



**MATH AND SCIENCE EXPLORATORY SCHOOL**

**2009-10**

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

**SCHOOL: 15K447**

**ADDRESS: 345 DEAN STREET, BROOKLYN, NY 11217**

**TELEPHONE: 718-330-9328**

**FAX: 718-330-0944**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

**SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE**

**SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE**

**Part A. Narrative Description**

**Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot**

**SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS**

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010**

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

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

**APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION**

**APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

**SCHOOL NUMBER:** 447      **SCHOOL NAME:** Math and Science Exploratory School

**SCHOOL ADDRESS:** 345 Dean Street, Brooklyn, NY 11217

**SCHOOL TELEPHONE:** 718-330-9328      **FAX:** 718-33-0944

**SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON:** Lisa Gioe      **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Lgioe@schools.nyc.gov

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON:** Susan Casagrande; James Lola

**PRINCIPAL:** Lisa Gioe

**UFT CHAPTER LEADER:** Meredith Lorber

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT:** Carole Kelly

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:**  
*(Required for high schools)* \_\_\_\_\_

**DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION**

**DISTRICT:** 15      **SSO NAME:** Empowerment

**SSO NETWORK LEADER:** Karen Ditolla

**SUPERINTENDENT:** Anita Skop

## SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

**Directions:** Each school is required to form a School Leadership Team (SLT) as per State Education Law Section 2590. SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff (students and CBO members are not counted when assessing this balance requirement), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. Chancellor’s Regulation A-655 requires a minimum of ten members on each team. Each SLT members should be listed separately in the left hand column on the chart below. Please specify any position held by a member on the team (e.g., SLT Chairperson, SLT Secretary) and the constituent group represented (e.g., parent, staff, student, or CBO). The signatures of SLT members on this page indicates their participation in the development of the Comprehensive Educational Plan and confirmation that required consultation has occurred in the aligning of funds to support educational programs (Refer to revised Chancellor’s Regulations A-655; available on the NYCDOE website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Administration/ChancellorsRegulations/default.htm>). *Note: If for any reason an SLT member does not wish to sign this plan, he/she may attach a written explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Lisa Gioe	*Principal or Designee	
Meredith Lorber	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Carole Kelly	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
	CBO Representative, if applicable	
James Lola	Member/Parent/Co-Chair	
Susan Casagrande	Member/Parent/Co-Chair	
Laura Kates	Member/Parent	
Helene Giacona	Member/Parent	
Sharon Doldron	Member/Teacher	
David Grosshandler	Member/Teacher	
Jenny Dhillon	Member/Teacher	

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

- Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

### **SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE**

#### **Part A. Narrative Description**

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

---

All children have a natural curiosity about the world around them and how it works. Inquiry education is very empowering for middle school children because they can take ownership of their learning by constructing knowledge for themselves, with the guidance of their teachers, through exploration within a meaningful context. Middle school students are social individuals, and benefit from learning through working in cooperative groups engaged in the inquiry process by practicing social skills and putting the idea of 'team work' to use in order to meet a common goal. Inquiry based instruction addresses the needs of students of **all** learning styles, interests, and backgrounds, enabling students to expand their knowledge and skills in the content areas within a meaningful context. In addition, Math & Science faculty use entry -level data, baseline assessments and portfolio development in order to identify student needs and implement differentiated instruction to support student learning.

Exploring and learning occurs both in and out of the classroom. We support experientially based learning experiences, collaborating with informal math and science institutions to provide children with opportunities to investigate and expand their understanding of the world around them. It is our goal is to lay the foundation for creative approaches to real-life inquiries in math and science by providing children with the mathematical and scientific process skills necessary for problem solving. Through engaging in activities that simulate the roles of mathematician and scientist, students work collaboratively to develop/identify questions, hypothesize, design action plans for further exploration/problem solving, collect qualitative and quantitative data and draw conclusions. We aim develop and nurture students' critical thinking and problem solving skills.

## SECTION III – Cont'd

### Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

#### CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
<b>School Name:</b>	The Math & Science Exploratory School						
<b>District:</b>	15	<b>DBN:</b>	15K447	<b>School BEDS Code:</b>	331500010447		
DEMOGRAPHICS							
Grades Served:	Pre-K		3		7	√	11
	K		4		8	√	12
	1		5		9		Ungraded
	2		6	√	10		
Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09
Pre-K	0	0	0		93.8	95.0	95.5
Kindergarten	0	0	0	<b>Student Stability - % of Enrollment:</b>			
Grade 1	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 2	0	0	0		98.2	98.0	98.8
Grade 3	0	0	0	<b>Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:</b>			
Grade 4	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 5	0	0	0		39.6	31.9	22.9
Grade 6	171	178	175	<b>Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:</b>			
Grade 7	117	166	175	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 8	107	115	170		0	2	5
Grade 9	0	0	0	<b>Recent Immigrants - Total Number:</b>			
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 11	0	0	0		6	1	3
Grade 12	0	0	0	<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>			
Ungraded	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Total	395	459	520				
<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>				<b>Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:</b>			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Self-Contained Classes	0	0	0	Principal Suspensions	33	34	27
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	22	37	38	Superintendent Suspensions	9	6	10
Number all others	31	31	41	<b>Special High School Programs - Total Number:</b>			
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:</b>				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
(BESIS Survey)				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	<b>Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:</b>			
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	15	16	16	Number of Teachers	34	45	49

**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	0	0	0	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	4	7	7
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	0	1
<b>Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)</b>				<b>Teacher Qualifications:</b>			
	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	29.4	35.6	40.8
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	23.5	26.7	30.6
<b>Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:</b>				% Masters Degree or higher	76.0	80.0	80.0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	83.7	79.7	87.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.8	0.9	0.8				
Black or African American	23.0	25.7	29.8				
Hispanic or Latino	32.9	29.0	27.3				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	5.8	6.3	6.5				
White	37.5	38.1	35.0				
<b>Male</b>	53.7	58.8	57.1				
<b>Female</b>	46.3	41.2	42.9				
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							
<b>SURR School (Yes/No)</b>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
<b>Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2008-09) Based on 2007-08 Performance:</b>							
√	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**

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

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		Grad Rate
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	
<b>All Students</b>	√	√	√			
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-				
Black or African American	√	√	-			
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	√			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-			
White	√	√	√			
<b>Other Groups</b>						
Students with Disabilities	√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√			
<b>Student groups making AYP in each subject</b>	6	6	4	0	0	0

**CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY**

<b>Progress Report Results – 2008-09</b>		<b>Quality Review Results – 2008-09</b>	
<b>Overall Letter Grade:</b>	A	<b>Overall Evaluation:</b>	NR
<b>Overall Score:</b>	94.8	<b>Quality Statement Scores:</b>	
<b>Category Scores:</b>		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment:	9.6	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
School Performance:	24.2	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
Student Progress:	53.5		
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>			
Additional Credit:	7.5		

<b>KEY: AYP STATUS</b>	<b>KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE</b>
√ = Made AYP	Δ = Underdeveloped
√ <sup>SH</sup> = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	► = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features
X = Did Not Make AYP	√ = Proficient
- = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status	W = Well Developed
	◇ = Outstanding
	NR = No Review Required

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

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

## SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

---

### ELA Data Analysis

- As evidenced in our 2008-2009 Progress Report, we made exemplary gains in 3 student groups: ELL Students, Special education Students and Hispanic Students in the lowest third citywide.
- 4.7% gain in students at proficiency (84.1% in 07-08 to 88.8% in 08-09).
- 11.3% increase in students making at least 1 year of progress (48.9% in 07-08 to 60.2% in 08-09).
- 76.5% of students in the school's lowest third made at least 1 year of progress.

Implications for the ELA instructional program:

- Formation of two inquiry teams:
  - 1 Team focused on level 2 students
  - 1 team focused on engaging high achieving students at high level 3 and level 4

### Inquiry Team Rationale:

We still performed lower in ELA than math last year and our continued overall goal is to raise our ELA scores. We are focused on all grades this year and are providing targeted intervention for students on level 2 to mid level 3. They receive this intervention during extended day and push in support in ELA classes. ELA enrichment is via a pull out book club during the ELA class scheduled independent reading time. In addition, we provide targeted differentiated instruction based on data collected at the beginning of each unit of study.

### Data Collection:

Initial Baseline Assessments consisting of:

- Teachers College Leveling Assessment will be used as a baseline to determine the level that each child is reading at.
- Spelling Inventory
- TC On Demand Writing Assessment
- TC Reading Comprehension Assessment
- A sample test from the ELA NYS Test designed to assess reading comprehension and writing. (Our predictive)

### Ongoing Assessments:

- Conference Logs
- Reading Logs
- Teachers College Leveling Assessments
- ITAs customized to Teachers College curriculum calendar assessments
- Student Portfolios

### Intervention & Instructional Implementation:

- We have created a push-in program to support intervention and enrichment for our target groups, using the data from our baseline and ongoing assessments. ELA teachers will push into ELA classes to work with target students and provide differentiated instruction, and lower overall student teacher ratio.

#### Math Data Analysis

- As evidenced in 2008-09 Progress Report, we made exemplary gains in 4 student groups: English Language Learners, Special Education Students, Hispanic students in the lowest third citywide and Other students in the lowest third citywide.
- 6.2% gain in students at proficiency (89.5% in 07-08 to 95.7% in 08-09).
- 12.2% gain in students making at least 1 year progress (68% in 07-08 to 80.2% in 08-09)
- 76.5% of students in the schools lowest third made at least 1 year of progress.

#### Implications for the Math Instructional Program:

- We have continued to collect baseline data, unit assessment data and predictive data to inform instruction and target areas where students need to grow.
- In addition, we are planning for and implementing further differentiated instruction within each of the three math tracks: On track, advanced track and regents track.

#### Significant aids to the school's improvement:

- Schedule to allow for common planning time for teachers to meet.
- Built in AIS/AES (Academic Enrichment Schedule) in ELA and Math taught by content teachers to challenge students and meet their needs.
- Use of baseline assessments in ELA and Math at the beginning of each unit to target instruction through differentiated lesson planning.
- Lowering overall student teacher ratio assignment in ELA and Math to 60:1.

#### Significant accomplishments:

- Consistent and steady student growth in proficiency and gains made across the content areas.
- Ability to retain teachers whom we have invested professional development resources into over time which has a direct result on student achievement.
- Commitment to supporting to students with IEPs through intervention and differentiated instruction which has resulted in gains in student achievement.

#### Barriers to school's improvement:

- Budgetary loss which effects student faculty ratio over all.
- Budgetary loss which limits ability to order manipulatives, library books and texts that need to be replenished.

## 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.

---

1. Recognizing that we have students who are approaching proficiency and/or need instructional accommodations to address learning challenges our goal is to increase the number of students at proficiency by 2% on the ELA state exam in the 2009 – 2010 school year through targeted ELA intervention via extended morning programs and daytime push-in model.
2. Recognizing that we need to continue to challenge our high level learners so that they maintain their proficiency in reading and writing our goal is to increase the number of students making at least 1 year of progress by 2% in ELA in the 2009-2010 school year through targeted ELA enrichment in the form of enrichment book clubs structured as a pull out model.
3. Recognizing that we have students who are approaching proficiency and/or need instructional accommodations to address learning challenges our goal is to increase the number of students making at least 1 year of progress by 2% in Math in the 2009-2010 school year through targeted Math intervention via extended morning programs and daytime push-in model.
4. Recognizing that we need to continue to challenge our high level learners so that they maintain their proficiency in math, in order to increase the number of students making at least 1 year of progress by 2% in Math in the 2009-2010 school year through targeted Math enrichment via differentiated instruction within the math regents track.
5. Due to the expansion of our special education programs, as we are doubling the number of special education classes thus the number of students with IEPs on each grade level, our goal is to continue to increase the development and expansion of the use of a variety of co-teaching models within the collaborative team teaching classroom through professional development for the 2009-2010 school year up to 100% implementation by the special education teaching staff.

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**Directions:** The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2009-10 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools designated for (Improvement, Corrective Action, Restructuring, SURR or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification.

**English Language Arts**

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>To increase the number of students at proficiency by 2% on the ELA state exam in the 2009 – 2010 school year through targeted ELA intervention.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>As a TC DYO school we implemented the following baseline assessments: Reading Levels, On Demand Writing, Reading Comprehension and School Based ELA Predictive in September and October.</b></li> <li>• <b>The ELA intervention inquiry team meets weekly throughout the school year to identify targets students on grade 7 (students scoring a level 2 on the 2009 state ELA exam) and analyze data to identify the intervention plan necessary to meet each students needs. The team meets weekly.</b></li> <li>• <b>From the beginning of the school year until June, each ELA teacher academic intervention time scheduled during extended day to work with students.</b></li> <li>• <b>Throughout the school year, there are 3 ELA teachers on each grade (8<sup>th</sup> grade has 2 ELA teachers; 90:1 ratio) to reduce the overall student teacher ratio to about 60:1 and increased ELA by one period on the eighth grade.</b></li> <li>• <b>Throughout the school year, teachers are actively engaged in facilitating targeted differentiated instruction based on student data.</b></li> <li>• <b>A school based predictive assessment has been implemented at the end of October which will be used to target test prep during our test prep unit which begins in mid March.</b></li> <li>• <b>We have departmentalized our special education department so that six (3 ASD NEST and 3 CTT) teachers are responsible for the ELA curriculum to accommodate and foster common planning with the ELA content teachers on each grade. This has been supporting the modifications and differentiation of instruction.</b></li> <li>• <b>We have purchased 20 days with a TC staff developer, send teachers to calendar</b></li> </ul>

	<p>workshop days to support the reading and writing curriculum through scheduled lab sites and common planning days throughout the school year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding has been used to maintain our status as a TC reading and writing project school.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We used our C4E money to fund a full time Literacy Coach this year.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>At the beginning of each reading and writing unit, we give a baseline assessment. This ascertains each student’s proficiency level within each unit according to the skill sets that are specific to each genre of reading and writing. Teachers are then able to target instruction through tiering lesson in order to meet students where they are at in terms of proficiency and set individual goals with each child to scaffold instruction to support academic success. We use the following tools and embedded assessments to monitor student progress throughout the school year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will be using the TC software to load and analyze our DY0 assessment data throughout the school year.</li> <li>• Student conferences, portfolios and publications.</li> <li>• Reading logs, reading and writing notebooks.</li> <li>• Informal/ Formal Observations of teachers and walkthroughs.</li> <li>• ELA State Exam data.</li> <li>• On Demand writing as a pre-assessment using teacher created rubrics to evaluate students skills. This data is used to inform instruction and plan for small group work.</li> </ul>

**English Language Arts**

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase the number of students making at least 1 year of progress by 2% in ELA in the 2009-2010 school year through targeted ELA enrichment.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a TC DYU school we implemented the following baseline assessments: Reading Levels, On Demand Writing, Reading Comprehension and School Based ELA Predictive.</li> <li>• The ELA Enrichment Inquiry Team meets weekly through out the school year to identify targets students on grade 6 (students scoring a high level 3 or 4 on the 2009 state ELA exam) and analyze data to identify the intervention plan necessary to meet each students needs.</li> <li>• Beginning October through June, each grade ELA teacher has pull out academic enrichment book club periods scheduled into their program to work with students in other ELA classes during independent reading time and lower class student teacher ratio.</li> <li>• Throughout the school year, there are 3 ELA teachers on each grade (8<sup>th</sup> grade has 2 ELA teachers; 90:1 ratio) to reduce the overall student teacher ratio to about 60:1.</li> <li>• Throughout the school year, teachers are actively engaged in facilitating targeted differentiated instruction based on student data to foster student engagement and enrichment within each unit for high level learners.</li> <li>• A school based predictive assessment has been implemented which will be used to target test prep during our test prep unit which begins in mid March.</li> <li>• We have purchased 20 days with a TC staff developer, send teachers to calendar workshop days to support the reading and writing curriculum and provide scheduled lab sites and common planning days throughout the school year.</li> <li>• Beginning November through June, our high level 3 and 4 students are invited to participate take advanced course which will lead to taking the American History Regents. They will participate in an after school program which focuses on reading and writing in the social studies content area, specifically the development of 5 paragraph essays using research as evidence to support their thinking and preparation for responding document based questions.</li> <li>• Funding has been used to maintain our status as a TC reading and writing project school for the school year.</li> <li>• We lowered the ratio of social studies teachers to students from 1:180 to 1:120 to increase the teachers' ability to assign and support essay and research writing</li> </ul>

	<p><b>assignments.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our TC Staff developer is also working with social studies teachers to enable them to be stronger teachers of non-fiction reading skills.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We used our C4E money to fund a full time Literacy Coach this year.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><b>At the beginning of each reading and writing unit, we give a baseline assessment. This ascertains each student’s proficiency level within each unit according to the skill sets that are specific to each genre of reading and writing. Teachers are then able to target instruction through tiering lesson in order to meet students where they are at in terms of proficiency and set individual goals with each child to scaffold instruction to support academic success. We use the following tools and embedded assessments to monitor student progress throughout the school year:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We use the TC software to load and analyze our DY0 assessment data throughout the school year.</li> <li>• Student conferences, portfolios and publications.</li> <li>• Reading logs, reading and writing notebooks.</li> <li>• Informal/ Formal Observations of teachers and walkthroughs.</li> <li>• ELA State Exam data.</li> </ul>

**Math**

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase the number of students making at least 1 year of progress by 2% in Math in the 2009-2010 school year through targeted Math intervention.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The target population for this goal is school wide.</li> <li>• We will continue to collect baseline data, unit assessment data and math DYO data to inform instruction and to target areas in which students need to grow.</li> <li>• Incoming sixth grade students are given an entry level exam prior to the beginning of the school year. This data along with the Math state test data is used to place students into one of three math tracks in order to narrow the range of ability and focus instruction on student need.</li> <li>• There are 3 math teachers on each grade to reduce the overall student teacher ratio to about 60:1.</li> <li>• We have a full time math coach and math administrator to support our teaching staff.</li> <li>• Common planning times for the grade teams to meet to look at student work, analyze data and lesson plan for differentiated instruction, occurs 2 periods per week.</li> <li>• Each math teacher has push-in academic intervention periods scheduled into their program to work with students in other math classes and lower class student teacher ratio.</li> <li>• During June planning in the 2008-2009 school year teachers worked on differentiating instruction for each specific math track (on track, accelerated track and regents' track) on each grade level.</li> <li>• ASD and CTT Special education teachers that push into the math classes have common planning time with content teachers to work on modifications and supports for students with special needs.</li> <li>• We have emphasized the ongoing implementation of student conferencing to foster goal setting for each student throughout the school year.</li> <li>• 1 full time AIS teacher to provide push in and pull out services for students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgeted for one full time math coach using tax levy money.</li> </ul>

**Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment**

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

In the math department, teachers give pre-assessments at the beginning of each unit to measure student proficiency within a given unit prior to teaching the unit, so that they can target instruction according to students needs. In addition, students are given the following assessments to monitor their progress throughout the unit and throughout the school year:

- Unit assessments and pre-unit assessments.
- DY0 Assessments.
- Midterm given in January.
- Performance on the state Math Exam

Our math program is tracked, so these ongoing measures of student progress are necessary for our math faculty to make sure that students remain in the correct track to support their academic success. Changes in students' math track placement have changed based on their proficiency data in math.

**Math**

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

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase the number of students making at least 1 year of progress by 2% in Math in the 2009-2010 school year through targeted Math enrichment.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After school program to support high level 3 and 4 students in preparation for the specialized high school exam that Starts in September and ends in late October.</li> <li>• After school program to support math students in the regents track to prepare for the Algebra Regents exam.</li> <li>• The target population for this goal is grades 6 through 8..</li> <li>• We will continue to collect baseline data, unit assessment data and Math DYO data to inform instruction and to target areas in which students need to grow.</li> <li>• Incoming sixth grade students are given an entry level exam prior to the beginning of the school year. This data along with the Math state test data is used to place students into one of three math tracks in order to narrow the range of ability and focus instruction on student need.</li> <li>• There are 3 math teachers on each grade to reduce the overall student teacher ratio to about 60:1.</li> <li>• We have a full time math coach and math administrator to support our teaching staff.</li> <li>• Common planning times for the grade teams to meet to look at student work, analyze data and lesson plan for differentiated instruction, occurs 2 periods per week.</li> <li>• During June planning in the 2008-2009 school year teachers worked on differentiating instruction for each specific math track (on track, accelerated track and regents’ track) on each grade level.</li> <li>• ASD Special education teachers that push into the math classes have common planning time with content teachers to work on modifications and supports for students with special needs. We have several ASD Nest students on the Regents math track on grades 6 through 8.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgeted for one full time math coach.</li> </ul>

**Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment**

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

In the math department, teachers give pre-assessments at the beginning of each unit to measure student proficiency within a given unit prior to teaching the unit, so that they can target instruction according to students needs. In addition, students are given the following assessments to monitor their progress throughout the unit and throughout the school year:

- Unit assessments and Pre-unit assessments.
- Math DYO Assessments.
- Midterm given in January.
- Performance on the state Math Exam
- Performance on the State Algebra Regents Exam

Our math program is tracked, so these ongoing measures of student progress are necessary for our math faculty to make sure that students remain in the correct track to support their academic success. Changes in students' math track placement have changed based on their proficiency data in math.

**Special Education across Core**

**Subject/Area (where relevant):**    **Content Areas**

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To continue to increase the development and expansion of the use of a variety of co-teaching models within the collaborative team teaching classroom through professional development for the 2009-2010 school year up to 100% implementation by the special education teaching staff.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School-wide professional development on differentiation and collaborative team teaching models.</li> <li>• NBI Professional development to foster effective collaborative teaching relationships and professional learning communities.</li> <li>• ASD/CTT monthly middle school/ high school study group/ inter-visitations.</li> <li>• Weekly grade level special education department meetings with AP in charge of special education.</li> <li>• Weekly co-planning meetings between each special education teacher and his/her cooperative content teacher.</li> <li>• External professional development workshops and literature on collaborative team teaching.</li> <li>• Weekly professional development team meetings to focus on school-wide goals: differentiation and collaborative team teaching.</li> <li>• Full time assistant principal in charge of special education.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgeted for 1 full time assistant principal to supervise special education.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit assessments and Pre-unit assessments.</li> <li>• DY0 Assessments.</li> <li>• Student conferences, portfolios and publications.</li> <li>• Reading logs, reading and writing notebooks.</li> <li>• IEPs</li> </ul>

## **REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010**

**Directions:** All schools must complete Appendices 1, 2, 3, & 7. (Note: Appendix 8 will not be required for this year.) All Title I schools must complete Appendix 4. All schools identified under NCLB or SED for School Improvement, including Improvement – Year 1 and Year 2, Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1 and Year 2, and Restructured Schools, must complete Appendix 5. All Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) must complete Appendix 6. **Note: Please refer to the accompanying CEP Guide for specific CEP submission instructions and timelines.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K			N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								
5								
6	14	12	3	14	3	n/a	5	
7	20	19	24	20	3	n/a	5	
8	22	14	2	22	3	n/a	5	
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> Provide a brief description of <b>each</b> of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p><b>ELA:</b></p>	<p>Push in Program provided by the SETTTS teacher and AIS teacher for grades 6 and 7 and 8. In addition we have teachers push in time for at-risk students in all grades who need support in the academic area. During our extended day period students are rotating through three cycles which focus on spelling/vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing skills. Materials being used include Words Their Way, and Kaplan Focus on Writing.</p>
<p><b>Mathematics:</b></p>	<p>Push in Program provided by the SETTTS teacher and AIS teacher for grades 6 and 7 and 8. In addition we have teachers push in time for at-risk students in all grades who need support in the academic areas. During our extended day period students are working through skills based on the results of their pretest. Materials that are being used are the Globe-Fearon Math Intervention Tool Kit which contains workbooks to teach and practice eight skill sets: Whole Numbers, Number Theory and Fraction Concepts, Operations with Fractions, Decimals, Ratio-Proportion-Percent, Geometry, Measurement, Pre-Algebra.</p>
<p><b>Science:</b></p>	<p>Program provided for grade 6, grade 7, and grade 8 for students who are believed to be performing below standards based on class work and performance on tests and quizzes. Exit project help is provided for 8<sup>th</sup> grade students who are at risk for failing to meet promotional requirements.</p>
<p><b>Social Studies:</b></p>	<p>Program provided for grade 6, grade 7, and grade 8 for students who are believed to be performing below standards based on class work and performance on tests and quizzes. Exit project help is provided for 8<sup>th</sup> grade students who are at risk for failing to meet promotional requirements.</p>
<p><b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b></p>	<p>Social worker and guidance counselor provide students and families with support during times of need to support their social and emotional well being. For example, some at risk counseling objectives may address, but are not limited to: attendance, compliance with school/classroom guidelines, peer conflicts, death in family, student stress, health developments, emotional and physical neglect and domestic violence. The social worker and guidance counselor support families during these times with short term counseling and referrals to appropriate community agencies.</p>
<p><b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b></p>	<p><b>none</b></p>
<p><b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b></p>	<p>Social worker and guidance counselor provide students and families with support during times of need to support their social and emotional well being. For example, some at risk counseling objectives may address, but are not limited to: attendance, compliance with school/classroom guidelines, peer conflicts, death in family, student stress, health developments, emotional and physical neglect and domestic violence. The social worker and guidance counselor support families during these times with short term counseling and referrals to appropriate community agencies.</p>

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

*NCLB/SED requirement for all schools*

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

---

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

### **Form TIII – A (1)(a)**

**Grade Level(s)** 6 - 8      **Number of Students to be Served:** 11 LEP   519 Non-LEP

**Number of Teachers** 49      **Other Staff (Specify)** 8 (Administration; DC 37; Service Providers (OT, Speech, SBST); Paraprofessional)

### **School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview**

#### **Title III, Part A LEP Program**

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

---

I. Instructional Program (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc):  
**ESL Instruction:** All ELLs at MS 447 are mainstreamed into General Education classes. The English as a Second Language program is comprised of both pull-out and push-in models of instruction. Students are serviced four days a week during different periods throughout the day. Students at beginning and intermediate proficiency levels receive six hours (360 minutes) of service each week, while advanced students receive three hours (180 minutes) of service per week. MS 447 seeks to ensure that all ELLs meet the standards by adhering to the balanced literacy program, as well as the grade-by-grade curriculum frameworks. ELLs will be provided with instruction in content area subjects such as social studies, math, science, reading, and language arts. The push-in component of the ESL program allows students to remain in their academic classes while receiving language instruction, modification, and adaptation. The goal of the entire program is to enable English Language Learners to access the academic language required for success in middle school. The Language Experience Approach (LEA) is used as a strategy to link oral and written development in ELL students. English Language Learners will be instructed in the following techniques: comprehensible input, non-verbal cues, scaffolding, such as the use of graphic organizers and other non-language supports, Total Physical Response, and some aspects of the Natural Approach as well as other language development theories.

**Key LAP Team Members:**

Heidi Slouffman is our fulltime ESL teacher. She is a part of the Academic Intervention Team which includes 1 fulltime, Katherine Lavery, and 1 part-time, Anna Rosenberg, Academic Intervention/ SETTS teachers who coordinate and plan intervention services in collaboration with Ms Slouffman in order to support students are English Language Learners. They meet weekly under the supervision of the Assistant Principal in charge of support services, Sharon Mahabir.

**Initial identification of possible ELL students includes the following steps:**

1. Administration of the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) to parents upon enrollment of their child. The school secretary or the person enrolling the student does this.
2. Assessment of the HLIS form by the licensed ESL teacher/coordinator, Heidi Slouffman to determine LAB-R eligibility.
3. If a language other than English is identified on a student's HLIS form, the LAB-R test is administered by Ms Slouffman within ten days of enrollment. The LAB-R is hand-scored to determine ELL eligibility and returned to the ISC.

**ELA Instruction:** The TC Literacy Workshop model is used in ELA to provide ongoing opportunities to develop language through conversations, word study skills and the balanced literacy program (read alouds, guided and shared reading, as well as guided and independent writing). The ESL teacher pushes into ELA classes two or three periods per week, providing scaffolds and differentiated instruction.

**Social Studies Instruction:** All ELLs are mainstreamed into Social Studies classes, which use the Glencoe curriculum, with a focus on research skills and document analysis. They receive appropriate differentiated instruction in social studies.

**Mathematics Instruction:** MS 447 uses a combination of Impact Math and Glencoe Mathematics curricula. The Math department focuses on Best Practices through the use of Lesson Lab. All ELLs are mainstreamed into regular math classes with differentiated instruction.

**Science Instruction:** Since MS 447 is also called the Math and Science Exploratory School, we focus on science standards and curriculum through our weekly off-site program. All ELLs participate in off-site one day per week and in general education science classes an additional four periods per week. Instruction is differentiated for the ELLs through modifications.

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

---

The ESL teacher at MS 447 attends the bi-monthly staff and department meetings provided for all staff. The ESL teacher participates in the monthly professional development training provided for ESL/Bilingual teachers. Professional development training is offered once a month for the duration of the school year. The ESL teacher participates in various TC workshops at Columbia University. The TC workshops focus on word study strategies (*Words Their Way*), reading and writing instruction for ELLs and differentiation of instruction.

Our school wide professional development focused on differentiated instructional strategies for all students, in addition to students who are English Language Learners and/or who have IEPs. On September 8, 2009 we held a morning session on differentiation of instruction and how to support all students' needs. The length of the professional development was 3 hours. The entire faculty was in attendance. On the November 3, 2009 election day pd, we spend an entire day on different learning styles and how to support students by tailoring instruction to meet the various needs of students. The length for this professional development was 6 hours. The entire faculty was in attendance. Our staff and department time every other Monday after school has been used for focusing on collaborative instruction, through co-planning for tiered lessons based on student proficiency level within each unit of study. Ms Slouffman will be running one of these on January 25<sup>th</sup>, to focus on specific instructional strategies to embed into lesson specifically geared towards supporting English Language Learners. This will be for the entire faculty for the length of 1 hour. We will continue to focus on student needs: academic, social, emotional through collaborative teaching and differentiation of instruction.

**Form TIII – A (1)(b)**

School: MS 447 BEDS Code: 331500010447

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

<b>Allocation Amount:</b>		
<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Budgeted Amount</b>	<b>Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.</b>
<b>Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits)</b> -	\$60,853	<b>1 Full time ESL Teacher using TL FSF. We do not receive ESL funding.</b>
<b>Purchased services</b> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.	\$30,000	<b>Teachers College Reading and Writing Project professional development contract. 20 onsite days with a TCRWP staff developer and Calendar day workshops at TC. All are accessible to the ESL teacher.</b>
<b>Supplies and materials</b> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	\$500	<b>Leveled Books</b>
<b>Educational Software (Object Code 199)</b>	\$0	
<b>Travel</b>	\$0	
<b>Other</b>	\$0	
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$90,853`	

## **Language Allocation Policy 2009-2010**

### **Introduction**

M. S. 447 is a 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade middle school located in Boerum Hill, Brooklyn. While the school serves a diverse community of students, most of them are fluent English speakers. M.S. 447, which is also known as the Math and Science Exploratory School, started in 2003 as an intermediate school designed to focus on math and science curricula. Among the school's 530 active students, 11 students (2%) are considered English Language Learners (ELLs). There are five ELLs in sixth grade, five ELLs in seventh grade, and one ELL in eighth grade.

### **ELL Identification Process**

Initial identification of possible ELL students includes the following steps:

1. Administration of the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) to parents upon enrollment of their child. The school secretary or the person enrolling the student does this.
2. Assessment of the HLIS form by the licensed ESL teacher/coordinator, Heidi Slouffman to determine LAB-R eligibility.
3. If a language other than English is identified on a student's HLIS form, the LAB-R test is administered by Ms Slouffman within ten days of enrollment. The LAB-R is hand-scored to determine ELL eligibility and returned to the ISC.

The New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) is administered to each identified ELL in May, as well as to Special Education students who have been X-coded from English as a Second Language services.

Once students are identified as English Language Learners, their parents are informed of a parent orientation at the school, which provides them with the educational choices they have in their child's program placement. The ESL Teacher and Spanish bilingual parent coordinator are present at the orientation, where a DVD explaining the parents' choices is shown in several languages. This orientation is often held concurrently with the school's well-attended curriculum breakfast, at the end of September.

Parents that attend the orientation are asked to complete and turn in the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms. Parents who do not attend are mailed the Program Selection form and/or entitlement letters in their native language, if possible. Students are reminded by the ESL teacher to bring the signed letters back to school. Letters are kept on file with each student's data.

M.S. 447 has such a small ELL population, that there are not enough ELLs of any one language group in two consecutive grades to warrant a Transitional Bilingual program. Therefore, parents that choose to have their children in a bilingual program are informed of schools in the area where they may choose to transfer their child. M.S. 447 maintains a Freestanding English as a Second Language program.

Review of former Parent Survey and Program Selection forms reveals that most parents choose to stay at M.S. 447 and enroll their child in our ESL program. One or two parents per year choose Transitional Bilingual programs, but opt to keep their child at M.S. 447 upon realizing that their child would be transferred to another school.

One way that we could align our program to the parental choices would be to ensure that ALL parents are clearly educated about the locations of Dual Language and Transitional Bilingual programs within the local area and how to transfer their child with ease.

### **ELL Demographics**

According to the results of the spring 2009 New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT), the ELL population at M.S. 447 consists of one (9%) beginners, one (9%) intermediate students, and nine (82%) advanced students. Two students were newcomers in September, with one qualifying for ESL services. In sixth grade, one English Language Learner is classified as a beginner, while four (80%) are advanced. In grade seven, one student (20%) is intermediate, while four students (80%) that qualify for ESL services are advanced. The one eighth grade ELL is advanced.

### **Programming and Scheduling Information**

#### **Organizational Model**

The ESL program at M.S. 447 is structured to provide our ELLs with as much small group language instruction as possible, while ensuring that students are present for the academic content of their classes. While a challenge, this is possible only through a combination of **push-in and pull-out** ESL instruction. Most Beginner and Intermediate students receive four periods of push-in instruction per week, as well as four periods of pull-out instruction. The Advanced students receive two or three push-in periods per week and two pull-out periods per week.

This enables them to receive more individualized instruction and skill development. Portions of the pull-out sessions are spent working on projects for their general education classes, as the individual teacher attention is greatly helpful to these students.

### **Program Model**

The program model at M.S. 447 is Block scheduling. ELLs are placed into a general education class that travels together all day. ESL instruction is delivered either in the general education classroom, or in a pull-out setting. Because of our small number of ELLs, groups are mostly heterogeneous, as most of the ELLs in each grade are placed in one general education class. Some smaller single-grade pull-out homogeneous groups (by proficiency level and linguistic need) have been created this year to deliver more differentiated instruction.

The staff of M.S. 447 makes many accommodations and modifications to their schedules to comply with the state mandates and to support and help meet the needs of our ELLs. The ESL teacher provides services to all eligible students. Three hundred sixty minutes (360) of ESL instruction are provided to students at the beginning and intermediate levels and one hundred eighty (180) minutes of ESL instruction and 180 minutes of ELA instruction are given to students at an advanced level of proficiency, as mandated by CR Part 154.

There are no bilingual programs at M.S. 447. Instruction is provided completely in English with native language support. Because we view ESL as an additive process, where students are *adding* a language to their schema, rather than subtracting their native language, the ESL teacher places huge value on the students' native language. Students often use the native language for clarification, expression, or emphasis. Books in the native language are available to support instruction. Some of the required reading novels for general education are provided in the native language, so ELLs are able to keep up with the rest of the class. Copies of the math textbook are available in Spanish.

### **ESL Instructional Methods and Pedagogy**

The ESL program is designed to meet the linguistic and academic needs of middle school students learning in a second language. Various ESL methodologies are used, such as Total Physical Response, Communicative Language Teaching, Language Teaching Approach, and Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA), as well as other techniques, not specifically designated for second language instruction such as cooperative learning, and the components of Balanced Literacy, including Shared Reading, Read Alouds, Word Study, Guided Reading and Writing. The Teacher's College workshop model and various reading and writing strategies are reinforced in the ESL

instruction. As was mentioned above, scaffolds are employed to allow ELLs to access the language necessary to learn from these techniques and methods. Materials used to teach ELLs include picture dictionaries, word translation dictionaries, ESL classroom libraries, laptop computers, books on tape, texts in native languages, and a host of instructional books and teacher materials.

### **Implications of the LAP for Content-Based Instruction**

The implications for the school's LAP and instruction are derived from the strengths and needs noted in the NYSESLAT and other assessments (LAB-R, ACUITY, Teacher Assessments, and informal observations).

Because of the academically rigorous nature of middle school in general and of M. S. 447 specifically, the core of ESL instruction at M.S. 447 is teaching English in the content areas and developing and strengthening the academic language necessary to succeed in the project-based curriculum of our school.

### **Implications for LAP in English Language Arts Area**

In order to assist our students in academic achievement and assessment, there are a variety of interventions and strategies we are implementing this school year. They include the following:

- Ensure adequate licensed personnel to deliver instruction as stipulated by NCLB and CR Part 154
- Collaboration between content area and ESL teacher to create a learning community which is knowledgeable and experienced in research-based Instructional Strategies
  - Analyze the data of ELLs to become informed about the academic performance of each ELL
  - Provide opportunities for students to be involved in purposeful conversation
  - Incorporate all language modalities during the lesson (both pull-out and push-in lessons) through the use of journals, group collaboration
  - Ensure that the Literacy Coach works closely with teachers to support rigorous academic instruction
  - Implement a print rich environment, use of ESL dictionaries and glossaries in the ELA classrooms.

### **Implications for LAP in Mathematics Content Area**

In order to assist our students in both academic achievement and assessment, there are a variety of interventions and strategies we are implementing this school year. They include the following:

- Ensure adequate licensed personnel to deliver instruction as stipulated by NCLB and CR Part 154
- Analyze the data of ELLs to become informed about the academic performance of each ELL

- Provide opportunities for students to negotiate with mathematics academic language, such as reading and solving word problems, interactive word wall, collaborative group work
- Incorporate writing in the math lesson
- Provide opportunities for students to share their problem solving strategies and the justification of answers
- Analyze students' mathematical strengths and weaknesses in order to drive and differentiate instruction
- Ensure that Math Coach works closely with teachers to support rigorous academic instruction

### **Plan for ELLs Requiring Additional Support**

ELLs who require additional support in the four modalities (speaking, listening, reading, writing) include beginning or intermediate language learners, students with interrupted formal education (SIFE), grade holdovers, newcomers and Special Education students. Because of the small population of ELLs at M.S. 447 in the 2009-2010 school year, all of our ELLs are receiving additional academic intervention support. Currently four ELLs are CTT students and two are SETSS students (Special Education). M.S. 447 does not have any SIFE students at this time, but a plan exists to meet the needs of such students if we do enroll them in the future. We realize that SIFE students and their level of English and academic success will vary, as will our instructional approaches and classroom modifications.

### **Plan for SIFE**

The ESL teacher at M.S. 447 works closely with the Academic Intervention Specialist and the SETSS teacher to target specific skills and strategies necessary for all students requiring additional support. SIFE students often have large gaps in their language proficiency and knowledge base. After school programs are available to all ELLs, but a separate focus program would be specifically targeted to any SIFE students to learn and practice the skills that may fill in some of the gaps in their academic knowledge. Skills such as phonics, vocabulary, and reading strategies that may have been taught in earlier grades would be employed in such a program. We would also provide SIFE students with an English-speaking peer to assist with organization, assignments for other classes, and social language development.

### **Plan for Newcomers**

Newcomer students at M.S. 447 are also paired with other English-speaking students in their class. This partnership allows the newcomer to feel welcome, to gain language building opportunities, to learn how to function in a new country and school, and provides both students with windows into another culture. Newcomers also receive ESL services that enhance the learning in the students' other classes. Many newcomers to middle schools are literate in their native language, which is a huge advantage as students transfer their knowledge

from the native language to English. This Common Underlying Proficiency can also apply to newcomers who are not literate in their native languages, but who are able to make connections between their language and English. Newcomers, as well as long term ELLs, will receive ESL services that include sheltered English content instruction, as well as scaffolding techniques, such as bridging, modeling, text-representation, and schema building. Such scaffolds are the building blocks to all sound pedagogy, but are essential for ELLs as they learn academic concepts in a second language.

### **Plan for Long Term ELLs**

In addition to utilizing scaffolds for our long term ELLs, we concentrate on developing their CALP, which is necessary for success in middle school. According to language acquisition theorists, people learning a new language will first learn the social and functional words of that language, Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS), before they learn the academic language. Realizing this natural process, as well as the fact that each student acquires language at a different rate, we emphasize learning and applying academic language to reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills for our long term ELLs.

### **Plan for Special Education Students**

A small number (six) of the ELLs at M. S. 447 are Special Education students. Four Special Education students at M.S. 447 have a CTT teacher designated to work with a group of twelve or less within the mainstream classes. The other two students have Resource Room five periods per week. Students in this category have Individualized Educational Programs, which are used by the ESL teacher and other teachers to assist with planning for specific areas of language and literacy need. The ESL teacher plays an active role in the updates of IEPs of ELLs who receive special education.

### **Plan for Students Reaching English Proficiency**

For students who have reached English proficiency by passing the NYSESLAT, in-class support will be provided for a transition period of two years. Two students who passed the NYSESLAT in 2009 still receive some ESL support as they transition to completely mainstreamed classes. Transitional students will continue to receive the same testing accommodations as ELLs for two years after they pass the NYSESLAT. These students will also be serviced by the school's Academic Intervention Specialist to ensure that they receive the support they still need.

### **Instructional Materials and Programs**

English Language Learners at M.S. 447 are provided with the same opportunities for arts, physical education, and technology as the rest of the school population. ELLs receive physical education twice a week, an arts course (visual arts, music, dance, chorus, drama, or technology) four periods per week. They are included in our intervention/enrichment time for Extended Day and are encouraged to participate in our after-school enrichment programs. Since we do not have the required number of ELLs to receive Title III, we do not currently conduct after school programs specifically for ELLs.

Instructional materials used to teach ELLs include picture dictionaries, word translation dictionaries, ESL classroom libraries, laptop computers, books on tape, texts and textbooks in native languages, and a host of instructional books and teacher materials. Independent reading books and other materials are available in many levels, from elementary to high school reading levels, providing all ELLs with texts that they can read.

We are planning to begin a new technology program specifically for ELLs this school year. The administration has set aside funds to purchase several iPods for use in the ESL classroom. Students will practice receptive listening as well as expressive speaking and writing skills through the use of podcasts, music, and book excerpts on iPods. The ESL teacher is creating a curriculum to enhance the language learning experience through this technology.

Newly enrolled ELLs and their parents are given an orientation and tour with our Parent Coordinator. During this time, they are able to meet the ESL teacher and some of their content teachers.

### **Professional Development**

The ESL teacher at M.S. 447 attends monthly professional development training sessions offered by the Brooklyn ISC, specifically geared to training ESL teachers to plan for academic rigor in their programs. The ESL teacher completed a five-day training in QTEL, a research-based program designed specifically for teaching ELLs in the content areas. The ESL teacher attends Language Workshops at Teachers College to enhance the teaching of Balanced Literacy. The ESL teacher also attends a variety of off-site workshops to promote collaboration between content area and language teachers.

The ESL teacher gives content area teachers who work with ELLs some strategies, guidelines, and professional development periodically. They are sent to professional development meetings related to English language instruction with the ESL teacher on occasion.

Our school wide professional development focused on differentiated instructional strategies for all students, in addition to students who are English Language Learners and/or who have IEPs. On September 8, 2009 we held a morning session on differentiation of instruction and how to support all students' needs. The length of the professional development was 3 hours. The entire faculty was in attendance. On the November 3, 2009 election day pd, we spend an entire day on different learning styles and how to support students by tailoring instruction to meet the various needs of students. The length for this professional development was 6 hours. The entire faculty was in attendance. Our staff and department time every other Monday after school has been used for focusing on collaborative instruction, through co-planning for tiered lessons based on student proficiency levels within each unit of study. Ms Slouffman will be running one of these sessions on January 25<sup>th</sup>, to focus on specific instructional strategies to embed into lessons geared towards supporting English Language Learners. This will be for the entire faculty for the length of 1 hour. We will continue to focus on student needs: academic, social, emotional through collaborative teaching and differentiation of instruction.

In order to assist our ELLs in their transition from middle school to high school, staff at M.S. 447 is conscious about gradually decreasing the instructional scaffolds. Heavy emphasis is placed on organization and study skills needed for high school. The ESL teacher brought the ELLs to visit two high schools last year and assisted them in their high school application process.

### **Parental Involvement**

The involvement of parents, especially parents of ELLs is an area in which M.S. 447 needs continued development. Parents are given all materials in their native language as is possible. The response to parent orientations and district workshops has been smaller than we would like, but some of the more vocal parents have attended and benefited from these meetings.

Native language interpreters are provided in each language for parent/teacher meetings, which has been met with favorable reaction. The parent coordinator is helpful in making phone calls to parents in Spanish, as well as meeting with parents and teachers as a liaison in understanding parents' needs.

We do not currently hold specific workshops for ELL parents on the school site, but advertise and share with them any district held workshops specifically geared towards parents of ELLs. Since there are so few ELL parents in our community, our ESL teacher is able to assess the needs of the ELL parents by speaking with them directly in an ongoing basis. Our parent coordinator, Julia Castro is able to assist with this. These conversations are kept in a data binder with the ESL teacher.

## **Assessment Analysis**

Analysis of the assessment data reveals that our newcomers that are eligible to take the LAB-R are 50% as likely to pass the LAB-R. About half of the newcomers have some basic literacy in English and often lack the academic language necessary to excel in our school's rigorous academic atmosphere. These students who take the LAB-R and do not qualify for ESL services are flagged for support and are placed into classes with ELLs, in order for the ESL teacher to check in and support them during push-in periods.

The NYSESLAT data over three years demonstrates that students who achieve Advanced level on the NYSESLAT in elementary school tend to remain at Advanced proficiency throughout their middle school years. These students continue to receive ESL services, and often need more direct instruction in grammar, reading, and writing, as the middle school curriculum in English Language Arts is challenging for them. Further inspection of NYSESLAT data reveals that students who begin at our school in Beginner or Intermediate levels progress fairly quickly to Intermediate and Advanced levels by the end of eighth grade. The greatest gains among NYSESLAT scores are in the Listening/Speaking cluster, which supports Cummins' second language acquisition concept that social language, especially oral, develops more rapidly than academic language, which includes analysis of reading and expressive writing. Implications for instruction from this information suggest that ESL instruction must focus more on reading analysis, especially of non-fiction texts, as well as writing structure and vocabulary.

The 2009 ELA scores show gains for 73% of last year's ELL population at M.S. 447 who had also taken the ELA exam in 2008. This trend exhibits the effectiveness of content-based instruction for ELLs, which is the model used for instruction at this school. While 73% of the ELLs' scores were Level 2s, the gains reveal that students are progressing in English literacy. Rigorous standards and structured content-based instruction that produces language are methods that the ESL teacher and the content teachers are employing to raise the Level 2s to Level 3s in 2010.

Seven out of the nine ELLs (78%) who took the Math test in March 2009 scored a Level 3 or 4. The remaining two ELLs scored Level 2s.

These results indicate a broad range of ability among our ELLs, as well as a consistent need for scaffolds in content area instruction, as well as ESL instruction that focuses on Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). The Grow Report indicates that a majority of our

ELLs need specific mathematics practice with modeling, multiple representation, measurement, and patterns. Literary expression and response are the literacy areas marked for concentration with our ELLs.

The ELL Periodic Assessments have been used in the past three years (except last year- they were not sent to us) to drive ESL instruction. The ESL teacher has identified the skills assessed for each question and the patterns of correct answers for particular questions among the students. For example, if ten out of fifteen students got an inference question incorrect, the ESL teacher then teaches a lesson or two on making inferences while reading. The ELL Periodic Assessments have been a valuable tool for the ESL teacher in preparing her students for the ELA and NYSESLAT tests.

Success in our ESL program is measured by the ELLs' testing gains, but more importantly by their academic progress throughout the year. All teachers of ELLs assess the students' needs at the beginning of the school year, address those needs through cooperative English learning instruction, and reassess for progress.

### **Teacher Qualifications**

The ESL teacher at M.S. 447 is fully NYS certified in TESOL (K-12) with a Master's degree in TESOL from Hunter College. The Language Allocation team consists of the members of the Academic Intervention Team at M.S. 447, including the ESL teacher, Heidi Slouffman, Academic Intervention Specialist, Katherine Lavery, and Resource Specialist, Anna Rosenberg, along with principal, Lisa Gioe, and Assistant Principals Sharon Mahabir and Dawn Faraj. Heidi Slouffman prepared this Language Allocation Policy, with input from the Language Allocation Team.

### **Overall Mission Statement for ELLs**

At M.S. 447, we are committed to fostering a love for learning, guiding our English Language Learners to know and discover more about the world around them, and to ensuring their academic and linguistic success as they grow into competent, contributing citizens.

**APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION**  
*Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools*

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

**Part A: Needs Assessment Findings**

---

1. Describe the data and methodologies used to assess your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs to ensure that all parents are provided with appropriate and timely information in a language they can understand.  
**Upon arrival of all incoming 6<sup>th</sup> graders, we look through all records from elementary school to determine the translation needs of all students.**
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.  
**Using data collected from student files, we report on schools report card, all findings of various diverse groups in our school.**

**Part B: Strategies and Activities**

---

1. Describe the written translation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Include procedures to ensure timely provision of translated documents to parents determined to be in need of language assistance services. Indicate whether written translation services will be provided by an outside vendor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.  
**We currently use in house personnel to translate items into Spanish which is the second most popular language among our families. We also use the department of educations translation unit to translate documents into Spanish, Arabic, Chinese and Japanese.**
2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Indicate whether oral interpretation services will be provided by an outside contractor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.  
**We use in house personnel for Spanish however always bring in staff from the Legal Interpreting Services for parent teacher conferences, IEP meetings or other meetings as determined by the parent.**
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>.  
**Using data compiled by elementary schools, once students are accepted into our 6<sup>th</sup> grade, we check the new records to look for students whose parents may have language concerns. We then make sure to have all documents translated into the various languages as needed by either in house staff or the department of educations translation unit.**

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

*All schools must complete this appendix.*

**Background**

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

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

---

**CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS**

**KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM**

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

***1A. English Language Arts***

**Background**

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

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

### ELA Alignment Issues:

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

---

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

Formal and informal observations by literacy coach and principal, as well as regular walkthroughs and classroom visits. Throughout the year, we do an analysis of DYO data and predictive assessment. We review the state test data as well.

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?

During a 3 day June planning retreat, extensive curriculum maps were created. Teachers expect extensive written products for each unit as per the TC standards. Extensive funds have been spent on high interest libraries to support all learners.

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

---

**1B. Mathematics**

**Background**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Throughout the year, we do an analysis of DYO data and predictive assessment. We review the state test data as well. Formal and informal observations, student project based assignments.

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

In addition to differentiating instruction through math tracks we have begun differentiating within each track though common planning beginning June 2009 planning.

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

---

## **KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION**

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

### ***2A – ELA Instruction***

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

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

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

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?

We use the Teachers College workshop model which consists of a 10 minute mini lesson where skills are modeled. Students are then asked to practice the skill/ strategy taught during the independent/ group work time. We observe high engagement.

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

---

### **2B – Mathematics Instruction**

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol (SOM<sup>2</sup>)* and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

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

Formal and informal teacher and class observations. A math coach that supports professional development in best practices of teaching and creating classrooms that support instruction and learning. Planning lessons utilizing manipulatives and calculators. Purchase of Smart boards and sending teachers to professional development to implement their use.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

---

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

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?

Based on the data taken from our progress report, math scores have consistently increased annually. Formal and informal observations.

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

---

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

We look at teacher transfer rate.

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?

Teacher transfer rate is low.

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

---

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

Interview data (from classroom teachers and principals) indicate that professional development opportunities regarding curriculum, instruction, and monitoring progress for ELLs are being offered by the districts, however, they are not reaching a large audience. Many teachers interviewed did not believe such professional development was available to them. A number of district administrators interviewed

mentioned the presence of QTEL (Quality Teaching for English Learners) training, but few classroom teachers seemed aware of this program. Although city, district and some school-based policies (e.g., Language Allocation Policy) and plans for ELL instruction do exist, rarely were they effectively communicated to teachers through professional development and other avenues.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

The principal, assistant principal, and literacy coach inform the ESL teacher of professional development opportunities on a monthly basis. The ESL teacher seeks out relevant professional development in order to strengthen her pedagogy. She completed a five day QTEL training in 2007-2008 and uses the methods and strategies in her ESL instruction. She attends Teacher's College workshops specifically geared toward instructing ELLs.

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?

Based on student success, via testing and class performance, we can see that the ESL teacher is well-informed of professional development related to ESL instruction, attending workshops and using the information and strategies in her lesson planning and implementation.

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.

---

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

The ESL teacher is responsible, with the assistance of the assistant principal, for accessing and recording assessment data for each of the ELLs in the school. She keeps a binder with NYSESLAT, ELA, and Math scores, as well as scores from the previous year and the specific the needed skills and concepts each student needs to develop. The ESL teacher distributes this information to all of the teachers of the ELLs. She meets on a regular basis with each of the teachers to discuss the ELLs' progress and a specific instructional plan for the week.

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?

The content area teachers work with the ESL teacher to determine how best to serve each child.

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

---

## **KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

To support our special education teachers in achieving student progress, we have a strong Special education team which includes a Special Education administrator, IEP coordinator, AIS coordinator, part-time School Based Support team, team of Related Service providers (speech, occupational therapy, ESL), guidance counselor, social worker, the Brooklyn ISC Special Education Department and

Autism consultants. As we meet together each week, we discuss individual student progress, supports that are currently in place, what additional supports that may or may not be needed and review of goals and objectives. As each of one of us is an expert in our field, we share best practices to ensure we are servicing the needs of the whole child.

In addition, we continued to receive strong support from our Instructional Specialist in Special Education in learning and implementing best practices in co-teaching and differentiated instruction school-wide. Ongoing whole staff professional development and study groups throughout the year have given our teaching staff opportunities to learn about and implement co-teaching strategies within their lessons and planning time. Our IEP coordinator works closely with the administration and special education teachers to ensure all annual reviews are completed thoroughly, page by page, and on time. The Brooklyn ISC Special Education department continues to counsel our school team in understanding the data from SEC, CAP and ATS to ensure that we are in compliance with student services.

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?

To support our special education teachers in achieving student progress, we have a strong Special education team which includes a Special Education administrator, IEP coordinator, AIS coordinator, part-time School Based Support team, team of Related Service providers (speech, occupational therapy, ESL), guidance counselor, social worker, the Brooklyn ISC Special Education Department and Autism consultants. As we meet together each week, we discuss individual student progress, supports that are currently in place, what additional supports that may or may not be needed and review of goals and objectives. As each of one of us is an expert in our field, we share best practices to ensure we are servicing the needs of the whole child.

In addition, we continued to receive strong support from our Instructional Specialist in Special Education in learning and implementing best practices in co-teaching and differentiated instruction school-wide. Ongoing whole staff professional development and study groups throughout the year have given our teaching staff opportunities to learn about and implement co-teaching strategies within their lessons and planning time. Our IEP coordinator works closely with the administration and special education teachers to ensure all annual reviews are completed thoroughly, page by page, and on time. The Brooklyn ISC Special Education department continues to counsel our school team in understanding the data from SEC, CAP and ATS to ensure that we are in compliance with student services.

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

---

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

Although IEPs clearly specify testing accommodations and/or modifications for students with disabilities, they do *not* consistently specify accommodations and/or modifications for the *classroom environment* (including instruction). Further, there appears to be lack of alignment between the goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria that are included in student IEPs and the content on which these students

are assessed on grade-level state tests. Finally, IEPs do not regularly include behavioral plans—including behavioral goals and objectives—even for students with documented behavioral issues and concerns.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

Our students Individualized Education Plan and 504 information is shared and discussed during June planning, start of the school year staff meetings, department meetings throughout the year, and during weekly PPC, AIS/RS, and common planning meetings. All of our Special education teachers have a copy of their students' IEPs to guide them in achieving their students' goals and objectives. Both the special education and content teachers co-plan together to ensure all students receive the access to lessons and understanding of the content each day. Where needed, modifications to the student work are generated for students that may need additional support. These modifications include visual and tactile learning tools such as overheads, manipulatives, graphic organizers, computers/laptops, Alpha Smarts, etc. Also, to promote a positive learning environment for all, individual student success sheets, for either academic or behavior tracking, are used to help students take responsibility for their success.

As we meet together on Special education teams each week, we discuss individual student progress, supports that are currently in place, what additional supports that may or may not be needed and review of goals and objectives. As each of one of us is an expert in our field, we share best practices to ensure we are servicing the needs of the whole child. Our IEP coordinator works closely with the administration and special education teachers to ensure all annual reviews are completed thoroughly, page by page, and on time. Each of the Special education teachers maintain a data binder throughout the year to track students progress and uses the data, along with the performance indicators and state standards, to determine progression in a student's goals, objectives, and modified promotional criteria.

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?

Our students Individualized Education Plan and 504 information is shared and discussed during June planning, start of the school year staff meetings, department meetings throughout the year, and during weekly PPC, AIS/RS, and common planning meetings. All of our Special education teachers have a copy of their students' IEPs to guide them in achieving their students' goals and objectives. Both the special education and content teachers co-plan together to ensure all students receive the access to lessons and understanding of the content each day. Where needed, modifications to the student work are generated for students that may need additional support. These modifications include visual and tactile learning tools such as overheads, manipulatives, graphic organizers, computers/laptops, Alpha Smarts, etc. Also, to promote a positive learning environment for all, individual student success sheets, for either academic or behavior tracking, are used to help students take responsibility for their success.

As we meet together on Special education teams each week, we discuss individual student progress, supports that are currently in place, what additional supports that may or may not be needed and review of goals and objectives. As each of one of us is an expert in our field, we share best practices to ensure we are servicing the needs of the whole child. Our IEP coordinator works closely with the

administration and special education teachers to ensure all annual reviews are completed thoroughly, page by page, and on time. Each of the Special education teachers maintain a data binder throughout the year to track students progress and uses the data, along with the performance indicators and state standards, to determine progression in a student's goals, objectives, and modified promotional criteria.

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

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

*This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.*

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

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

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

*All schools must complete this appendix.*

### **Directions:**

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

### **Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)**

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

---

### **Part 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).

As of October 27, 2009 there are no students at MS 447 in temporary housing.

2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.

We did not receive Title I set aside funding.

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.