our school.

- *The SEC data for mathematics curriculum alignment (similar to Key Finding 1A for ELA), shows that there is a lack of depth in what is being taught in the mathematics classroom as compared to what is required by the state standards.*

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 154 uses *Everyday Mathematics*, which is a research-based curriculum developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project. UCSMP was founded in 1983 during a time of growing consensus that our nation was failing to provide its students with an adequate mathematical education. The goal of this on-going project is to significantly improve the mathematics curriculum and instruction for all school children in the U.S.

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

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

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

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

Furthermore, our most recent test results show growth:

- Standardized test scores have risen each year from 58.4% at levels 3 & 4 in Math in 2003 to 88.2% in 2008

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

NA

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

time in Grades K–8, but this percentage shrank to 49 percent at the high school level. Finally, independent seatwork (students working on self-paced worksheets or individual assignments) was observed frequently or extensively in approximately 32 percent of the K–8 ELA classrooms visited and just over 34 percent of classrooms in high school.

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

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

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

Informal observation will be used to assess student engagement.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

As stated, PS 154 employs a workshop model of instruction for English Language Arts instruction. The architecture of the mini lesson component of both the Reader’s and Writer’s Workshops includes:

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

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

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

Student Engagement Checklist 2008/2009
School-wide Informal Observations

Category	Observation	Comments
<p>Whole Class Instruction: Rug Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All students are attentive and looking at teacher(s) -Students sit on rug in purposeful ways depending on task -Various students participate when questions are posed - not the same hands all the time -Student responses to queries are positively validated 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p>Independent Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All students are working productively on assigned task -Students know what to do when "they are done" -Students seek the assistance of a teacher or a peer when they are confused or need direction -Students use environmental print for self-direction 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p>Transitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Are quick and smooth -Require little direction -Students go from point A to point B without interruption -Students are prepared with required materials 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p>Organization of the Day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Morning meeting sets the tone for the day: children are part of an interactive conversation concerning the flow of the day -Children know what they will be learning / what is being taught -Children know what is expected of them at all times -Children know why they are part of a small group experience 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	

<p>Student Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are held to a high standard: good is not good enough -Students know what work that is good enough looks like -Students are given opportunities to improve their work -Students know the behavioral expectations in the room and act appropriately 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p>Metacognition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are given opportunities to share their thinking -Students are held accountable for their learning - they are asked to articulate or write what they know and understand -Incorrect answers are not validated or simply ignored - being "right" is important and misunderstandings are discussed 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p>Self Esteem - Building Toward Intrinsic Motivation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Children are self-directed and self-motivated -Children who need to be "pushed" are pushed in subtle, nurturing ways -Children do not sit next to peers who disrupt or interrupt learning (including friends) -Children feel good about their learning and are excited to share new experiences -Children who need behavioral plans have them and these are used in consistent ways -There is never a "why should I?" attitude - children perform because they understand that learning is important 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

This finding is not relevant to PS 1 for the following reasons:

PS 154 employs a workshop model of instruction for Mathematics instruction. The architecture of the mini lesson component of the Math Workshop includes:

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

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

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

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

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

Student Engagement Checklist 2008/2009
School-wide Informal Observations

Category	Observation	Comments
<p style="text-align: center;">Whole Class Instruction: Rug Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All students are attentive and looking at teacher(s) -Students sit on rug in purposeful ways depending on task -Various students participate when questions are posed - not the same hands all the time -Student responses to queries are positively validated 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Independent Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All students are working productively on assigned task -Students know what to do when “they are done” -Students seek the assistance of a teacher or a peer when they are confused or need direction -Students use environmental print for self-direction 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Transitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Are quick and smooth -Require little direction -Students go from point A to point B without 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p>	

interruption -Students are prepared with required materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Not really	
Organization of the Day -Morning meeting sets the tone for the day: children are part of an interactive conversation concerning the flow of the day -Children know what they will be learning / what is being taught -Children know what is expected of them at all times -Children know why they are part of a small group experience	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes to all <input type="checkbox"/> Yes to some <input type="checkbox"/> Not really	
Student Accountability -Students are held to a high standard: good is not good enough -Students know what work that is good enough looks like -Students are given opportunities to improve their work -Students know the behavioral expectations in the room and act appropriately	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes to all <input type="checkbox"/> Yes to some <input type="checkbox"/> Not really	
Metacognition -Students are given opportunities to share their thinking -Students are held accountable for their learning - they are asked to articulate or write what they know and understand -Incorrect answers are not validated or simply ignored - being "right" is important and misunderstandings are discussed	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes to all <input type="checkbox"/> Yes to some <input type="checkbox"/> Not really	
Self Esteem - Building Toward Intrinsic Motivation -Children are self-directed and self-motivated -Children who need to be "pushed" are pushed in	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes to all <input type="checkbox"/> Yes to some	

subtle, nurturing ways -Children do not sit next to peers who disrupt or interrupt learning (including friends) -Children feel good about their learning and are excited to share new experiences -Children who need behavioral plans have them and these are used in consistent ways -There is never a "why should I?" attitude - children perform because they understand that learning is important	_____ Not really	
--	------------------	--

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

NA

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

2008	3	7%
2007	3	7%
2006	3	7%

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

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

NA

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 154 is an Empowerment Support Organization School. In addition to the professional development each teacher receives in the school from internal and external coaches, the ESO also customizes 1:1 PD for all ELL teaches. These sessions are planned and facilitated by the Network’s Special Services Manager and delivered either at the school or in a venue for Network collaboration. Finally, this school year, the ESO has contracted an ELL Specialist, Catherine Brown, from *Accelerating Minds with Language*. Ms. Brown will be conducting five full-day workshops for the Network’s ELL and bi-lingual teachers.

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

NA

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 154 received an overall score of proficient for SQ1: “School leaders consistently gather and generate data, and use it to understand what each student knows and is able to do and to monitor the students’ progress over time.” and a score of proficient for sub criteria 1.3:

“School leaders and faculty provide an objective, constantly updated understanding of the performance and progress of English Language Learners.”

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

NA

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 154 received an overall score of proficient for SQ3: “The school aligns its academic work, strategic decisions and resources and effectively engages students around its plans and goals for accelerating student learning, and an overall score of proficient for sub criteria

3.4: “The school ensures that teachers use school, class and student data to plan for and provide differentiated instruction that meets the specific needs of all students in their charge.”

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

NA

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

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

Finally, the Administrative Cabinet and IEP Teacher will review IEP’s for behavioral plans for those students who are Emotionally Handicapped and/or who, based on the school’s data, have exhibited behaviors that deter from that child’s educational and social/emotional growth and development.

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?

PS 154 teachers have received extensive professional development in the area of student goal setting and writing correct, appropriate and educationally sound IEP's. This training has been provided to them at the school level by the Empowerment Support Organization's Special Services Manager. Teachers at this school use the NYS standards when making promotional decisions prior to writing an IEP at annual review. All students with special needs at this school have promotional goals that clearly reflect a percentage of their current grade level's performance outcomes. We aspire to have each classified student achieve proficiency in both ELA and mathematics.

Teachers at PS 154 have received Mel Levine training and know how to write and use functional behavioral plans for students for whom this is a necessary intervention.

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

NA

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year).
 - PS 154 presently (October 2009) has 1 student living in temporary housing.
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
 - PS 154 uses its Title 1 set aside funds for supplies and personal items (when necessary) for our students living in temporary housing.
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.
 - PS 154 received \$4,331 in Title 1 Targeted Assistance funds.