



**P.S. 6
LILLIE D. BLAKE SCHOOL
02M006**

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

SCHOOL: 02M006
ADDRESS: 45 EAST 81ST STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10028
TELEPHONE: (212) 737-9774
FAX: (212) 772-8669

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE	3
SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE.....	4
SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE.....	6
Part A. Narrative Description	6
Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot	7
SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT	10
SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS	12
SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN	13
REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010.....	20
APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM.....	18
APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs).....	24
APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION	25
APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS	27
APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT	32
APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURR).....	33
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.....	34
APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10 Error! Bookmark not defined.	46
APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)	47

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 02M006 **SCHOOL NAME:** PS 6 – Lillie. D. Blake School

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 45 East 81st Street, New York, NY 10028

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (212) 737-9774 **FAX:** (212) 772-8669

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Lauren Fontana **EMAIL ADDRESS:** lfontana@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Margaret Alverson

PRINCIPAL: Lauren Fontana

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Carla Greco

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Jennifer Nobandigani

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 02 **SSO NAME:** Children First Network #5

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Yuet Chu

SUPERINTENDENT: Daria Rigney

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
Lauren Fontana	*Principal or Designee	
Carla Greco	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Jennifer Nobandigani	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Eugenia Brown	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	
Margaret Alverson	Member/Parent	
Sherry Flynn	Member/Parent	
Martina Deignan	Member/Parent	
Debbie Teitelbaum	Member/Parent	
Brooke Lipskin	Member/Teacher	
Barbara Rosenblum	Member/Literacy Coach	
Janet Harvilchuck	Member/Teacher	

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

PS 6 is a nationally recognized leader in public education that holds high academic standards for all students. Investigative-based curriculum, interdisciplinary teaching and a highly motivated faculty serve as the foundation for identifying, developing and promoting successful strategies that meet the individual educational and emotional needs of PS 6 students. The needs of a diverse body of learners are met with programs such as Collaborative Team Teaching, intervention, and enrichment small group instruction.

PS6 is a school that strives for a balance between process-oriented instruction and the skills and strategies good educators have always valued. Teachers teach programs that are an outgrowth of their staff development and their own collaborative process across and within grades. At P.S. 6 we believe that the best instruction comes from good modeling, and that this must happen on two levels. First, teachers use their own writing process, mathematical thinking, and reading comprehension to mode specific strategies for students. Second, the fact that staff are deeply involved in furthering their own practices and continuing their own learning provides a model for student to do the same.

P.S. 6 teachers are more interested in the success of all students as individuals – academically, socially and creatively. To that end, PS 6 has a comprehensive art, music and dance program that tap into a multi-talented student body. The school values character education – training staff members, students and parents in social emotional education. PS 6 is committed to provided a balance between academic achievement and personal growth.

Our students **speak over 20 different languages** at home, including Albanian, Arabic, Bengali, Cantonese, Mandarin, French, Khmer, Georgian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Polish, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish and Urdu. Some of our families have recently immigrated to the United States. Our ESL teacher offers both pull-out and push- in small group instruction. She serves children scoring at the beginner, intermediate, and advanced proficiency levels. A goal for the coming year is for the ESL teacher to collaborate more with classrooms teachers, providing them with strategies to help their ELL students, and to support the learners with the ongoing classroom curriculum.

SECTION III – Cont’d

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT				
School Name:	PS 6 – Lillie D. Blake School			
District:	02	DBN #:	02M006	School BEDS Code #: 310200010006

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungraded			
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					94.7	94.7	96.8		
Kindergarten	119	140	138						
Grade 1	124	131	148						
Grade 2	141	134	119						
Grade 3	132	127	133						
Grade 4	149	133	126						
Grade 5	128	132	135						
Grade 6									
Grade 7									
Grade 8									
Grade 9									
Grade 10									
Grade 11									
Grade 12									
Ungraded									
Total									
				Poverty Rate: % of Enrollment					
				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
					6.4	5.0	5.2		
				Students in Temporary Housing: Total Number					
				(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
					0	3	0		
				Recent Immigrants: Total Number					
				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
					0	6	12		
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) – Total Number					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	22	24	24						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	49	69	69	Principal Suspensions	4	3	3		
Number all others	43	35	40	Superintendent Suspensions	2	0	0		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS										
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Special High School Programs: Total Number						
(As of October 31)				(As of October 31)		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		CTE Program Participants				
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes		0		0		0		Early College HS Participants		
# in Dual Lang. Programs		0		0		0				
# receiving ESL services only		16		21		17		Number of Staff: Includes all full-time staff		
# ELLs with IEPs		3		3		2		(As of October 31)		
				2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers		39		50		
				50		50				
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals		6		14		
				14		14				
(As of October 31)		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		Number of Educational Paraprofessionals		
		0		0		0		5		
								4		
								6		
				Teacher Qualifications:						
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09
(As of October 31)		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school		100
								100		100
American Indian or Alaska Native		0.5		2.3		4.89		Percent more than two years teaching in this school		69.2
Black or African American		5.0		5.0		4.89		Percent more than five years teaching anywhere		41.0
Hispanic or Latino		10.2		9.4		10.15		Percent Masters Degree or higher		87.0
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.		8.1		8.2		9.15		Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)		91.8
White		76.2		75.2		69.43				80.0
Multi-racial										95.0
Male		52.5		52.4		53.76				
Female		47.5		47.6		46.24				

2008-09 TITLE I STATUS				
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)		<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Title I
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:		<input type="checkbox"/> 2006-07	<input type="checkbox"/> 2007-08	<input type="checkbox"/> 2008-09
				<input type="checkbox"/> 2009-10

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:	
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvement – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvement – Year 2	
<input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action – Year 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Restructured – Year ____	
* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.			
Individual	Elementary/Middle Level		Secondary Level

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Subject/Area Ratings	ELA:	IGS	ELA:	
	Math:	IGS	Math:	
	Science:	IGS	Grad. Rate:	

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	√	√	√			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-			
Black or African American	-	-	-			
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	√	√	-			
White	√	√	√			
Multiracial	-	-	-			
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√				
Student groups making AYP in each subject	6	6	2			

Key: AYP Status

√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status		

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

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	NA
Overall Score	76.2	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	8.4	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	16.8	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	48.0	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
Additional Credit	3.0	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

School-Wide Student Performance on the NYS ELA Assessment								
All Tested Students								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	4	1.0	24	6.5	242	65.6	99	26.8
2008	5	1.3	31	8.2	263	70.1	77	20.4
2007	6	1.5	38	9.5	269	67.1	88	21.9

School-Wide Student Performance on the NYS Math Assessment								
All Tested Students								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	1	.2	13	3.4	166	43.1	205	53.2
2008	2	.5	12	3.1	159	42.0	206	54.4
2007	4	1.0	20	4.9	151	37.3	230	56.8

The above data confirms the strong academic performance of PS 6 students, where the varied needs of our students are met by strong instructional support from our teachers. In 2009, 92.4% of our students scored 3s or 4s in the New York State English Language Arts Test (in comparison to 89% in 2007), with 95.3% of our students doing similarly in the New York State Mathematics Test (in comparison to 94.1% in 2007). Further data analysis breakdowns and trends are available in each content area, with strong academic growth for students with IEPs in each of the two content strands.

While our students continue to perform well in meeting grade standards set by New York State, our school-based needs assessment revealed that the school required a more unified and cohesive school-wide word study curriculum from K-5 to support the English Language Arts. In addition, the needs assessment found a greater curricular and pedagogical link must be established for the student transition from 2nd to 3rd grades. To this end, we have outlined our goals specifically aligned with our school-needs assessment.

A significant factor impacting student academic gain has been the increasing use of targeted small group instruction. Over the last two years this has been our greatest accomplishment. Our teachers

have had professional development in how to use assessments to analyze students' strengths and needs to form small instructional groups. The groups are differentiated by learning style as well as learning need. Staff developers and coaches work with teachers to significantly enhance the knowledge base of teachers in this understanding. This methodology is used in all classrooms, K-5, on a daily basis. Extended day is another time in the day when targeted small group instruction is in place, and we have formed groups according to student needs.

One of the greatest barriers has been the need to retrain teachers in our methodology and curriculum. This is caused by teacher reorganization to new grades, as well as hiring new teachers. This means that some teachers need to be retrained to successfully carry out small groups appropriate to their current grade. While new programs, such as Words Their Way, will ultimately improve student achievement, at the onset the additional time and resources needed to train staff towards proficiency may *initially* slow down the overall effect.

A significant aid in our school is the high level of teacher professionalism and desire to grow from staff development. Teachers are reflective of their pedagogy and continually reevaluate methods and how they impact student achievement. In addition, the in-house coaching support plays a pivotal role in assisting teachers in making data driven decisions and implementing targeted instruction.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

Goal 1: To sustain student literacy skills through increased focus and unified curriculum across all grades in word study.

- In grades 1-5, students will master 2 stages of Words Their Way using the WTW curriculum in small differentiated groups during the course of a year. Students will progress along the developmental continuum starting at the place where they are in need of development according to the first assessment given. The WTW spelling assessments will be given a minimum of three times a year. In addition, students' writing will show evidence of the application of these skills, as measured in on demand writing samples and end of unit WTW spelling and dictation assessments.

Goal 2: To improve student mathematics achievement by using student work to form mathematical goals for differentiated groups of students. Professional development in lower grades will inform instruction and lead to specific gains in content knowledge and lead to 20% more students receiving the benchmark standard of a level 3 in the mathematics section on the June progress report.

- Teachers will collect beginning and end-of- unit assessment data from the Investigations curriculum to assess progress in each of the mathematical strands. Strands may take from 2 weeks to 5 weeks. After each strand's assessment, small group instruction will be formed based on the data collected. Specialists and the Math Coach will work with the targeted grades to provide planning and support on teaching concepts that demand higher order thinking skills. Based on this data, intervention specialists as well as classroom teachers will work with students who perform below the benchmark standard in specific targeted skills.

Goal 3: By November 2009 first grade teachers will teach targeted and focused reading and writing instruction for small groups to support student achievement.

- First grade students will demonstrate reading proficiency by increasing four or more levels above their October reading assessment measured by TC reading assessments (using Fountas and Pinnell guided reading levels). Teachers will meet with students 3 or more times a week in guided reading groups to model and assess strong reading strategies and provide instruction to move students to the next reading level. 85% of first grade students will be reading at or above grade level by June 2010 as measured by the TC running record assessments.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Arts – Word Study

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>Goal 1: To sustain student literacy skills through increased focus and unified curriculum across all grades in word study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In grades 1-5, students will master 2 stages of Words Their Way curriculum using the WTW spelling assessments. In addition, student writing will be expected to apply these skills to their every day writing using on demand writing samples. The WTW spelling assessments will be given a minimum of three times a year. In addition, students’ writing will show evidence of the application of these skills, as measured in on demand writing samples and end of unit WTW spelling and dictation assessments •
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Teachers will plan instruction to challenge each of the student groups to support differentiated word study instruction across the grades.</p> <p><i>Activities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect assessment data to form differentiated student word study groups by October 2009. • Starting the second month, each grade will provide targeted small group instruction, allowing for students who are performing above, at, and below grade standards. • Staff developers and coaches will support each grade on a weekly basis to implement word study groups effectively. • After each assessment period, coaches will support those teachers who need additional time to master the program. • All teachers will review the progress made to ensure mastery of the word study features. Teachers will look at bi-monthly assessments to determine whether students have mastered the word study features of the corresponding word stage. Small group instruction will be provided to support this endeavor. • Master lists of books in the building to support high frequency word acquisition. • Mentor teachers will be utilized to support professional development in each of the grades to support assessment, differentiation and instruction.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will submit to administration student word study assessment data at four points across the year. • Sponsor teacher word study groups to foster professional learning community.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p><i>Staffing and Funding</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize a full time literacy coach and mentor to provide support and teacher development in word study and facilitate staff study groups. • Utilize full time literacy coach and mentor to meet with teachers after each assessment period to analyze data collected to determine student growth. • Provide coverage and substitute teachers for teachers working in study groups, with literacy coaches and Words Their Way professional development. • Additional phonics based books available in the school will be catalogued for classroom use to support word study practice. • Parent volunteers will create word study materials – sorts, games, word searches to provide practice instruction for classrooms. • Invest NYSTL Textbook funds to purchase teacher guides and supplemental materials to support student sorts and word inquiry • Arrange support from the CFN network to sponsor additional pedagogical focus on incorporating word walls in classroom word study. <p><i>Scheduling</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule additional common planning period for all grades, K-5 • Create and implement coaching schedule to support new and experienced teachers for small-group word study strategy teaching. • Create a schedule for cluster teachers to push in the classroom and support small group instruction. • Create a schedule for extended day allowing for cross-grade targeted word study groups.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records of quarterly goals teachers have set for students. • Monthly reading levels collected by teachers • Running records of target students. • Words Their Way initial, formative and summative assessments.

Subject/Area (where relevant):

Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 2: To improve student mathematics achievement by using student work to form mathematical goals for differentiated groups of students. Professional development in lower grades will inform instruction and lead to specific gains in content knowledge and lead to 20% more students receiving the benchmark standard of a level 3 in the mathematics section on the June progress report.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Teachers will challenge students in K-2 by designing and implementing authentic instruction to target higher order thinking skills in mathematics. Teachers will use student work to assess their understanding of strategies and their ability to convey this knowledge.</p> <p>All teachers in K-2 will collaborate with the Math Coach to differentiate instruction and turn-key <i>Contexts In Learning</i> professional development work to foster student higher-order thinking skills.</p> <p><i>Activities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Collect beginning and end-of- unit assessment data from the Investigations curriculum to assess progress in each of the mathematical strands. Strands may take from 2 weeks to 5 weeks. After each strand’s assessment, small group instruction will be formed based on the data collected. Specialists and the Math Coach will work with the targeted grades to provide planning and support on teaching concepts that demand higher order thinking skills. Based on this data, intervention specialists as well as classroom teachers will work with students who perform below the benchmark standard in specific targeted skills.• The Math Coach will serve as the point person in coordinating professional development work with <i>Contexts in Learning</i>.• The Math Coach and Math Specialist will co-teach weekly with the classroom teachers to model targeted instruction to specific groups of students.• The Math Coach will meet with grade level teacher groups on a monthly basis to develop an understanding of how to analyze student work and use it to differentiate instruction in the classroom. Together they will develop a continuum of understanding for different strands so the teachers may successfully group their students.• Extended day groups will be formed to target the specific needs as analyzed through students’ work. Groups will be rotated twice a year to ensure that targeted instruction is flexible.• Fund professional development with Math in the City. Lower grade teachers will participate in Math in the City professional development in order to develop their own higher level teaching skills and to learn successful implementation methods of the current units.• Staffing & Funding will allow for purchase of books to support the <i>Contexts in Learning</i> units.• Expand the hours and days that the Math Specialist is available to work with lower grades.• Continue to staff a full time math coach.• Provide coverage for teachers to participate in study groups, work with Math Specialist & Coach,

	<p>and participate in Math in the City professional development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct lower grade staff surveys twice a year to examine growth in teacher comfort level in teaching mathematics. • Provide parent outreach math workshops to align parents with our curriculum and methodology.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p><i>Scheduling</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule common planning period for K-2. • Create and implement coaching schedule to support new and experienced teachers for differentiated instruction. • Create a schedule for math specialist to push in/pull out to work with target students.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze report card math data to measure the number of students who receive a standard grade of 3. Form groups of those students who are below the standard grade to provide extra time for instruction. • Analyze classroom and homework data as well as observational notes to anticipate students needing remedial or enrichment instruction. Reassess students for extended day groups and intervention work. • Survey students in Lower Grade Math Clubs to see if membership in these clubs contributes to higher level strategy work. • Evaluate end of unit assessments monthly for evidence of increased content knowledge as well as increased higher level thinking. • 90% of students are projected to master concepts of each unit. Small group instruction will be provided for those students who have not yet mastered concepts at end of unit. • Conduct a Staff Online Survey to measure understanding of math assessment and grouping for differentiated instruction.

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Arts – 1st Grade

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 3: First grade teachers will offer targeted and focused reading and writing instruction for small groups to support student achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First grade students will demonstrate reading proficiency at 4 levels or more above their October reading assessment measured by Fountas and Pinnell. • First grade students will demonstrate reading proficiency by increasing four or more levels above their October reading assessment measured by TC reading assessments (using Fountas and Pinnell guided reading levels.)
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>1st grade teachers will plan instruction to challenge each of the student groups to support differentiated, targeted literacy instruction in small groups. As many of our 1st grade students enter school for the first time, additional small group instruction is necessary to support student achievement. Teachers will meet with students 3 or more times a week in guided reading groups to model and assess strong reading strategies and provide instruction to move students to the next reading level. 85% of first grade students will be reading at or above grade level by June 2010 as measured by the TC running record assessments.</p> <p><i>Activities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect assessment data 4 times a year from Teachers College reading assessments. • Starting the second month, first grade will utilize the split-schedule (where half of the class attends a special, while the other half remains in the classroom) to provide targeted small group instruction. • The mentor teacher will be utilized to support professional development in first grade to support assessment, differentiation and instruction. • The mentor teacher will work with each first grade teacher immediately following each assessment period to analyze assessments in order to determine targeted small group instruction. Based on this data, intervention specialists as well as classroom teachers will work with students who perform below the benchmark standard in specific targeted skills. • Teachers will submit to administration student reading and writing data at four points across the year.

Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule

Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.

Staffing and Funding

- Utilize a full time literacy coach and mentor to provide support and teacher development in literacy & facilitate staff study groups.
- Utilize full time literacy coach and mentor to meet with teachers after each assessment period to analyze data collected to determine student growth. The coach and mentor will work with teachers to create new groups, based on information gained from these assessments.
- Provide coverage and substitute teachers for teachers working in study groups, with literacy coaches and Teachers College Reading and Writing professional development.
- Invest NYSTL Textbook funds to purchase guided reading books designed for small group instruction and supplemental materials to support student inquiry

Scheduling

- Design prep schedule so that all first grade teachers will have a split-schedule, where half of the class will be with a specialist while the other will be with a classroom teacher, and vice versa in the next period.
- Schedule common planning period for 1st grade.
- Create and implement coaching schedule to support new and experienced teachers for small-group literacy strategy teaching.
- Create a schedule for cluster teachers to push in the classroom and support small group instruction.

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

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

- Records of quarterly goals teachers have set for students. Goals will include the projected Fountas & Pinnell guided reading level each child will achieve by the next assessment period, as determined by the Teachers College assessment running records, as well as the writing level as determined by the Teachers College writing continuum.
- It is projected 85% of first graders will be reading on or above grade level by June 2010, increasing by at least 4 reading levels from October to June. Mid year progress reports will be analyzed to measure which students may not reach the recommended benchmark.
- Teachers will send independent reading levels to administration 3x a year for every student. Any student whose level does not increase across 2 months will be supported with additional small group guided reading or guided writing work.
- Monthly reading levels collected by teachers
- Initial and ongoing writing assessment of target students.
- Analyze classroom and homework data to anticipate students needing remedial or enrichment instruction. Reassess students for extended day groups and intervention

	<p>work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Administration observation
--	---

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	22	10	N/A	N/A	7		1	
1	23	8	N/A	N/A	16		2	
2	23	27	N/A	N/A	13		3	
3	11	19	N/A	N/A	7		0	
4	16	5	8	5	11		9	
5	11	5	10	7	22		1	
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Differentiate instruction, based on on-going assessments such as Teachers College Reading and Writing Project running records, in all grades ▪ Intervention program begins with Tier I interventions in-class, utilizing programs such as Wilson, Foundations ▪ Small-group instruction, focusing on guided reading, writing, and word study. ▪ Offered during the school day as well as during extended day. ▪ Push-in and pull-out programs conducted by AIS specialists.
Mathematics:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Differentiate instruction in all math classes -- Tier I intervention ▪ Evaluate effectiveness through frequent content and skills-based assessment, as well as data collected through the periodic assessments (grades 3-5) ▪ Small-group instruction, focusing on mathematical inquiry, skill-building, problem solving strategies. ▪ Offered during the school day as well as during extended day. ▪ Push-in and pull-out programs conducted by AIS specialists.
Science:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In addition to the State mandated periods of science instruction, students will receive an additional 45 minute period of science per week. ▪ The science lab will be used as a vehicle to provide additional instruction to grades 3-5. ▪ Offered during the school day as well as during extended day. ▪ Utilization of technology, such as SmartBoards, document cameras to assist visual learners.
Social Studies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Differentiate instruction in all social studies lessons -- Tier I intervention ▪ Evaluate through frequent content and skills-based assessment, as well as data collected through the periodic assessments (grades 3-5) ▪ Small-group instruction, focusing on social studies inquiry, skill-building, problem solving and critical thinking. ▪ Offered during the school day as well as during extended day. ▪ Push-in and pull-out programs conducted by AIS specialists.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide guidance and crisis counseling services during the school day, one period a week or more frequently if needed, to students in need of academic intervention services. ▪ Offered during the school day as well as during extended day. ▪ Students are assisted in learning how to deal with various personal issues including school, friends, family, current events, etc.

At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ offer clinical services, agency referrals, and educational, social and personal services during the school day on an as needed basis to at risk students. ▪ Offered during the school day as well as during extended day. ▪ Identify emotional, social, neurological factors that impede on student performance and provide prescriptive measures that address student needs by suggesting additional student support services.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide counseling services to at risk students. ▪ Offered during the school day as well as during extended day. ▪ Assist in learning how to deal with various personal and family issues that are adversely affecting student progress.
At-risk Health-related Services:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Offered during the school day as well as during extended day. ▪ Assist in learning how to cope with health related issues such as obesity, diabetes, asthma, etc.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

Part 1: School ELL Profile

A. Team Composition Language Allocation Policy

The LAP team consists of the following members of our school community:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Lauren Fontana	Principal
Amy Santucci	Assistant Principal
Daniel Kim	Assistant Principal
Marisa Moss	ELL Teacher
Jessica Underwood	Guidance Counselor
Pam Fuchs	Parent Coordinator

B. Teacher Qualifications

Our ELL teacher is properly certified in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) and is also certified to teach grades K-12. There are no certified foreign language teachers who are teaching Native Language Arts. There are no content area teachers with Bilingual Extensions. There are no Special Ed. Teachers with Bilingual Extensions, and there are no teachers who teach ELLs without ESL/Bilingual Certification. The teacher who teaches ESL is properly certified in all areas.

C. School Demographics

P.S. 6 is a K-5 elementary school located on 81st Street between Park and Madison Avenues, in the Upper East Side neighborhood of Manhattan. We currently serve 27 English Language Learners in a freestanding ELL program.

The total number of students at P.S. 6 is about 800. There are 24 technical English Language Learners, which accounts for about 3% of our school's population. 3 students are serviced by the ESL program as at-risk cases.

Part II: ELL Identification Process

In order to identify whether a student is eligible for ELL services, the first thing we do at P.S. 6 is have the parent(s) fill out a home language identification survey at registration. The Administration conduct the initial screening as well as the administration of the HLIS, along with the parent coordinator. The parents are told what the form is for and if needed, a translator is provided for interpretation. The HLIS form is also offered in a variety of languages. If a family speaks one of the languages that is offered in the translated version, they may fill out one in their NL. The Parent Coordinator will conduct an informal interview at this point, with the parents, while they fill out the HLIS form, and provide translations if necessary. If a parent or guardian has selected another language for at least 2 of the first four questions, and one of the second four questions, that student is then eligible for LAB-R testing. The ELL Teacher is the pedagogue who is responsible for conducting the LAB-R testing. The Lab-R testing must occur within the first 10 days of the academic school year. After the students are tested, students who scored at or below LAB-R cut scores will receive ELL services. If they scored higher than the cut score, they will not be entitled to ESL.

Steps are taken to annually evaluate ELLs using the NYSESLAT. Students who have scored low on the reading section for example, are grouped with others of the same or similar age to be pulled-out. This way, the low-reading group can focus on reading comprehension and reading skills, while the low-writing group may focus on writing skills. The NYSESLAT provides scores in all 4 categories of listening, speaking, reading and writing. It helps to evaluate where students are academically, and also in terms of language acquisition.

A Parent Orientation is held at the beginning of the school year. During this parent orientation, parents are asked to sign in and are given 2 packets. One is the general information for parents which is available in many different languages which are offered at the meeting along with English printed pamphlets. There's also a survey selection form they are given, but this is after they are shown the Parent Orientation DVD from Joel Klein. This DVD explains that as residents of NYC, they have 3 options: A freestanding ESL pull-out program, a Transitional Bilingual Education program, and also a Dual Language Program. We let the parents know that we offer the Freestanding ESL program, and that if they should desire one of the other programs they should consult with our Parent Coordinator, and go ahead and tour other schools that offer programs they want. Parents are given a choice to fill out the parent survey and program selection form right after the orientation, or they may take it home to consult with others, and to bring it back exactly 1 week from the orientation meeting. Copies of all program selection forms may be found in the ELL office. In the past few years, most if not all parents have selected the Freestanding ESL option on the program selection form. This makes it very easy to build alignment between parent choice and program offerings, since the program that they always choose is already in effect. No additional steps have been taken at this time to change anything because the #1 choice is, and has been, Freestanding ESL. As noted before, The first ELL parent orientation is during September. The ELL teacher is also available to meet with parents of newly enrolled students throughout the year. Parents are able to learn about the school community, state assessments, and general program requirements. The ELL teacher joins the parent-teacher conferences for all ELL students in order to ensure appropriate support for the child.

The ELL teacher will distribute entitlement letters and also non-entitlement letters home once LAB-R testing has closed. Students who are new to the school and who will qualify will receive a letter explaining entitlement services, while those who passed the LAB-R test will receive

letters explaining that they passed the LAB-R, and therefore do not qualify for ELL services. Students who have passed out of ESL due to passing the NYSESLAT will receive letters of notification that they are no longer entitled to ESL accommodations. Finally, ESL students who had previously been in ESL and did not pass out of the NYSESLAT will receive letters explaining their continued entitlement for ESL services.

Part III: ELL Demographics

A-B. The number of ESL students who are self contained is 3. Two are in 5th grade and one is in 3rd grade. For general ed, there are 5 kindergarten ELLs. There are 5 First grade ELLs, there are 3 Second grade ELLs, there are 3 Third grade ELLs, 2 Fourth Grade ELLs, and 3 Fifth Grade ELLs.

Years of Service:

	K	1	2	3	4	5
0	3	2	1	2	1	1
1	2	3		1	1	1
2			1			
3			1			
4						1
5						
6						

There are 24 technical English Language Learners, which accounts for about 3% of our school's population. 3 students are serviced by the ESL program as at-risk cases. We do not currently have any SIFE students. There is one ELL in year 6 here at P.S. 6. There are two students who are long term Ells. There are 3 ELLs in Special Education. The chart below shows the languages spoken by ELLs in each grade.

C.

Language	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Russian	1	2					3
Spanish			2		1		3
Albanian	1						1
Mongolian	1					1	2
Chinese	1	1		1			3
Japanese		1					1
Czech		1					1

Serb-Croat				1			1
Haitian-Creole					1		1
French			1		1	1	3
Korean				1			1
Farsi						1	1
Turkish	1						1
Portuguese				1			1
Bulgarian					1		1
Total ELLs							24

D. How instruction is delivered:

At P.S. 6 we align all ELL programs with the comprehensive core curriculum. The ESL teacher works collaboratively with classroom teachers to ensure the students are getting the most out of their small groups. While one ESL group may focus on reading elements, the classroom teacher can help the ESL teacher pick out appropriate texts to tie into a thematic unit that the class is studying. For example, if a class is studying apples, the teacher can give the ESL teacher appropriate apple books (if the ESL teacher doesn't have any) to read and discuss.

The ELL instruction is provided mostly through a “pull-out” model. The push-in model is also utilized a few of times per week, for the beginners. The ELL teacher, the Principal, and other staff members are continuously working to develop a schedule for ELL students in each grade and proficiency level that is compliant with the CR Part 154 regulations.

The ELL program is built around the four essential skills students must acquire: listening, speaking, reading and writing. The ELL instruction is content-based. The content, materials and lessons are adapted to meet each student’s needs and provide scaffolding for language. The ELL teacher utilizes differentiated teaching methods to ensure the success of each individual student at his or her level. There is a strong emphasis on literacy work, following a balanced language approach in the workshop model.

The program model that we have at P.S. 6 is a mix of Heterogeneous and Homogenous. We try to group by skill level as well as grade level. For example if there is a Fourth grader whose proficiency level is lower than that of the other 4th graders, but the same as the 3rd graders, that student would be placed with the Third grade group.

Students are served with the mandated number of minutes according to proficiency level in the ESL model. The advanced students are served with 4 periods of 45 minutes of ESL per week. In order to ensure the beginning and intermediate levels have 8 periods (or 360 minutes) a week, the push-in model is then utilized for the remaining minutes.

ESL instruction is given to the students on two levels. On the beginning and intermediate level, PS 6 provides 360 minutes of explicit instruction per week. On the advanced level, explicit instruction is provided 180 minutes per week. This is complemented by a minimum of 400 minutes of explicit ELA reading and writing instruction provided in the regular classrooms.

The ELA and ESL content delivered is a mixture of heterogeneous and homogeneous levels, based on both the grade and proficiency level of the student. This is complemented by the balanced literacy model that is provided within the classrooms throughout PS 6. Each of the content areas is made comprehensible by differentiating instruction for each of our students, providing different levels of scaffolding based on language proficiency and literacy with the content areas. A variety of resources are utilized, such as "just-right" books and manipulatives.

Instruction and intervention within the ELL subgroups is differentiated, depending on the fluency levels of the students. We try to pair the students with similar fluency students, but this is not always the case. In some cases, we may provide one student with enriched text, and another student with a controlled text, as in the Wilson articles. Other times worksheets may be adjusted according to skill level.

P.S. 6 does not currently have any SIFE students, meaning there is currently no program model in effect for those students. If we were to receive a SIFE student, we would place the student in an appropriate age range yet have them in the group that best suits their needs. Appropriate scaffolding techniques would be applied.

Our plan for ELLs in the US less than 3 years involves a lot of vocabulary-based lessons, as well as grammatically-enriched lessons. With the newcomers, generally the vocabulary range is our strongest focus, paired with picture books. With the intermediate newcomers, we usually work on sentence syntax and the grammar rules, as well as reading comprehension. For the ELLs who have been in the US for over 4 years, the lessons are very different than the ones for newcomers. These ELLs work mostly on reading and reading comprehension as well as essay writing and general writing and editing. However, we support these learners in a variety of content areas, including social studies and mathematics, scaffolding their learning through previewing, explaining concepts and ideas to peers and teachers, as well as manipulatives and other hands-on materials.

At P.S. 6 we do not currently have any students who have been here for over 6 years, so there is no program in place. However if we did have such students, the program would be based upon intensive study created using the NYSESLAT score reflecting areas of weakness. If one student keeps getting low scores in writing, they would be placed in a writing-intensive ESL class. For ELLs who have special needs, lessons are tailored according to the individual's specific needs. If there is a student who has trouble sitting and staying on task, methods like TPR and getting up and moving around the room to point at something or perhaps to create a vignette to portray comprehension may be helpful.

All the ELL students are continually assessed to examine the effectiveness of the instruction and the intervention program for all content areas. Additional at-risk intervention is available for instruction in Spanish for those who qualify.

No new programs are currently forecasted, as the needs of our students currently are being met by the above outlined program. However, we will be conducting a year-end program assessment to determine if a new curricular or new instructional approaches are needed based on projected needs of students in school year 2010-2011. Also to note, we will be examining whether or not we will discontinue the use of the Wilson Foundations program that is currently weaved into the ESL program, as the program is currently being implemented across the board by all the classrooms. This will eliminate redundancy, while freeing up additional instructional time to focus more on the specific needs of the ELL students.

ELL students are accorded full access to all school programs, such as the PS 6 Track Team and enrichment programs offered during Extended Day, as well as with outside community based organizations such as Big Apple Sports, the 92nd Y, and the After School Workshop.

The Extended Day program serves many of our ELL students, by utilizing small-group instruction for two days for an additional 100 minutes per week. During this time, the students are provided with additional support in the content areas, and specific areas that the students are having difficulty. For example, the current ELL students who attend the extended day program have been focusing on phonemic work, oral skills and reading comprehension to support their increased literacy for all content areas that they are working on in their classrooms.

A variety of differentiated instructional materials are utilized within the ESL program. The students have access to a wide variety of reading materials, from classroom libraries (most of them have over 1,000 titles), the school library (with over 100,000 titles) as well as the ESL library, which has over 500 titles, geared towards specific languages and cultures). In addition, specific programmatic texts tailored to the ELL population are used. For example, the school word study curriculum, Words Their Way, is modified to fit the specific learning needs of the students. In addition, the students are supported in helping them bridge their prior knowledge from a variety of cultures, by utilizing math and content supports. For example, many students who have been exposed to math in different cultures find it easier to explain their understanding while using blocks and other math manipulatives, as well as science concepts.

As mentioned above, to support age, grade and proficiency levels of the students, we align our material and instructional resources to meet their needs. There is a constant collaboration between the classes and the ESL program so that there is a consistency of message and content. For example, a 5th grade beginning English Language Learner will be matched with subject texts that would interest a 10 year old, while meeting the language needs of the same student by providing easier texts. This is coordinated frequently with the classroom teacher so that the students can actively participate in both programs.

Due to the comprehensive nature of our ESL program, we need to be proactive in contacting and informing ELL students who will be attending PS 6. Our office staff flags those families whose home language is not English, and accords them additional information and support through the resources available to the parent coordinator. Official documents and information about the school is available in the PS 6 webpage in a variety of translated languages. In addition, as many of our ELL population comes from the various hospitals (families of medical staff), consulates and embassies, we have working relationships with their staff to exchange information and provide additional resources for those new incoming families.

E. Schools with Dual Language Programs

N/A

F. Professional Development and Support for School Staff

Staff development is very useful and important for P.S. 6. Our ELL teacher and any other teacher who would like to participate, take advantage of opportunities like the NYS TESOL conferences, small ELL study groups offered within the network and other related workshops. The ELL teacher can stay informed about successful techniques and assessments. It is also a great way to become familiar with new publications and professional development resources. This past summer, our ESL teacher attended four different professional development workshops, all focused on supporting ELLs in various content areas.

There is an amount of professional development for all personnel who work with ELLs. Articles selected by the ESL teacher and the administration are handed out periodically from various reputable research sources on awareness of ELLs, methods and strategies for dealing with having an ELL in your classroom and other related topics. At staff meetings readings will be discussed and analyzed. Included in the staff meetings are APs, classroom teachers, cluster teachers, paraprofessionals, at-risk teachers, speech and language teachers, OT/PTs, school secretaries and other admin, the Parent Coordinator, guidance counselors, the special ed and CTT teachers, the psychologists and also all coordinators. Aside from the staff meetings that are held, the ESL teacher is consistently in talks with all classroom teachers, special education teachers, speech and language teachers and also the guidance counselor in order to keep up communications about the various ELLs in the school. In these meetings updates are revealed and strategies and methods are implemented to improve student achievements.

Support is provided to staff to assist ELLs as they transition from one school level to another. The previous teacher and the new teacher discuss the student at length, and the old teacher as well as the ESL teacher help to give the new teacher insightful strategies and methods that helped the student progress in the years past. Teachers old and new are especially collaborative in this way, constantly speaking to one another about ways to help scaffold the students.

There is a minimum of 7.5 hours of ELL training for all staff. We have records to maintain these requirements which have been met. During the professional development days, when students are not in attendance, there is a certain amount of time allotted for ESL information and training. This can last between one to two hours, depending on the session. By the end of the school year, we have met or have exceeded the 7.5 hours assigned to ELL training. Some of the training may come from the ELL teacher from her network meetings, and some of it may come from APs.

G. Parental Involvement

The parent involvement level at P.S. 6 is extremely high, whether or not it is concerning the parents of ELLs. Even parents of English speaking children contribute to ELL students needs. For example, they will donate books that the ESL teacher might have asked for, or put educational material or books into her room for her to see if it might be useful for the students. Parents of ELLs are also highly active. There are a few who are a part of the PTA and a few who volunteer their time occasionally to help at school. At the ESL Orientation meeting at the beginning of the year, many parents had conversations and exchanged numbers so they may be in contact with each other as well. All parents, whether ELL parents or not, dedicate time, energy, books and money to the school.

At this time P.S. 6 does not have Title III money, which is used to create workshops for students and parents after the school hours. In order to receive such monies, the ELL population must reach 30. We are very close, but do not have 30 ELLs. We do encourage all students to participate in one of many after school programs (i.e. Big Apple Sports, after school at PS6, the Y, etc.).

In order to evaluate the needs of the parents, the classroom teachers as well as the ESL teacher are in constant contact with these parents. The parents have all of the teachers' phone numbers and email addresses in case they should ever need to get in touch to talk about a concern or to ask a question. Parent-teacher conferences are held, and in many cases, follow-up meetings are held with parents a month or so after each parent teacher conference to check up on student progress and parent thoughts.

P.S. 6 has parental involvement activities, which address the needs of the parents as well as the children. We have several occasions when the parents are invited into the school to partake in various activities. We have Parents as Learning Partners, grade plays and sidewalk singers, special classroom events and celebrations, like publishing parties, when the parents come in and review student work and celebrate the hard work their children did. Parents needs include wanting to be involved in the students education, wanting to be in the know about what's happening with their child at school, and they want outside support. We provide every type of support a parent could want, with the exception of the after school workshops with Title III funding.

Use of Native Languages and Cultures

Native language and culture is continuously portrayed in students' independent writing and presentations. There are a number of foreign language books also available for newcomers, and also for special projects. Students are encouraged to share their cultural knowledge with others. There is a Holiday project every year where each child composes an essay about their favorite holiday in their home country. They then present their essay (accompanied by a drawing or some type of significant art) to the rest of the group. The work is celebrated by hanging on the wall for the rest of the semester for other students to enjoy. It's essential to make sure the student knows his or her culture is of great importance. This philosophy is especially important in the ELL classroom.

Instruction of ELLs

The NYSESLAT, LAB-R, and ELL interim assessments can all be used as a guideline for instruction, and also for student progress. Results from the interim assessments will reveal the areas of strength and weakness for each English Language Learner.

We will allow certain beginning newcomers the opportunity to write in their native languages. This will help them to begin expressing ideas, while they learn more and more and eventually begin participating in solely English.

A wide variety of materials are used to support ELLs in the classroom, including 1 pocket chart, magnetic journals, classroom, resource room and school libraries for both fictional and non-fictional books, leveled readers, a listening library, picture dictionaries of all levels and sizes, big books for the younger students, graphic organizers, word walls, Wilson Readers and additional materials, Words Their Way materials, and also computer programs.

Part IV. Assessment Analysis:

The chart below shows how many ELLs at each proficiency level we have in each grade. (Please note that this does not include "category X" students, who are in CTT.)

Level	K	1	2	3	4	5
Beginner (B)	2	0	1	1	1	1
Intermediate (I)	1	2	1	1	1	1
Advanced (A)	2	3	1	1	0	1

The ELL teacher can access students’ scores through ATS to determine the breakdown of test results. By analyzing the “Exam History Report,” we can also see patterns of student performance. This is very helpful when it comes time to group the classes and also to see what areas need improvement.

Certain information is revealed by the data patterns across proficiency levels and grades. For example, in Kindergarten there appears to be about an equal amount of Beginners, Intermediate and Advanced students. This same pattern follows through until Fifth grade, when all 3 levels have equal amounts of students. The only grade that doesn’t have at least one beginner is first grade. It looks like there is generally an equal distribution of Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced students across all grades.

When reviewing NYSESLAT data, our students are generally performing better in the areas of listening and speaking. Students who received low scores in reading typically had strengths in writing, and vice versa. The patterns across the NYSESLAT modalities (reading/writing and listening/speaking) do affect how the ELL teacher plans instruction. Decisions on how she proceeds with ELL instruction depend on the scores of the ELLs. If a certain group of students excel in the reading areas but not in writing, that class will have a much stronger focus on the writing aspect. The same would be true for a group who expressed low reading scores: that group would then work much more on reading and reading comprehension, and reading for fluency. Individual students who are in similar age ranges are grouped with others who show similar test results, with the exception of Kindergarteners and newcomers. Kindergarten is placed in one group, and newcomers are assigned to those groups who are at the beginning-intermediate stages, and never with advanced.

It is difficult to analyze ELL students who are taking tests versus tests in their home language. The only language that allows us to analyze differences at this point is Spanish. The Spanish kids who are special needs are having difficulties with tests both in English and in Spanish. Spanish speakers who are in general education and have moved here within the past couple years have more trouble taking tests in English as opposed to Spanish. General Ed students are typically having an easier time in their native language, if not both, while the students with Language processing problems or other special needs are struggling in both areas, regardless of language.

School leadership and teachers are using the results of the ELL Periodic Assessments. They help provide our teachers and staff with detailed information about our students’ strengths and weaknesses in English language development. These tests also serve as a resource to help the ELL teacher better plan for the small-group lessons. By seeing where specific strengths and weaknesses fall, we are not only better able to get the students placed, but we can also focus on problem areas and lean less on the areas they excel in. This is not to say a student who scores high on reading will not be able to read, but that writing will simply take up more of his time than reading will. These assessments are very similar to the NYSESLAT and to the ELA. The school is learning a lot of information about ELLs from the Periodic Assessments. As previously stated, we can see where

certain students are falling behind, and we can see where others are excelling. These tests give us an idea of what each student is capable of. This helps us all to plan and create different lessons with appropriate amounts of differentiation and scaffolding.

Assessment Analysis:

The scores listed below are from the 2008 New York State standardized tests. An analysis of the data indicates that English Language Learners are performing well in other content areas, such as math and science. None of them scored below a 3 on any tests, and many scored all 4's. This indicates that they are very strong in every other area. We will continue to support them with successful ELA instruction.

Academic Achievement of ELLs on Standardized Test

Name	Grade in 2008-09	ELA 2009	Math 2009	Science 2009
Ariel Rojas	3	AA	AA	NA
Regine Melenette	3	2	2	NA
Viktoriya Atanasova	3	LEP	3	NA
Diane DuBois	3	NA	NA	NA
Nomunbileg Sukhbold	4	3	4	2
Mathias Andre	4	NA	NA	NA
Mahbod Esmaili	4	LEP	4	1

2007-2008 Math and Science Test Results

<u>Name</u>	<u>Grade in 2007-2008</u>	<u>Math Score</u>	<u>Science Score</u>
Nomunbileg Sukhbold	3	4	NA
Mahbod Esmaili	3	NA	NA
Mathias Andre	3	NA	NA

Subgroups of ELLs

There are currently no SIFE students at this school. New students and beginners are seen more often than those who are advanced. During the extended-day it is extremely helpful to both our ELL teacher and the beginners to be able to receive that much more time in ELL.

There are multiple conferences between classroom teachers and the ELL teacher to help us provide transitional support for students who have achieved proficiency. If needed, the ELL teacher can also continue to take students who are “at-risk” but who no longer require services. This proves to be very helpful and successful.

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) K-5 **Number of Students to be Served:** 24 **LEP** 3 **Non-LEP**

Number of Teachers 1 **Other Staff (Specify)** _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

PS 6 Manhattan is a K-5 elementary school on Manhattan’s Upper Eastside. We serve approximately 27 English Language Learners from Kindergarten through fifth grade in a free-standing ESL program, both push-in and pull-out. Thirty-two (32) classes participate in the program since each class has a cluster of ELL/LEP students speaking a variety of languages.

English language and literacy instruction is provided by a fully certified ESL teacher as well as classroom teachers trained in balanced literacy. The team reaches approximately 30 students in grades K through five. The size of the ELL population varies during the year.

The ESL Program at PS 6 includes:

- Students are mainstreamed for gym, science, art, computers and music, as well as extra-curricular activities.
- The ESL teacher supports instruction in the content areas as well as English Language Arts.
- The literacy block includes all aspects of language usage, which is then modified by the ESL teacher. This program includes students who have passed the NYSESLAT or have reached advanced English levels and need continued support.
- Service is provided 4-5x a week, depending on the skill level of the ELL subgroup.

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.

Our ELL students' performance seems to show encouraging growth in both ELA and Math. Careful student-by-student analysis is required for deep understanding of the 2009 results for two reasons. First, SY 2009 is the third year that all students with at least one year of attendance in an English language school system have been required to test. This effectively tripled our testing population and included many students who were not required to test in prior years. Second, unlike with IEP students, the makeup of these ELL student groups is much more fluid and changeable even though the numbers have remained consistent over the course of the past three years. Due to our student population and the school's location near several consulates, students from various countries have attended the school and have subsequently returned to their native country, though they are often replaced by new students who are new to the English language.

The following instructional strategies, activities and programs are implemented to ensure that ELL/LEP students meet curricular standards and pass required ELA tests:

- ESL instruction provided by a fully certified ESL teacher.
- Direct, small-group, and differentiated ESL instruction for beginning through advanced ELLs through the use of a pull-out model, as well as push-in for lower grades.
- ESL instruction provided based on beginning, intermediate and advanced levels (as determined by the LAB-R or NYSESLAT) and consistent with CR Part 156 units of instruction requirements.
- ESL instruction fully aligned with SED ESL Learning Standards.
- Scaffolded content and materials/lessons adapted to each ELL's language needs. In the general education classroom, all academic content areas are taught using ESL strategies.
- ELA classroom instruction through a balanced literacy program where shared, independent, and guided reading, as well as independent and shared writing are emphasized.
- Longer periods and extended day sessions with the ESL teacher for more intensive instruction for students who require additional English support (usually new immigrants).
- Continued support of transitional students who have exited the program, including them in ESL groups when requested by parents (opt-in).
- Additional after-school sessions with children who do not perform well on standardized tests because of psychological interference or entering school with no first language literacy skills.
- Books on tape and other appropriate literature available in classroom lending libraries through listening centers.

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.

- Utilize a full time literacy coach and mentor to provide support and teacher development in literacy & facilitate staff study groups.
- Provide coverage and substitute teachers for teachers working in study groups, with literacy coaches and Teachers College Reading and Writing professional development specialized for supporting ELL students.
- Invest NYSTL Textbook funds to purchase guided reading books designed for small group instruction and supplemental materials to support student inquiry
- Provide coverage and substitute teachers for teachers working in study groups, with literacy coaches and ELL professional development.
- Arrange support from the CFN network to sponsor additional pedagogical focus on incorporating literacy-rich environment to support ELL literacy development.
- Collect assessment data to form differentiated student ELL groups, and ELL instructor support classroom instruction.

Form TIII – A (1)(b) – N/A. PS 6 Does not receive Title III funds.

School: 02M006 BEDS Code: 310200010006

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Per session - Per diem 	(e.g., \$9,978)	(Example: 200 hours of per session for ESL and General Ed teacher to support ELL Students: 200 hours x \$49.89 (current teacher per session rate with fringe) = \$9,978.00)
Purchased services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts. 	(e.g., \$5,000)	(Example: Consultant, Dr. John Doe, working with teachers and administrators 2 days a week on development of curriculum enhancements)
Supplies and materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed. 	(e.g., \$500)	(Example: 1 Books on Tape, Cassette Recorders, Headphones, Book Bins, Leveled Books)
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	(e.g., \$2,000)	(Example: 2 Rosetta Stone language development software packages for after school program)
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL		

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.

The school has utilized the home-language survey to initially assess PS 6's written translation and oral interpretation services necessary to effectively reach our parent population in a timely and appropriate manner. From that initial information gathered, parents are contacted by the parent coordinator and classroom teachers to deem parents' facility and comfort level with school information in English at the start of the school. A catalogue is created of the language services that are presently needed to increase parental involvement.

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.

PS 6 currently has translation and interpretation needs for:

Language	Families
Russian	3
Spanish	3
Albanian	1
Mongolian	2
Chinese	3
Japanese	1
Czech	1
Serb-Croat	1
Haitian-Creole	1
French	3
Korean	1
Farsi	1
Turkish	1

Portuguese	1
Bulgarian	1

This information was transmitted to each classroom teacher, specialist teachers, intervention specialists and ESL teacher, as well as the parent-coordinator who has maintained translation service needs from year to year.

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.

The vast majority of the school communication to parents is centered on the PS 6 website – through Connections, the web-based parent-newsletter. In addition to e-broadcast capabilities, the website boasts a translation service that is able to translate the entire content of information to a host of languages. These languages include Japanese, Chinese, Russian, Korean, Spanish, and French. In addition, the parent coordinator is responsible for informing both the school staff and the parent body for the translation and interpretation services that are available through the NYC Department of Education.

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

The majority of the oral translation needs are provided internally by the PS 6 staff. Currently, we have fluent speakers of Spanish (2 staff members), Haitian-Creole (1 staff member), Korean (2 staff members), Russian (1 staff member) who have participated in parent-teacher conferences, telephone conferences, as served as translators for presentations. Parent volunteers have filled the need for Japanese translation needs, while the Mongolian Consulate has provided additional support for the Mongolian students who join us through the families of the Embassy. The NYC DOE translation services are utilized for Mandarin language conferences and interpretation needs.

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>.

The Parent Coordinator takes the lead in ensuring full compliance with Chancellor’s Regulations A-663, to ensure that parents are fully aware of the translation and interpretation services at the disposal of parents. In addition to school-based and NYCDOE-produced flyers, the Parent Coordinator routinely reaches out to staff members and volunteers to update the school webpage and increase accessibility for parents.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

NA – PS 6 does not receive Title I Funds.

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

- All Title I schools must address requirements in Part A and Part B of this appendix.
- Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) schools must complete Part C of this appendix.
- Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) schools must complete Part D of this appendix.

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

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

N/A – PS 6 is not an NCLB Needs Improvement School.

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

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

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

1. For each area of school improvement identification (indicated on your pre-populated School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot, downloadable from your school’s NYCDOE webpage under “Statistics”), describe the school’s findings of the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified.
2. Describe the focused intervention(s) the school will implement to support improved achievement in the grade and subject areas for which the school was identified. Be sure to include strategies to address the needs of all disaggregated groups that failed to meet the AMO, Safe Harbor, and/or 95% participation rate requirement. Note: If this question was already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified. Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development (amounts specified in Part A of Appendix 4) will be used to remove the school from school improvement.
2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school’s strategy for providing high-quality professional development.
3. Describe how the school will notify parents about the school’s identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

N/A – PS 6 is not a School Under Registration Review

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

The PS 6 community collaborates on all levels and facets of instruction, and ELA instruction is no exception. Each grade has on multiple occasions gathered to assess the reading and writing needs of our students, based on close examination of student achievement data. The sources of data include, but not limited to, student independent and guided reading levels based on Fountas & Pinnell reading assessments, writing assessments based on the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Writing Continuum, phonics instruction information based on E-CLAS2 and Wilson Foundations assessments, Gates-McGinitie assessments (grade 2), New York City DOE predictive assessments for the upper grades (3-5) and the New York State English Language Arts Test.

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?

Based on the evidence gathered from the above mentioned sources, the school staff members evaluated school data to determine the success of the school reading and writing curriculum, the effectiveness of our curriculum maps, and the materials available for our ELL students. The results of our continuous evaluation have been shared with our School Leadership Team, as well as directly to the parent body through Meet The Teacher Night, parent workshops on reading and writing. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school educational program in the areas of curriculum mapping and the taught curriculum and support for our English Language 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.

Not Applicable.

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

Lead by the Math Articulation Team and the support of our Math Coach, each grade has on multiple occasions gathered to assess the mathematical learning needs of our students, based on close examination of student achievement data. The sources of data include, but not limited to, *TERC Investigations* Unit Assessments, Mad Minutes student computational assessments and student results, New York City DOE periodic assessments for the upper grades (3-5) and the New York State Mathematics Test (gr 3-5).

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?

Based on the evidence gathered from above mentioned sources, the school staff members evaluated school data to determine the success of the school's mathematics curriculum, the alignment of the instruction to both content and process strands of the New York State standards. The school's curriculum, based on an investigative methodology and the utilization of multiple problem solving strategies, support the establishment of a strong foundation for the students' mathematical growth in middle school. The results of our continuous evaluation has been shared with our School Leadership Team, as well as directly to the parent body through Meet The Teacher Night, Math Night, and parent workshops on investigative mathematical methodologies. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school educational program.

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

Not Applicable.

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

Classroom observations in audited schools show that direct instruction was the dominant instructional orientation for ELA instruction in almost 62 percent of K–8 classrooms. (In direct instruction, the teacher may use lecture- or questioning-type format. It includes instances when the teacher explains a concept, reads to students, or guides students in practicing a concept.) Direct instruction also was observed either frequently or extensively in approximately 54 percent of the high school ELA classrooms visited. On a positive note, high

academically focused class time (an estimate of the time spent engaged in educationally relevant activities) was observed frequently or extensively in more than 85 percent of K–8 classrooms visited, though this number fell slightly to just over 75 percent of classrooms at the high school level. Student engagement in ELA classes also was observed to be high – observed frequently or extensively 71 percent of the time in Grades K–8, but this percentage shrank to 49 percent at the high school level. Finally, independent seatwork (students working on self-paced worksheets or individual assignments) was observed frequently or extensively in approximately 32 percent of the K–8 ELA classrooms visited and just over 34 percent of classrooms in high school.

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

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

School staff members have utilized a variety of data sources to assess whether or not this finding is relevant to our school's educational program. The school administration, including the principal and two assistant principals, utilize frequent formative assessments and observations to offer support to classroom instruction. In addition, two mentor coaches (who also serve as literacy coaches) have worked directly with new and beginning teachers, as well as veteran teachers, to focus on the instructional pedagogy presented to students. Teacher self-assessments and goal setting has also informed whether the above findings were relevant to our school.

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?

PS 6 utilizes the workshop model in its balanced literacy approach to English Language Arts instruction. The vast majority of instruction is given to students within the workshop model, where direction instruction accounts for less than 10 minutes of a given 45-50 minute period. The remainder of the time period is allowed to independent work to foster student independence and active engagement. This has revealed a high level of student engagement and student time-on-task.

In addition to the workshop model, the school instructional staff have spearheaded efforts for greater differentiation through small group instruction. These small groups of students have been determined by teacher's effective use of data to gather student challenges and needs. Through small group instruction, teachers are supporting and scaffolding student learning by specifically targeting skill and strategies.

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

Not Applicable

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

School staff members have utilized a variety of data sources to assess whether or not this finding is relevant to our school’s educational program. The school administration, including the principal and two assistant principals, utilize frequent formative assessments and observations to offer support to classroom instruction. In addition, a full-time math coach work directly with new and beginning teachers, as well as veteran teachers, to focus on the instructional pedagogy presented to students. Teacher self-assessments and goal setting has also informed whether the above findings were relevant to our school.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

PS 6 again utilizes the workshop model in its investigative approach to TERC Investigations math curriculum. The vast majority of instruction is given to students within the workshop model, where direction instruction accounts for less than 10 minutes of a given 45-50 minute period. The remainder of the time period is allowed to independent work to foster student independence and active engagement. This has revealed a high level of student engagement and student time-on-task.

Paralleling the small-group instruction in ELA noted above, students are explicitly taught multiple strategies that enhance and grow students' understanding of number sense and operations (content) rather than rely purely on algorithmic shortcuts. Through working through problems, students across in all grades are expected to be fluent in multiple problem solving strategies, and communicate effectively how they arrived at their conclusion (process). There is a growing use of technology in the classrooms, facilitated by additional smart-boards in each floor of the school, as well as upgraded computers in the computer lab and classroom (slated for winter 2008).

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.

Not Applicable.

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.

The School Based Option Hiring Committee, as well as the school administration has evaluated school experience and stability issues utilizing school staff documentation.

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?

While PS 6 experienced a larger staff turnover in 2007-2008 two years ago, the 2009-2010 school year has seen greater staff stability. Out of 32 classroom teachers, only three classroom teachers are new to PS 6, through none of them are new in leading their own classroom. They join us from three different public elementary schools in New York City.

These teachers are currently supported by one mentor teacher who concurrently serve as a literacy coach, as well as a full-time mathematics coach. For planning purposes, each teacher participates in a common grade meeting at least once a week, in addition to curriculum meetings with literacy and math coaches. New teachers are carefully screened to ensure their full understanding of the latest and most effective research-based pedagogical methodologies.

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

Not applicable.

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

To gather relevant information, teacher interviews and teacher needs assessment were conducted to evaluate whether or not this finding was relevant to our school.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The school places a heavy emphasis on professional development to support learners across the board through Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Calendar Days and Staff Developers, and through that effort, additional support and training has been provided to support classroom teachers to foster the learning of ELL students. In addition, the ESL teacher collaborates closely with classroom teachers, to offer additional coordination and professional development.

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

Not applicable.

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

This information was based on interviews and surveys conducted with teachers, the ESL teacher and the school Data Specialist.

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?

There is close monitoring of student achievement progress focusing on ELLs' academic progress. There is a routine check-in process and frequent collaboration between the classroom teacher and the ESL teacher to ensure that the instruction is closely aligned and focused on supporting student work in the classroom. Each of the ELLs' independent reading levels are disbursed throughout the building so that intervention specialists are aware of the student achievement progress on a timely manner. This information is also tracked from year to year, to assess student proficiency and growth on a longitudinal level.

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

Not Applicable.

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

This finding has been vetted by the multiple constituencies that serve our special education population, from classroom and special education teachers, to intervention teachers, as well as the school-based clinical team.

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?

Based on the above assessment and analysis on 6.1 conducted in the SY2008-2009, the school identified the need for greater information and professional development on special education. Spearheaded by our lower-grade assistant principal and guidance counselor, the school has improved its Pupil Personnel Team procedures to be able to offer additional direct assistance to teachers. Through a greater focus on differentiating instructional approaches, teachers have been able to garner the expertise of those within the school to try out various intervention strategies on multiple levels. In addition, the principal has hosted various professional development opportunities for special education teachers focusing on the revisions on IEP programs and student goals. The focused effort last year has paid dividends in meeting the needs of the students through greater professional development of the pedagogical and special services staff.

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

Not Applicable.

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

The school assessed the veracity of the above key finding through discussions with intervention specialists and special education teachers.

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?

Classroom teachers at PS 6 routinely apply student modifications for the classroom environment and instruction for students with disabilities, according to their Individualized Education Programs. PS 6 is particularly strong in utilizing adaptive technology to support the needs of our students, where three of our classroom teachers wear FM units to support particular student auditory needs, or take advantage of classroom computers or AlphaSmarts to support students with grapho-motor challenges. While teachers cannot modify the New York State assessments, classroom teachers frequently modify ELA and Math curriculum to foster students’ understandings of the concepts presented.

Due to the efforts of the 2008-2009 school year, the school community has rectified the problem that many IEPs do not regularly include behavioral modification plans in the students’ IEPs. To address the final concern, a concerted effort was made to coordinate between the School-Based Support Team (the clinicians) and the classroom teachers so that students with documented behavioral issues can be better supported through a behavioral modification program. These programs are currently being added through a coordinated effort during the students’ annual and triennial conferences this academic year.

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

Not applicable.

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

N/A – PS 6 is not a Title I School.

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

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year).

There are no students at PS 6 in temporary housing.

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