



**PS 40
AUGUSTUS SAINT GAUDENS**

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

SCHOOL: 02M040

ADDRESS: 320 EAST 20TH STREET, NY, NY 10003

TELEPHONE: 212-475-5500

FAX: 212-533-5388

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE 3

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE..... 5

Part A. Narrative Description 5

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot 6

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT 10

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS 12

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN 13

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010..... 17

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

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)..... 21

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION 17

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS 18

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

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

APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL-LEVEL REFLECTION AND RESPONSE TO SYSTEM-WIDE IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS FROM AUDITS OF THE WRITTEN, TESTED, AND TAUGHT CURRICULUM IN ELA AND MATHEMATICS.....25Error! Bookmark not defined.

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 40 SCHOOL NAME: Augustus Saint-Gaudens

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 320 East 20th Street, NY, NY 10003

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 212-475-5500 FAX: 212-533-5388

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Marie Eng EMAIL ADDRESS: meng@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Daria Agosta/Thom Ostrowski

PRINCIPAL: Susan Felder

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Julie Coren
Stacy Bartlett

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Rhoda Cerritelli
Rebecca Sandler

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 2 SSO NAME: CFN 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
Susan Felder	*Principal or Designee	
Nicole Lahee	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Rhoda Cerritelli	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Daria Agosta	Teacher	
Stephanie Cheung	Teacher	
Catherine Garvey	Teacher	
Jill Hing	Parent	
Mary Beaudette	Parent	
Thom Ostrowski	Parent	
Susan Crawford	Parent	

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

Mission Statement:

PS 40 is a neighborhood school dedicated to the three inter-related concepts of academic excellence, social responsibility, and student self esteem. This philosophy drives our instruction and the way we live together as a community.

P.S. 40's mission is to provide a nurturing and supportive learning environment for each child. We promote academic excellence through a collaborative approach to standards-driven instruction in heterogeneous settings, and we provide all children with meaningful learning opportunities through, among other things, student inquiry within a clearly articulated, developmentally appropriate curricular framework.

Our curriculum is strengthened by the inclusion of music and the arts, Spanish, physical education, technology, and conflict resolution/peer mediation and opportunities. Community is the school-wide, integrated social studies theme that spirals up through the grades as students move from the concepts of home and neighborhood to a broader understanding of one's country and one's world. The theme of community is included both in our curriculum and in our environment and school culture.

P.S. 40 services the Gramercy, Cooper-Stuyvesant, Flatiron, and adjacent areas. It occupies the first three floors of two connected buildings. One of them – a century old five-story building – is also home to the Salk Middle School, which has 400+ students in grades 6 through 8. Because of its high enrollment, this year Salk expanded to one of the P.S. 40 third floor classrooms. Both schools share an auditorium, a lunchroom, two gymnasiums, a courtyard and other common spaces. P.S. 40 has 25 classrooms, a computer lab, a science lab, a music room, an art room, a library, and a rooftop playground.

Parent involvement is an essential component in the collaborative processes of the mission and the commitment to all students. Our success is dependent upon continuing and expanding the ongoing collegial and productive collaboration among teachers, administrators, specialists, support staff and members of the larger, surrounding neighborhood community and including parents as important partners in the education of their children.

P.S. 40 has two half-day pre-kindergarten classes, five kindergartens, four first grades, four second grades, four third grades, three fourth grades, and three fifth grades. The average class size in the lower grades (K-3) is 20. In grades 4 and 5 the average class size is 26. We have CTT classes in Kindergarten through Fifth grades. Additionally, we have one 12:1 second/third grade class. For the first time, this year, some of our 12:1 students will be taking the State exams.

SECTION III – Cont’d

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT										
School Name:		P.S. 040 Augustus Saint-Gaudens								
District:		2	DBN:		02M040	School BEDS Code:		310200010040		
DEMOGRAPHICS										
Grades Served:	Pre-K	√	3	√	7		11			
	K	√	4	√	8		12			
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded	√		
	2	√	6		10					
Enrollment					Attendance - % of days students attended:					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09			
Pre-K	33	31	29		94.2	95.1	TBD			
Kindergarten	100	96	92							
Grade 1	88	93	86	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:						
Grade 2	89	80	89	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
Grade 3	86	79	84		95.6	96.1	TBD			
Grade 4	78	79	84							
Grade 5	75	78	77	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:						
Grade 6	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
Grade 7	0	0	0		9.5	9.7	11.3			
Grade 8	0	0	0							
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:						
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
Grade 11	0	0	0		5	2	TBD			
Grade 12	0	0	0							
Ungraded	2	2	1	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:						
Total	551	546	535	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
					3	1	4			
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:						
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
# in Self-Contained Classes	0	10	11	Principal Suspensions	10	5	TBD			
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	37	42	45	Superintendent Suspensions	0	0	TBD			
Number all others	41	33	27							
These students are included in the enrollment information above.				Special High School Programs - Total Number:						
				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:						
(BESIS Survey)				(As of October 31)						
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09					2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0							
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0							
# receiving ESL services only	19	17	17	Number of Teachers	35	41	41			

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	0	0	4	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	6	7	7
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	2	3

Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade) <i>(As of October 31)</i>	Teacher Qualifications: <i>(As of October 31)</i>			2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09				
	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	97.6

				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	71.4	61.0	70.7
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	45.7	43.9	51.2

Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment: <i>(As of October 31)</i>				% Masters Degree or higher	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09				
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.7	0.9	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100.0	100.0	100.0
Black or African American	7.3	8.6	6.7				
Hispanic or Latino	15.2	13.7	12.0				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	14.5	12.6	14.2				
White	63.0	64.3	65.0				
Male	49.2	51.3	52.7				
Female	50.8	48.7	47.3				

2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

√	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)				
	Title I Targeted Assistance				
	Non-Title I				
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

SURR School (Yes/No)	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:			
----------------------	---	--	--	--

Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10) Based on 2008-09 Performance:

√	In Good Standing (IGS)			
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1			
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2			
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1			
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)			
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____			
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____			

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

Individual Subject/Area Ratings:

Elementary/Middle Level

ELA:	IGS
Math:	IGS
Science:	IGS

Secondary Level

ELA:	
Math:	
Graduation Rate:	

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		Grad Rate
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	
All Students	√	√	√			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Black or African American	-	-	-			
Hispanic or Latino	-	-	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-			
White	√	√	√			
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	-			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	4	4	2	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade:	TBD	Overall Evaluation:	TBD
Overall Score:	TBD	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	TBD
School Environment: <i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>	TBD	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	TBD
School Performance: <i>(Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)</i>	TBD	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	TBD
Student Progress: <i>(Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)</i>	TBD	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	TBD
Additional Credit:	TBD	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	TBD

KEY: AYP STATUS

√ = Made AYP
√ ^{SH} = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target
X = Did Not Make AYP
- = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status

KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE

Δ = Underdeveloped
▶ = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features
√ = Proficient
W = Well Developed
◇ = Outstanding

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

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

We conducted our needs assessment based on input from parents and teachers. Additionally, we used the most current data from interviews, professional development feedback, observations and running records, records of activities, records of attendance, standardized test scores, and analysis of student work. Information from these assessments is shared at weekly Pupil Personnel Team meetings and at staff/grade conferences and PTA meetings.

The greatest accomplishments over the past couple of years include:

- Implementation of shared and guided reading
- Implementation of school-wide assessments including Teachers College literacy assessments and writing assessments (Show Me Your Stuff)
- Improving the quality of our writing instruction
- Improving and expanding our special education program
- Expanding the arts programs to include a full-time art teacher as well as various art enrichment programs through outside organizations
- Improving communication with staff and parents, including daily, weekly, and monthly correspondence
- Adding more workshops for parents in order to educate them about their children's schooling

Aids to our school include:

- A dedicated, well trained and highly motivated teaching staff that collaborates at all levels
- Low staff turnover rate
- An active PTA that works collaboratively with the administration and teachers to provide a quality learning environment for all of our students
- Professional development that supports our curricular initiatives
- Good relationship between administration and UFT
- State reduced class size funding for grades K-3

Barriers to our school include:

- Excessive amount of paperwork
- Lack of PD time
- Shared space

Literacy continues to be a major focus. We find that there is a need for early identification and on-going support for at-risk students on all grade levels. We will utilize early intervention strategies and push-in/pull-out reading programs. Due to budget cuts we will be using our SETTS and ESL teachers to provide academic support to some of our struggling students. Our Pupil Personnel Team will meet weekly to discuss counseling and academic support for our at-risk population, and our classroom teachers will meet with SETSS teachers and other support staff to discuss the progress and changing needs of their students. Continuing success with reduced class size, we will strive to maintain smaller class size through the upper grades.

Test results in both Math and English Language Arts reveal an upward trend over the past three years. The citywide Progress Report has helped us look at percentages of students making at least one year of progress. We have grown in our percentage of student progress in both ELA and math from 2008 to 2009, with the most significant progress in math. **In math, we grew by 15.2% of students making one year of progress.**

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 have an effective Collaborative Team Teaching model across the grades.

By June 2010 the CTT teams will demonstrate progress towards mastery of team teaching techniques as stated on the Rubric for Best Practices, measured by four out of six teams of teachers moving at least one rubric level in at least 4 out of 7 categories from the initial (October) to final (May) evaluation.

For the first time in PS 40's history we have Collaborative Team Teaching classes in all grades K-5. Given this, our focus is to continue to develop effective models of team teaching. Additionally, this year five out of our six teams are new partnerships with varying degrees of experience ranging from first year teachers to teachers with 10+ years of CTT experience. We will provide professional development through inter and intra visitations, study groups, professional reading and workshops.

Goal #2 -- Reflect, revise and refine past goals and initiatives in order to deepen effective practice.

By June 2010 the teachers will demonstrate progress towards their personal goal developed through the Professional Learning Action Plan established in individual meetings in October. It is expected that at least 75% of teachers will demonstrate growth in their goal through observations, portfolios, and/or presentations.

Over the past several years we have implemented a comprehensive approach to the teaching learning cycle, which included in-depth work around guided reading, writing assessments, reading logs, comprehension rubrics and parent feedback. We have decided that teachers are digesting and perfecting their work around each of these topics and need time to fully implement varied components in their classrooms. Individual teacher goals are related to any of the previous programs and are supported through goal meetings and observations with a culminating project for some teachers. Professional Learning Action Plans will be established and evaluated at individual goal meetings with teachers in September/October and again in May/June.

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): Special Education

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To have an effective Collaborative Team Teaching model across the grades.</p> <p>By June 2010 the CTT teams will demonstrate progress towards mastery of team teaching techniques as stated on the Rubric for Best Practices, measured by four out of six teams of teachers moving at least one rubric level in at least 4 out of 7 categories from the initial (October) to final (May) evaluation.</p> <p>Results of the Rubric for Best Practices in a CTT Classroom, as provided by the DOE, will be collected and analyzed twice a year. The rubric will be completed by the teachers as well as administrators.</p> <p>Our goal will also be measured by classroom observations (formal and informal), lesson plans, and team conferences.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>CTT teachers and school leaders will participate in PD to achieve the goal. Teachers and school leaders will attend various professional development sessions, including PD with Kristin GoldMansour, who will work with specific teams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase network wide practice of all 6 co-teaching models in co-taught classrooms • To build teacher skills and basic knowledge in instructional strategies and best practices for inclusive education • To build teacher skills in developing individualized goal specific adaptive materials and supports

	<p>During the PD day on September 8, 2009, we will launch the school year with a CTT meeting to outline the expectations and goals specific to CTT.</p> <p>School leaders will meet individually with all teachers to discuss professional goals. CTT teachers will be encouraged to select goals related to their own CTT development.</p> <p>An upper grade and lower grade team will be chosen as point people in collecting and analyzing data, planning next steps, and turnkeying information to staff. They will focus on the work shared by Kristin GoldMansour.</p> <p>The Rubric for Best Practices in a CTT Classroom will be shared during the initial meeting. During the goal meetings and pre/post observation conferences we will use the rubric as a tool for assessing growth in each major topic. The rubric will be completed by the teachers and administrators.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Common CTT meeting time will be scheduled bi-monthly before or after school, providing training rate for teachers who choose to stay. Substitutes will be hired to cover lab sites and professional development.</p> <p>We will use Tax Levy funds to pay for workshops, and hire subs for PD and lab site coverages. We will also use NYSTL and PTA funds for the purchase of professional books. PTA funds will be used to pay for Kristin GoldMansour.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Interim progress will be measured by participation in the PD and attempts at new teaching methods.</p> <p>Four out of six teams of teachers will move at least one rubric level in at least 4 out of 7 categories from the initial (October) to final (May) evaluation.</p> <p>Teachers' conference notes and lesson plans.</p>

Subject/Area (where relevant): Professional Development

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>Reflect, revise and refine past goals and initiatives in order to deepen effective practice.</p> <p>By June 2010 the teachers will demonstrate progress towards their personal goal developed through the Professional Learning Action Plan established in individual meetings in October. It is expected that at least 75% of teachers will demonstrate growth in their goal through observations, portfolios, and/or presentations</p> <p>Through the Annual Performance Review (APR) project and/or observation we expect 75% of classroom teachers will demonstrate implementation of their goals. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ 6 out of 8 teachers who chose a project for their APR ❖ 18 out of 24 teachers who will have a formal observation <p>Increase participation on the Inquiry team by 3 more teachers</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>We will create a Professional Development Committee, including administrators and staff, to build capacity among our own staff. The committee will meet monthly to review teachers' goals and assist in planning professional development to meet the needs of the faculty. They will create a professional learning school-wide plan in order to provide differentiated PD for the faculty.</p> <p>Each teacher will meet with the principal or assistant principal within the first 6 weeks of school to discuss their individual goal. Using the Professional Learning Action Plan, shared at the September PD day, goals will be discussed and approved. A follow-up will take place later in the year to determine if the goal was met.</p> <p>Inquiry Team research will be expanded to include more teachers in a school-wide inquiry of spelling. This work began during June planning days last year. An analysis of spelling work based on the TC Assessment will provide the teachers with data to plan for the teaching of spelling. The Assessment will be administered three times during the school year. Writing assessments will take place throughout the school year and will provide information on the automaticity of spelling common words. Both of these assessments will provide information on the progress of student spelling.</p>

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>We will use Tax Levy funds to pay for per session for teachers. We will also use the Inquiry Team funding to pay per session to teachers who are part of the team.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Interim progress will be measured though check-ins with each teacher on their work toward their goal. Artifacts from Professional Learning Action Plans Inquiry team meeting agendas, notes Final progress will be measured through classroom observations and/or teacher portfolio/presentation</p>

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	3	3	N/A	N/A	5	0	0	0
1	24	24	N/A	N/A	5	0	0	0
2	22	22	N/A	N/A	4	0	0	0
3	26	26	N/A	N/A	7	0	0	0
4	19	19	19	19	2	1	0	0
5	13	13	13	13	5	1	1	0
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

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p>Kindergarten – small group instruction in phonemic awareness, letter-sound/sound-letter relationships and letter formation by our ESL teacher 1st grade –Small group guided reading, guided writing, and word study instruction during extended day. 2nd–5th grade – small group instruction in reading, and writing about reading, during the school day, two or three times per week, and during extended day. Using Guided Reading and word analysis skills to practice decoding and comprehension strategies such as retelling, predicting, inferring, questioning, visualizing, etc. QRI assessments three times during the year.</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p>Supporting student class work in small groups three times a week for grade 3, and two times a week for grades 4 and 5. Focusing on common confusions students have such as subtraction - grades 3 and 4, and multiplication – grade 5. Practicing skills with direct teaching and playing math games. Assessing students weekly and planning based on assessment and discussion with teachers. Extended day time will also be used to reteach and reinforce skills.</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>The Science intervention is done in conjunction with our literacy support. We utilize non-fiction texts to support students in research and study skills.</p>
<p>Social Studies:</p>	<p>The Social Studies intervention is done in conjunction with our literacy support. We utilize non-fiction texts to support upper-grade students in transitioning from learning to read to reading to learn.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<p>Students work in small groups to develop social skills with peers; learn anger management techniques, develop conflict resolution skills, and learn strategies for dealing with anxiety, stress, and distressing life situations.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</p>	<p>Individual counseling to develop strategies to deal and to cope with anxiety and stress so that attention can be more fully paid to academics.</p>

At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	Small group counseling to develop social skills, more appropriate ways to deal with anger and frustration, and conflict resolution especially through verbalizing preferences and negotiating.
At-risk Health-related Services:	

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.

LAP NARRATIVE FOR P.S. 40

P.S.40 is an elementary school serving the Gramercy Park and Stuyvesant Town communities. A guiding, organizational principle of the school is that diversity adds to the richness of education and, as such, classes are heterogeneously grouped. All classes are taught using the workshop model, combining mini-lessons with group, paired and independent work. Teachers use a balanced literacy approach in teaching reading which incorporates read alouds, independent reading, shared reading and guided reading. Daily periods are spent in writers' workshop. P.S. 40 uses a constructivist mathematics program, Investigations. In addition, all children participate in FOSS, a hands-on science program, and a research-based social studies curriculum. Technology is infused throughout the curriculum. The children also receive instruction in music, art, technology, Spanish, and physical education. The course of study is academically rigorous and in alignment with all New York State standards. The goal is to help all students meet and exceed the standards.

There are 582 PreK–5 students in the school, 19 of whom (3.5%) are English Language Learners. These students come from many different native language backgrounds. Based on our RHLA report there are many languages at P.S. 40. Some are Spanish, Serbo-Croatian, Albanian, Japanese, Korean, and Chinese.

Our LAP policy team is composed of the principal (Susan Felder), assistant principal (Stephanie Lukas), literacy coach (Melanie Levy), parent coordinator (Juliette Knight), guidance counselor (Shelly Hoberman), and the ESL teacher (Hilda Montane). Ms. Montane's license and certificates are filed with our payroll secretary, Debbie Wong. They are also in the ESL classroom filed in the ESL Document binder.

As a critical component of Children First reforms, program placement for ELLs is determined by parents' choice. On the basis of the HLIS and the results of the Lab-R, parents of newly enrolled ELLs receive a letter in English and their home language inviting them to come to a school meeting in which the program choices are explained. At that time, they receive a translated brochure, "Guide to English Language Learners" and

watch an orientation video. The program choices are Transitional Bilingual Education, Dual Language, and Freestanding English as a Second Language. Parents are informed that at this time, P.S.40 does not have a sufficient number of students from the same language group to form Transitional Bilingual Education classes but parents have the option and right to transfer their children to another school that does. Parents complete the Program Selection Form. Any parent wishing to transfer their child to a program not offered at PS 40, such as transitional bilingual or dual language, is directed to the parent coordinator to find a school that offers the requested program. Ongoing parent orientation meetings are scheduled with the parent coordinator as newly eligible students are enrolled in the school. Translation services are available for parents as needed.

After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, 100% of the parents have requested the Freestanding English as a Second Language program. The program offered has been fully aligned with parental request. If in the future, fifteen or more second language learners in contiguous grades from the same language group enroll in the school, the LAP team will reassess the school's program offerings.

During the first ten days of the school year, the ESL teacher tested newly enrolled ELLs with the Lab-R in order to determine students' proficiency in English. Based on the HLIS, the ESL teacher tested 29 newly admitted students using the LAB-R. Only six students were mandated ELLs. Two ELL students in kindergarten, new to New York City public school system, scored at the beginner level of proficiency and one kindergarten student scored advanced. One first grade student scored beginner level, one scored advanced, and one second grader scored beginner level. Next, the ESL teacher analyzed the Spring 2009 NYSESLAT scores. Out of the 21 students who took the test, 11 students in grades K-5 passed the test. Most of the students who passed the NYSESLAT scored at or above grade level in both ELA and math assessments. All special education students scored at the intermediate level. All the students in the first grade received an advanced score except one. Two third graders received an intermediate score and one second grader received an advanced score. There are eight new ELLs and seven continuing ELLs with scores from beginner to advanced. Most students did extremely well in Listening/Speaking and demonstrated a weakness in Reading/Writing while others did well in Reading/Writing but demonstrated a need for more support in Listening/Speaking.

The patterns across the four modalities have had tremendous consequences in making instructional decisions by the ESL teacher. Within each pull-out group and grade, there are students at various proficiency levels in the four modalities. As a result, all four modalities need to be explicitly taught. The best way to accomplish this has been to work with the children in cooperative learning groups, four to six students at a time. The children

have been able to improve their own proficiency while helping their peers. In addition, the classroom teachers have had to differentiate teaching and learning to meet the ELL students' needs.

After reviewing all the data in content area assessments and tests for ELLs, almost all students who scored proficient on the spring 2009 NYSESLAT scored at or above grade level in both math and ELA assessments. This year there are no fourth or fifth grade ELLs.

For assessments to be truly meaningful and inform instruction, it is necessary to analyze all the responses and not just the final score. NYSESLAT scores in both listening and speaking levels are proficient and advanced for all children, but reading and writing for one first grader is at a beginner level. All special education children scored intermediate in both reading and writing. Two first graders and one second grader scored advanced. Two third graders scored intermediate in reading and writing, but advanced in speaking and listening. Clearly, the higher the level of English proficiency, the more comprehensible the subject matter.

The Teachers College Reading and Writing assessment used by kindergarten through fifth grade teachers, also indicates some interesting patterns. The more obvious result was that there was a strong correlation between the NYSESLAT scores in reading and the comprehension scores on the TC assessment. However, when one does a complete item analysis, it is clear that ELLs, whose comprehension is on or near grade level, may still be struggling with vocabulary and/or decoding strategies.

Our ESL program includes two Special Education students, one is a long-term ELL, six newcomer ELLs and seven continuing ELLs in grades 1-3.

Although we do not have any **SIFE** students at the present time, our LAP team has been discussing how we would support these students. We would insure that they receive additional instructional time after school. In addition, we would arrange for a conference with the parents, providing a translator. The math coach is developing a nonverbal test in computation to determine students' strengths and weaknesses in performing mathematical operations. We would also design other content area assessments and hire a translator, if necessary, to administer them. If needed, we would purchase reading material on a beginners level, making sure that the material is age appropriate.

P.S. 40 uses a Freestanding ESL program model. There is one fully licensed ESL teacher. Children are placed in a monolingual class and the ESL teacher pulls them out into small groups as per CR Part 154. The results of the LAB-R for new admits and of the NYSESLAT score for those students who were in the public school system in Spring 2009 determine the number of ESL instructional units that a student receives. Instruction is provided in the four modalities using a thematic approach in alignment with New York State standards for English Language Arts, New York State

Learning Standards for English as a Second Language and content area standards. Various scaffolding strategies are employed including the use of modeling, graphic organizers and schema building. Realia picture cards and songs are incorporated into the curriculum. There is one newcomer at the school. Picture cards and trade books with picture support are used. A TPR methodology is employed. The ESL teacher articulates with the classroom teacher to help ensure that the students are achieving academic rigor and success.

Careful planning is required for long-term ELLs who have been in the New York City school system for six years or more. Periodic/interim assessments include: Acuity, Periodic Diagnostic ELA and Math (grades 3 through 5), and Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Assessment administered three times a year (grades K through 5). These tests are given to inform instruction. All our first through third grade ELLs attend the four days a week (37.5 minutes) extended day program for additional instructional support. New methodologies may need to be put in place. For instance, if the student is having difficulty decoding, the Wilson Program might be used. If deemed necessary, a referral would be made and the student further evaluated and assessed by the School Based Support Team. These assessments might need to be administered in English and the home language.

One present third grade student reached proficiency in all modalities on the Spring 2009 NYSESLAT. To make certain that this student is successful academically, he receives push-in services by the ESL teacher. The ESL teacher breaks down instructions into smaller chunks so that they are comprehensible. When in need, these proficient students also receive additional instruction after school in literacy and test preparation for the ELA. In addition, even if their math skills are good, they may be weak in content area vocabulary and, thus, would be provided with additional after school support in mathematics and standardized test preparation.

The mandated number of instructional minutes is provided according to proficiency level. Of the 15 mandated ELLs in P.S. 40, **6** are on the advanced level (1 in kindergarten, 4 in first grade, 1 in second grade). There are **5** beginner level students (2 in kindergarten, 2 in first grade, and 1 in second grade). There are **4** intermediate level students (2 in special education and 2 in the third grade). Three second grade students are at an intermediate level. These students are in our 12 to 1 class and as per their IEP they do not receive ESL instruction.

In order to be in compliance with CR Part 154, beginner students in grades K–2 are grouped together. Intermediate students in grades 2 and 3 are grouped together. All advanced students in grades K–2 are also grouped together. Students in beginner and intermediate levels receive 8 periods of ESL instruction per week while those in the advanced level receive 4 periods of ESL instruction. (Each period is 45 minutes in duration.) Three

ESL students do not receive ESL as per their IEP. ELLs who have reached NYSESLAT proficiency are supported during reading and writing workshop in their classrooms at least twice a week.

A component of the balanced literacy program is independent reading. As a result, the children always have independent reading books. The ESL teacher confers with the ELL students to make sure they can decode and comprehend the books they are reading. In addition, the ESL teacher has her own library that is organized thematically and by independent reading levels. Among the other resources the ESL teacher uses authentic literature as well as songs and poems from teacher resource books such as: Words Their Way - Pearson Learning Group, Singable Songs for the Very Young by Sherrill B. Flora and Poem of the Week selected by Maria Fleming. In addition, picture cards, realia and Fontas and Pinnell leveled guided reading books support the literacy instruction and the content area work. Instruction is in thematic units so that the social studies and science curriculum can be supported.

Technology instruction is provided for all ELLs once a week in our new Apple Technology Lab. During regular classroom time, ELLs have ample opportunity to use the class computers.

P.S. 40 takes part in a variety of strategies to assist ELLs in the transition from elementary to middle school level. In the fall, during parent conferences, the classroom teacher and, if necessary, the Spanish-speaking ESL teacher explain the process of visiting and applying to middle school. Tours are scheduled throughout the winter and spring so that parents can make informed choices for their children. Based on our NYSESLAT scores, middle school candidates are placed in appropriate ESL programs.

All teachers at P.S. 40 are receiving professional development. The ESL teacher attends all school-wide professional development and interprets the material to best suit the needs of her ELL students. The thrust this school year is on how to use supporting structures or scaffolding to help the ELLs reach proficiency in English and in the content areas. Many of these techniques are already in place in the classrooms as part of the balanced literacy program and content area curriculum. Among the scaffolding strategies being explored are modeling, metacognition, schema building, text representation and how to use graphic organizers, realia and pictures. Some of the resources being used are 7 Keys to Comprehension by Susan Zimmermann and Chryse Hutchins 2003, Boy Writers by Ralph Fletcher, and Active Literacy Across the Curriculum by Heidi Hayes Jacobs (Eye on Education, Inc. 2006).

The Special Education teacher meets with the ESL teacher once a month to discuss strategies that drive instruction for the Special Education ELLs in the four modalities, listening, speaking, reading and writing, as per Jose P.

Parental involvement is key to academic success. At P.S. 40, all kindergarten parents are invited and encouraged to come into the classroom and sit with their children for the first 15 minutes of each school day. This eases the transition for all kindergarten children. In order to increase involvement, translation monies are being used to hire translators during parent-teacher conferences. Native culture is honored throughout the school and parents and students are encouraged to share customs, language and foods with the school community. Children are encouraged to bring books in their native language to share with their ESL peers. Spanish books are always provided for students to take home and read. In addition, many K-1 ELLs are involved in our parents as reading partners. During this time parents read one on one with students to expose them to language and literacy.

In conclusion, P.S. 40 has a Language Allocation Policy based on the Freestanding English as a Second Language model and incorporates all principles that pertain to this model including coherence, academic rigor, explicit ESL instruction with a certified ESL teacher, content area instruction aligned to the standards and ongoing assessment in content areas, as well as English language development.

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

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

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

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.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: _____ BEDS Code: _____

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Per session - Per diem 	N/A	
Purchased services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts. 	N/A	
Supplies and materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed. 	N/A	

Educational Software (Object Code 199)	N/A	
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.

Through our ATS system a home language report is generated in order to determine the major languages spoken at P.S. 40. Written translation in the student's home language is provided whenever necessary. Appropriate forms are downloaded from the DOE website in the languages needed. The parent coordinator has access to all Translation and Interpretation information. Materials are obtained through the coordinator when needed

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.

. According to our ATS report RHLA, P.S. 40 speaks three major languages Spanish, Serbo-Croatian and Albanian. These finding are reported to the school community on the school web-site.

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.

In-house staff members provide written translation in Spanish. The Translation and Interpretation Unit is used to translate documents when necessary. Classroom teachers request written or oral translation from the parent coordinator. Since there are in-house staff member who speak Spanish, most written and oral translation is conducted by one of our bilingual staff members.

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

Oral interpretation at P.S. 40 is usually provided by in-house staff members. Our ESL teacher, Hilda Montane provides Spanish interpretation during parent teacher conferences. Outside services are provided whenever needed.

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>.

As per CR A-663 requirements, P.S. 40 uses interpretation services either on-site or over the phone. Our parent coordinator, Juliette Knight conducts informal interviews with our parents during registration. On-site or over-the-phone services are provided for parents who need the services.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

PS 40 is using the SLT as a vehicle for researching these findings and determining if they are applicable to our school. A subcommittee has been formed to research and gather data on this topic. Our SLT meetings will be used to share and discuss pertinent information.

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?

- Curriculum maps created by teachers in consultation with literacy staff developers include skills and strategies as well as content.
- Curriculum maps align to state standards. Standards are used when planning and help us guide instruction.
- Assessment data (Teachers College running records, etc.) is used to inform instruction and meet individual student's needs.
- Reading materials are ordered that support various reading levels. Two book rooms are in the school, and teachers sign out these books regularly.
- Our extended day program is organized in groups based upon specific academic needs.
- Our ELL students receive similar instruction as the children in the general classroom. The teacher often pushes into classrooms to support the classroom curriculum.

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

Same as 1A.1.

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? Our school does not use Everyday Mathematics. Our curriculum is TERC or Investigations.

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

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

We engage in thoughtful planning of instruction cross/intra-grade. Within grade levels, we plan ELA instruction weekly to meet the needs of our diverse population.

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?

While direct instruction is one tool that our teachers utilize in the classroom, student-centered directed activities are also an integral part of our instructional day. The workshop model, which includes a clear teaching point and an opportunity for students to practice this work independently, is the basis for our instruction.

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

The SLT is now working in subcommittees to discuss ways to differentiate mathematics instruction and utilize technology during mathematics classes.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

2B.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?

Our school received a technology grant to upgrade our computer lab and technology equipment for use in the classrooms. The teachers are participating in professional development workshops with our full-time technology expert, Brad Ashley. Technology and laptop carts are available for use in all classrooms. The Smartboard is also available for use in the library, as well as the computer lab and two fifth grade classes, for interactive instruction for students.

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

We will continue to analyze teacher turnover rates, however this is not an issue at our school.

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?

In analyzing the organization sheets from the past 5 years, we find that very few teachers choose to leave PS 40 on their own accord. Typically, we have between 2-4 first year teachers each year.

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

4.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. As part of the SLT's responsibilities, we will consult with Hilda Montane, our ELL teacher, to discuss how PS 40 can continue to address the needs of our ELL students.

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?

Due to the fact that our ELL population is fewer than 20 students, this has not been a major area of focus in the past. We plan to include our ELL teacher in our grade-level planning meetings. She currently plans instruction with individual teachers.

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

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 is provided, the data are not disaggregated by proficiency level of ELL student, students' time in the United States, or type of program in which the ELL is enrolled (i.e., ESL, TBE, Dual Language, or general education).

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

5.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. As mentioned above, we are establishing a subcommittee within the SLT to address avenues for dissemination of data about our ELL students and how it can inform instruction.

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?

Through the work of our Inquiry Team, we are studying the academic progress of our ELL students. Our focus for our action-research project is spelling. The Inquiry Team will update the school staff periodically of their findings. Through observations of the ELL instruction, we will gather data on monitoring progress.

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

6.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. We are currently engaging in discussions about professional opportunities for all teachers. Our special education liaison, Stephanie Lukas, in consultation with the PPT is evaluating and planning for special education professional development.

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?

Through our Empowerment Network, we have many professional development opportunities including inter-visitations, special education liaison forums, and workshops for paraprofessionals.

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

7.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. The IEP Team, along with the Special Education Teachers, continually reviews all student documents to ensure that accommodations are documented accurately.

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?

Evidence can be found on the IEP documents where the goals, objectives, and modifications are outlined. During Annual Reviews, the assistant principal engages in quality assurance.

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

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

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