



ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON SCHOOL

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN

(CEP)

SCHOOL: 02M183
ADDRESS: 419 EAST 66TH STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10065
TELEPHONE: 212-734-7719
FAX: 212-861-8314

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 183 **SCHOOL NAME:** Robert Louis Stevenson School

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 419 East 66th Street, New York, NY 10065

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 212-734-7719 **FAX:** 212-861-8314

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Mary Anne Sacco **EMAIL ADDRESS:** msacco@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Lorraine Levey

PRINCIPAL: Mary Anne Sacco

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Veronica Humphreys

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Jennifer Fitzgerald

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 02 **SSO NAME:** CFN5

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
Mary Anne Sacco	*Principal or Designee	
Veronica Humphreys	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Jennifer Fitzgerald	*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	
Susie Levin-Miller	Member/Parent	
Liz Lesnick	Member/Parent	
Dawn Berkowitz-Ader	Member/Parent	
Randi Schey	Member/Teacher	
Susan Beshel	Member/Teacher	
Amanda Hirsch	Member/Teacher	
Kimberly Banks	Member/Teacher	

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

P.S. 183 is an empowerment school serving approximately 650 students in kindergarten through fifth grade. We celebrate the diverse backgrounds and the 40 plus languages spoken by our student population. This year our school population grew by approximately 60 students across all grades. With our proximity to Memorial-Sloan Kettering, New York Presbyterian Hospital and Rockefeller University, many of our parents are physicians and/or research scientists who come from all over the world to be here. Together with native neighborhood families, they create a school community, which uniquely resembles the diversity of New York City. This extremely supportive and dedicated community of families dedicates their time, money and expertise to enrich and enhance the school, helping to create a welcoming and collaborative learning environment.

P.S. 183 is a collaborative learning environment dedicated to providing academically rigorous and standards-based instruction to its students, while maintaining a child-centered approach to learning. Our curriculum reflects standards and individual needs of students. A balanced literacy program addresses the needs of a variety of learners (i.e. high-achieving, ELL, in need of improvement) while maintaining the integrity of the workshop model and whole class instruction. Literacy components are aligned with New York State and City standard in literacy instruction.

At P.S. 183, we strongly believe that each child brings a unique gift and it is our intent to develop individual strengths. We have consistently high expectations of students, and our staff members foster a learning environment where students feel confident to take risks and work to their potential. We have Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) classrooms in each grade, which adheres to our school's child-centered and inclusive philosophy of addressing the needs of all children. In addition to meeting both school and state goals and standards, our broad and engaging curriculum includes a strong emphasis on the arts and literacy instruction.

We create and maintain strong partnerships with outside entities to support and promote the academic and social needs of students and families.

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. 183 Robert L. Stevenson						
District:	2	DBN:	02M183	School BEDS Code:	310200010183		
DEMOGRAPHICS							
Grades Served:	Pre-K		3	√	7		11
	K	√	4	√	8		12
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded
	2	√	6		10		
Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09
Pre-K	0	0	0		94.9	95.2	94.7
Kindergarten	115	115	126	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 1	126	101	107	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 2	98	115	96		94.9	96.3	95.5
Grade 3	91	77	85	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 4	100	77	85	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 5	69	90	69		16.0	16.0	16.4
Grade 6	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 7	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 8	0	0	0		1	0	3
Grade 9	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 11	0	0	0		11	7	0
Grade 12	0	0	0	Special Education Enrollment:			
Ungraded	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Total	599	584	588				
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	0	0	Principal Suspensions	0	0	1
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	56	52	59	Superintendent Suspensions	0	0	0
Number all others	33	38	39	Special High School Programs - Total Number:			
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:			
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# receiving ESL services only	55	51	53	Number of Teachers	34	48	45

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	5	1	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	4	11	10
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	3	3
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	50.0	50.0	71.1
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	35.3	33.3	40.0
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher	76.0	77.0	78.0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100.0	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.7	2.0	2.4				
Black or African American	7.5	7.2	7.7				
Hispanic or Latino	14.7	13.9	12.2				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	17.9	18.7	16.5				
White	59.3	58.2	59.5				
Male	50.4	51.9	52.9				
Female	49.6	48.1	47.1				
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 (2008-09) Based on 2007-08 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

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

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate
All Students	√	√	√			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-			
Black or African American	-	-	-			
Hispanic or Latino	-	-	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	√	√	-			
White	√	√	√			
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	-			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	5	5	2	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade:	A	Overall Evaluation:	NR
Overall Score:	87.5	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment:	8.6	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
School Performance:	15.1	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
Student Progress:	60		
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>			
Additional Credit:	3.8		

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

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

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

Performance Trends

Student Performance and Progress from 2007-2008 school year to 2008 -2009

Category	Percentage Point Change
ELA % of Students at 3 or 4	4.30%
ELA Median Student Proficiency	-0.04%
Math: % of Students at 3 or 4	1.40%
Math: Median Student Proficiency	-0.01%
ELA % of Students Making at least 1 yr progress	8.00%
Math % of Students Making at least 1 yr progress	10.60%

We have made progress on an absolute basis and relative to our peers on the percentage of students scoring a 3 or a 4 in ELA and Math. 229 out of 255 children scored a 3 or a 4 in ELA. 247 out of 260 children scored a 3 or a 4 in Math. We have increased the percentage of our students making at least one years' progress in ELA and Math. Our progress on all measures is strong relative to our peer group. There was a 4.3% increase in the number of students receiving a 3 or a 4 on the ELA, and our score relative to our peers' score jumped from 44.9% in 2007-2008 to 62.3% in the number of students receiving a proficient score. We now score above 50% of our peer schools in student performance in ELA.

However, despite the increase in the number of students receiving a 3 or a 4 in ELA, the median student proficiency dropped .04%. Our ELA median student proficiency relative to our peer group is at the low end of the 2nd quartile.

Our overall performance in math is stronger than in ELA. Our score in mathematics relative to our peer schools increased from 48.8% to 59.8%. We continue to score above 50% of our peer schools in student performance in mathematics.

The Average Change in Student Proficiency for Level 3 and 4 students was relatively low for ELA (.03). The Average Change in Student Proficiency for Level 3 and 4 students in Math was (.11). The Average Change in Student Proficiency for Level 1 and 2 students was relatively low for ELA (.02). The Average Change in Student Proficiency for Level 1 and 2 students in Math was (.17).

Our high needs population made the most significant gains in both the ELA and mathematics test.

Student Group	% Pt Change
ELA: Special Education Students	0%
ELA: Other Students in the Lowest 1/3 Citywide	9.1%
ELA: ELL's	40%
Math: Special Education Students	3%
Math: Other Students in the Lowest 1/3	8.6%
Math: ELL's	21%

Our Greatest Accomplishments:

As evident by our student performance and progress, our school has made significant gains from year to year. We are now in the 3rd quartile for student performance compared to our peers in ELA and mathematics. Our median scores for both the ELA and the math tests are in the proficient range and we continue to increase the number of students receiving a 3 or a 4 on each test. Our most remarkable progress is noted in our high needs students.

Our school's ELL population continues to make significant progress in both Mathematics and English Language Arts performance, as evidenced by the significant gains in standardized test performance highlighted above.

The Learning Environment Survey shows progress in how the school is being perceived by the parents and teachers, as well as views that the education and teacher quality continues to improve. There were overall gains in every category from both the parent and teacher perspective. The most notable changes are in the percentage of parents that are Satisfied or Very Satisfied in the quality of their child's teacher and the overall education their child is receiving. In 2006-2007, 89% of parents were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of their child's teacher, in 2007-08, 97% were. In 2006-07 only 84% were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of education their child received. In 2007-08, 95% of parents were satisfied or very satisfied. That is a significant jump in overall happiness of the parent community.

Significant Aids and Barriers:

One factor contributing to an increase in performance is the use of Inquiry Teams. Teachers have been charged with becoming experts in using data to identify a change in instructional practice that will accelerate learning for a specific group of students. One of the principal's PPR goals is to increase the participation rate of teachers in inquiry work via teacher teams. In the 2009-2010 school year, there are four inquiry teams involving math and literacy and include teachers of general education and special education across all grade levels.

A potential barrier to our continued success is our ability to support our stronger students; this is borne out of relatively low performance levels relative to our peer schools, and the potential for greater progress on median ELA scores. This parallels the concerns noted by parents on the School Leadership Team Surveys as well as the Learning Environment Surveys. Parents identified the need for more challenging courses and more enrichment programs. To address the previous barrier, enrichment programs have been created to challenge all children, Children are able to take Chess as a class, and attend enrichment classes in extended day for Science, Art, and Math. In addition, small group

instruction before/after school focuses on moving children from 3's to 4's on both the NYS English Language Arts and Mathematics exams.

While P.S. 183 benefits greatly from the hospital and research community, it also is a more transient population than other neighborhood schools. As children frequently enter or leave our school, it can disrupt consistency in the classroom.

Our community also has a significant number of bilingual students. English Language Learners also affect our ELA scores. Our math scores, however, remain consistently higher as language is not a barrier to success on the mathematics exam. However, to address this barrier, enrichment groups have been created to challenge all children, including the higher performing students. Two groups focus on moving children from a 3 to a 4 on both the ELA and the mathematics tests. Children are also able to take Chess as a class, attend enrichment classes in extended day for Science, Art and Math. After school classes for ELL learners in literacy are also offered.

Enrollment for the 2009-2010 school year has increased from 588 in June 2009, to 648 in October 2009. Our kindergarten registration process brought unprecedented numbers and resulted in a "waitlist." Enrollment has increased significantly across all grade levels. For example, our class size in fourth grade in 2008-2009 school year was 21-24 and in the 2009-2010 school year it has increased to 28-30 students.

P.S. 183 has made extraordinary progress over the years and is an excellent school. While we have a few natural barriers to increasing student scores, we have created action plans to alleviate them. We continue to reflect and revise according to the needs of our students. We are confident that P.S. 183 will continue to make progress in all areas as we have done so in the past.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

- To improve mathematics instruction with an emphasis on differentiation in order to meet the needs of students at all proficiency levels
- To increase achievement in the area of Social Studies literacy in grades 3-5 by strengthening and vertically aligning the curriculum to improve instruction
- To increase participation rate of teachers in inquiry team work via teacher teams
- To strengthen and improve the overall system for professional development, while vertically aligning curriculum across grades.
- To strengthen and improve literacy instruction and learning across the grades with an emphasis on differentiating instruction based on assessment results

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): Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will continue to develop number sense and utilize their understanding of mathematical concepts to solve problems, reason about mathematics and communicate their mathematical ideas with insight and accuracy. • Students will continue to develop logical and critical mathematical thinking skills and develop problem solving skills. • To strengthen and improve math instruction and learning across the grades with an emphasis on differentiating instruction based on assessment results.
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement <i>Investigations in Number and Space</i> math program in grades K-5, focusing on problem solving, questioning and experimentation throughout September – June. • Teachers will use assessment data to inform whole class instruction and differentiation. • Build teacher capacity and knowledge in mathematics through inquiry team work and professional development opportunities. • Two inquiry teams will be put in place. The Inquiry Team questions will focus on improving math instruction and providing intervention through the use of curriculum assessment data. • Math Study groups will focus on teaching and learning mathematics with understanding. • Lesson Study was conducted in Kindergarten focusing on deepening students engagement and understanding. • Teachers and coach will target high-performing math students (based on previous standardized test scores) in grades 3-5 who will be invited to an enrichment program.

<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full-time math coach/data specialist will work with all grade levels. • Math consultant will provide additional support and professional development to coach and teachers and help with parent workshops. • Inquiry team will include a teacher from every grade level and these teachers will share the information with their grade level colleagues. • Monthly grade level meetings will be dedicated to math topics and facilitated by the math coach or teachers. • Teachers will participate in Developing Mathematical Ideas professional development. • Select teachers participated in Math in the City for continued development in mathematical concepts and training in their supplemental materials. <p>Responsible staff members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Mary Anne Sacco, Principal ➤ Tara Napoleoni, Assistant Principal ➤ Melissa Getzels, Math Coach ➤ Kate Abell, Math consultant and support ➤ Classroom teachers
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will be selected to participate in DYO Implications Meetings • Improvement in math as evidenced by progress on math DYO (4x/year) and end-of-unit curriculum assessments. • Improvement in math instruction as evidenced by formal and informal observations by teachers. • Results from the Inquiry Team Studies. • Results of standardized test scores.

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will continue to develop literacy skills in reading and writing that will enable them to use effective strategies for comprehension in reading and writing with fluency and variety • To strengthen and improve literacy instruction and learning across the grades with an emphasis on differentiating instruction based on formal and informal
--	--

	<p>assessment results and conference notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To continue to develop effective assessment tools and approaches in literacy instruction that help to address needs of a wide range of learning abilities
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate Professional Development time and resources for the collaborative development of literacy unit plans in reading and writing • A Curriculum committee will be formed, and facilitated by a teacher-leader in training, to begin vertical planning and recording of units in reading and writing • Working documents of units of study will be developed and made accessible to all teachers • Funds will be allocated to provide planning time after school for teachers, for literacy consultant support, and alignment of curriculum across grades • To differentiate and create enrichment and extended groups for additional ELA practice <p>Responsible staff members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Mary Anne Sacco, Principal ➤ Tara Napoleoni, Assistant Principal <p>Classroom teachers</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate funds for professional development workshops. • Allocate funds for afterschool per-session for teacher planning. • Allocate funds for purchasing curriculum resources. <p>Schedule common planning time for teachers to meet and plan.</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>A curriculum document collaborative written with teachers, administration and consultants that is standards-based and relevant to the needs of the grade level and school</p> <p>Working documents of units of study in reading and writing instruction will be developed and made accessible to entire school staff</p>

Subject/Area (where relevant):	Science
---------------------------------------	----------------

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By the end of the year, Grades K-5 Science Scope and Sequence will be aligned with the NYC and NYS Standards with the implementation of the FOSS program. This includes: Promoting the understanding of relationships and common themes that connect science, mathematics and technology by developing students’ ability of information systems.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Our Action Plan for Science recognizes that young scientists are thinkers, researchers, investigators and communicators. They interpret data, make decisions, document findings and draw conclusions that spark new questions and provide new directions of inquiry.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement the <i>FOSS Program</i> (Full Option Science System) that was developed by the Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California at Berkeley. 2. In Grades 3-5, continue to deepen instruction of Foss and Harcourt <i>Science</i> textbook and modules. FOSS and Harcourt modules are an inquiry-based curriculum that fully meets the goals of the National Science Educational Standards and the New York City Standards for Science. 3. Science teachers will work with community contacts/resources to further develop scientist-teacher partnerships, particularly with Rockefeller University and to expand and supplement instructional opportunities. 4. Science teachers will work collaboratively with classroom teachers to implement science program and to provide support with the science program and curriculum integration. Science teachers will provide science opportunities in our science classroom and in the general classroom two to four periods per week. In Addition, Science teachers will supplement and enhance scientific knowledge and teaching with Smartboard technology. 5. Ongoing professional development is provided to our science teachers, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ City-wide Professional Development days ➤ American Museum of Natural History Education Programs for New York City Schools and Teachers

- **Wildlife Conservation Society Education Programs**
- **Membership and participation in professional organizations, such as the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)**
- 6. Extended day science enrichment program for students.**
- 7. Students participation in a science expo to share their love of science and expand on scientific concepts explored in the classroom.**

Responsible staff members:

- **Mary Anne Sacco, Principal**
- **Tara Napoleoni, Assistant Principal**
- **Amy Carroll (K-2); Beth Baribault (3-5), Science Teachers**
- **Classroom Teachers**

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	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K	5-10 beginning in February '10	10 beginning in February '10	N/A	N/A	3			
1	10	10	N/A	N/A	1			
2	10	10	N/A	N/A	2			
3	16	15	N/A	N/A	8			
4	10	10			7	1		
5	10	10			1	2		
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	<p>All AIS are overseen by the Pupil Personnel Team, which meets for 1 hour weekly to follow progress and/or further needs and supports for Tier I-IV students AIS students also include our at-risk students who are in need of additional support, not necessarily mandated based on test scores.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AIS for at risk ELA students are being implemented as follows • Differentiated instruction in all classes – Tier I • In grades K-3, Wilson and/or Guided Reading and Writing instruction are provided for Tier II students (max group size of 4), either push in or pull out model, 2-3 periods weekly. • Additionally, K-2 at-risk ELA students attend Extended Day sessions, 1-4 days weekly for further support • In grades 3-5, at-risk ELA students attend Extended Day sessions, 1-4 times weekly for additional support • In grades 3-5, At Risk ELA referred referred for Tier II intervention are supported with an additional 2-3 periods of direct support driven by Schools Attuned Model. Teacher works on organizational and study skills, as well as intervention-based support. Based on need and scheduling constraints services are either push in or pull out. • Upper grade students also receive ELA support during Extended Day sessions, 1-4 X weekly . Length of intervention cycle varies from 8 weeks to full year coverage.
Mathematics:	<p>AIS in math is implemented in several different ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiation instruction in all math classes – Tier I intervention • Through teacher based assessments and observations, as well as DY0 in grades 3-5, Tier II intervention students are determined. • Tier II students in grades K-2 receive between 1-3 periods of instruction through Extended Day small group instruction and may also work at risk 1-2 periods per week with SETTS teacher to strengthen basic mathematical concepts • Tier II students in grades 3-5 receive small group support through the Navigator mathematics intervention program and/or participated in extended day class.

Science:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students receive NYS mandated periods of science instruction per week. All instruction is differentiated. • Students receive extended day science instruction
Social Studies:	Students receive NYS mandated periods of social studies instruction per week. All instruction is differentiated.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	The guidance counselor provides guidance and crisis counseling services during the school day. Separate at risk social skills groups (based on age and needs) meet one period per week to assist students in coping with various personal issues. The social skills group are co-facilitated by the school social worker.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	The school psychologist offers clinical services, agency referrals and educational, social and personal services on an as needed basis to at risk students.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	The social worker provides counseling and group work to at risk students and outreach to families on an need basis, throughout the school day. Additionally, combining expertise with the guidance counselor, social skills groups meet on a weekly basis to assist students in coping with various personal and family issues adversely affecting student progress.
At-risk Health-related Services:	Health-related services are overseen by the school nurse. Staff with health-related concerns confer with her on a daily basis, either through established written communication or in person. Students are assisted and instructed by school nurse on learning how to cope with general issues related to maintaining healthy habits, and health related issues such as asthma, obesity, diabetes, etc.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

SEE ATTACHMENT: LAP WORKSHEET

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) K-5 Number of Students to be Served: 59 LEP _____ Non-LEP _____

Number of Teachers 2 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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.*
- 2 Summarize the major findings of your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs. Describe how the findings were reported to the school community.*

At PS 183, New York City Board of Education posters are displayed in the main office, to inform parents in their native languages that translation services for school matters are available free to them. These translation services begin at registration time. The Home Language Identification Survey administered to parents of children who have a home language other than English is available in the following languages in addition to English: Albanian, Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, French, Hebrew, Haitian Creole, Hindi, Korean, Polish, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, and Urdu, the languages identified as most prevalent by the City of New York.

The school secretary is trained in administration of all registration forms, including how to help parents whose English language fluency is less than proficient. Upon completion of the HLIS form the ESL teachers are notified and each HLIS form is checked to ensure its completion, including previous education and the parent or guardian's signature.

Those HLIS forms indicating that the enrolled student speaks another language besides English in the home are tested with the LAB-R. All students who speak another language see names posted on a language bulletin board at the entrance to the school, a popular and reassuring feature to later entrants who can show their own children that there are many students like them in the school, and perhaps even others who speak the same home language. Registrants' contact information (parent's email addresses, phone numbers etc.) is written down and filed. The primary language of the home is listed on the student's blue emergency card should a teacher or staff member need to contact the family, and entered into ATS.

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.

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.

3 Describe how the school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services. 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>.

Parents who are bilingual are often called to help serve as translators for field trips, publishing parties and other events. The language board posts every language spoken at P.S. 183 and students, teacher and corresponding staff speaking each language. Students, parents and the surrounding school community often refer to the language board when looking for play dates or translators or when they have general questions about a specific language. From the first day of school, parents and guardians of students whose native language is not English are given all notices in English, however they are also introduced to school staff (assistants, paraprofessionals, student teachers, etc.) who speak their native language and will answer questions or translate important notices for them. Bilingual staff is called down into the main office on an as-needed basis to meet the parents in front of the language board to help translate or assist.

Written translations of important documents are obtained via email from bilingual parent volunteers. Ms. Burton, the ESL teacher, uses the contact information found on the HLIS forms or on ATS to reach out to these parents. Annually a list of bilingual adults is compiled and added to previous lists, since parents whose children have graduated from the school are especially pleased to offer this service, as it indicates that their family's bilingualism is valued and remembered. NYU graduate students studying TESOL or Applied Linguistics also volunteer to translate during parent-teacher conferences, at ESL information sessions, and for state testing. Lists of these graduate students are compiled from the steady stream of observers in the ESL room. If no translator from the PS 183 community or NYU is deemed appropriate, then a written translation request is sent to the board of education and an outside vendor is used for translation services.

09-10 ELL LANGUAGE DISTRIBUTION BY GRADE, PLUS TRANSITIONAL STUDENTS WHO RECENTLY EXITED ESL STILL BEING SERVED AS NEEDED

09/10	K	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	TOTALS
-------	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--------

	Albanian		Albanian	Albanian			3	Albanian
	Chinese		Chinese	Bengali			1	Bengali
			Croatian	Chinese	Chinese2		5	Chinese
				Czech			1	Croatian
				Dutch			1	Czech
				Finnish2			2	Dutch
	French	French			French	French2	5	Finnish
	Hebrew	Hebrew2	Hebrew2	Hebrew3	Hebrew	Hebrew3	12	French
			Hungarian				1	Hebrew
	Italian				Italian	Italian	3	Hungarian
	Japanese			Japanese2	Japanese		4	Italian
	Korean	Korean	Korean		Korean	Korean	5	Japanese
	Portuguese		Portuguese	Portuguese	Portuguese 2		5	Korean
	Russian	Russian	Russian3		Russian		6	Portuguese
	Spanish2	Spanish3	Spanish3	Spanish2	Spanish6	Spanish5	21	Russian
		Thai					1	Spanish
								Thai
	11	9	14	15	16	12	76	

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.

Public School 183 Manhattan is a K-5 elementary school on Manhattan's Upper Eastside. It is annually a diverse population linguistically, with half the student body speaking one of 50 other languages in addition to English. We offer Free Standing ESL pull-out program as per parents' choice.

Twenty-four classes participate in the ESL program since each class has a cluster of ELL/LEP students. English as a second language and literacy instruction is provided by two fully certified ESL teachers. Additional support is provided by a classroom teachers trained in balanced literacy and by TESOL graduate students in the room with the ESL teachers. One ESL teacher instructs about 30 kindergarten and first grade ELLs, and the other is responsible for approximately 30 others in grades two through five. Students are serviced according to the mandates. Students at the beginner and intermediate proficiency level are served 360 units a week and advance level students are served 180 units a week. Direct, small-group, and differentiated ESL instruction with scaffolded content and materials/lessons are adapted to each ELL's language needs. In the mainstream general education classroom, all academic content areas are taught using ESL strategies. These strategies are taught and reinforced in the

professional development sessions provided by the ESL teachers, and they are archived in a resource binder kept in the school's professional library. ESL and classroom teachers have an opportunity to meet at least once a week to discuss students, their progress and next steps.

Supplemental ESL instruction funded by PS 183's Title III program takes place twice a week after the school day at 3:30pm for one hour. The ESL after-school programs are hour long sessions taught by our certified ESL instructor Molly Rusten, assisted by our recent NYU graduate and volunteer, Ms. Erzsebet Harskuti (who holds New York state certification in ESL K-12). The two programs are divided between a program for 1st, 2nd and 3rd graders who are developing their oral skills and 1st, 2nd and 3rd graders developing their reading and writing skills. The after-school ESL programs allow ESL students that are not involved in after-school activities and clubs to join her for content based learning. Both after-school programs begin with a guided or shared reading exercise and a retelling of the story (to reinforce meaning and vocabulary and provide accountable talk) and support the language arts curriculum.

These ESL after-school programs help to immerse ELLs in rich language experiences, providing context and meaning to engage students so they are willing and able to speak to, write on, and read about topics with passion and clear understanding.

PS 183 also uses United Streaming Video to assist our ELL population with vocabulary building. Video streaming is also used by our parents during the ESL classes; they also are able to use it at home to assist their children with language development.

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.

Teachers will have a Professional Development after school in March 4, 11, 2010. The workshop will be open to teachers who have ELLs in their classes. Teachers will learn how to use ARIS to make instructional decisions for ELL students in their classes. The workshop will be 2 hours in total.

Parental Involvement

ESL classes are offer for parents of English Language learners which started October, 2009 and will run through June 2009. An ESL teacher teaches the class once a week. Parents are taught English as a Second Language and strategies for helping their children with homework.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: P.S. 183 Robert Louis Stevenson School BEDS Code: 31020001018

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

Allocation:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	\$3,998.04	After-school Program 1 ESL teacher \$49.98 x 1 hr 80 days = \$3,998.04
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	\$1,600.00	An ongoing ESL Professional development discussion group for PS 183 Classroom Teachers \$400.00/ day x 4 days = \$1,600.00
Supplies and materials	\$6,356.00	United Streaming Video: Online educational video resource for ELL Families (\$1256.00) Superduper: language learning tools for children with special needs (\$750.00) Consumable art supplies (\$500.00) Laminating materials (\$500.00) Take home audio books (\$350.00) Software lending library (\$500.00) Book Projector for reading instruction (\$800.00) Content related texts (\$200.00) Weekly reader take home magazines for K and 3 rd grade (\$250.00) 2 sets
Parental Involvement	\$2,579.10	ESL classes for parents 1 ESL teacher X 49.98 x 1.5 hrs x 30 days = \$2,249.10 Morning snack for parent ESL classes \$10 x 33 = \$330.00
Other	\$400.00	Afternoon snack for ESL after-school program for students Snacks \$5 x 80 = \$400.00
TOTAL	\$14,933.00	

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

SCHOOL PROFILE

Public School 183 Manhattan is a K-5 elementary school on Manhattan's Upper Eastside. It is annually a diverse population linguistically, with half the student body speaking one of 50 other languages in addition to English. This year our school's International Day Festival children with families from 70 different countries participated in the parade of flags. Many are either current or former ELLs.

Twenty-four classes participate in the program since each class has a cluster of ELL/LEP students speaking a variety of languages. English language and literacy instruction is provided by two fully certified ESL teachers (as well as classroom teachers trained in balanced literacy), and by TESOL graduate students in the room with the ESL teachers. One ESL teacher instructs about 30 kindergarten and first grade ELLs, and the other is responsible for approximately 30 others in grades two through five. The size of the ELL population varies during the year. The principal of PS 183, Ms. Mary Anne Sacco, is the supervisor of the ESL program.

Additional personnel include a retired early-childhood specialist who used to be an ESL teacher. She does parent outreach, not only teaching them English but also focusing on how parents can help their children learn and take advantage of the cultural opportunities that abound in New York City.

PARENT PROGRAM CHOICE

At registration each new admits parent or guardian fills out a Home Language Identification Survey form. If the HLIS indicates the family speaks a language other than English, the school secretary calls an ESL teacher down to meet the parent and to conduct an informal interview to ascertain whether translation assistance is needed. Each HLIS is checked by a fully certified ESL teacher to determine 1. the

student's native language and 2. whether or not they should be administered the LAB-R. Then a copy of the HLIS is made to keep in a central location. From the copies, a roster of LAB-R eligible students is compiled and checked against a current ATS RLER. Parents of LAB-R testees are sent a hardcopy letter informing them that according to state guidelines their child will be tested in the next two weeks. Two packets of information are prepared, one for each child eligible for services based on LAB-R results or NYSESLAT scores from the previous spring, and a separate one for each child who is ineligible according to either LAB-R or NYSESLAT score. The NYSESLAT exam is administered annually to every child deemed eligible for services according to the initial LAB-R or the prior year's NYSESLAT.

A checklist with each child's name and a column for each entitlement letter, meeting notice, score notification, preference form, email form, and a PS183 ELL information questionnaire is prepared. When a form is sent home, a check is entered in the appropriate cell of the table; then when the form is returned signed, the check is marked as an X. If the form is not returned the parents continue to be sent reminders.

LAB-R and NYSESLAT scores determine English proficiency levels and the corresponding number of periods of ESL students must receive according to CR part 154 instruction units requirements.

In the information packets is an invitation to attend an ESL parent-orientation at the end of the first month of school. The orientation describes all program options available in the city at other schools, including the PS 183 ESL program. One hundred percent of the parents for as many years as they've had the choice have requested that their children receive only ESL instruction. Our school has never had enough speakers of a single language to have self-contained bilingual classes, and further, bilingual programs elsewhere in the city don't match the needs of the large number of low-incidence languages in our community. Nearly half the ELLs' languages fall into the "other" category instead of the city's high-incidence ones.

Through the year, to ensure that no new admit or transfer is overlooked, the ESL teachers use ATS to run weekly RLER and RLAT reports. Families arriving later in the year are invited to meet with their child's ESL teacher individually, and are given a copy of that fall's meeting summary.

ESL schedules are drawn up according to the number of NY state-specified mandated units for each child, with special effort made to avoid periods when the child's class is going to gym, computer, art, etc. Because of the demographic of our school, with nearly all the

international parents working for research institutions contiguous to the block the building is on, parents rarely prefer to be communicated with in the home language; when this does occur, the school maintains a list of available bilinguals in the neighborhood and among the school community, including a list of the many international graduate students who come to observe the school's ESL pull-out classes.

PLANNING FOR ELLs

We usually have about 60 students in the ESL program, about 10% of the student body, from kindergarten through fifth grade, in a free-standing pull-out ESL program (the distribution of the ELLs in all but two classrooms makes push-in impracticable). A large portion of the ELLs' families are visitors in the country for a few years doing post-doctoral scientific research, before they move on to another country or back to their home countries. These professional families value education highly, and are very involved in school life. Nearly all have internet in their homes, and it is not unusual for their children to attend weekend school to maintain home language growth to ease re-entry into the home country schools. ESL lessons are often sent home via email (hard-copy to two families without email) stories and enrichment activities for families to share together.

Ms. Sacco requires that both teachers meet ESL mandates, attend professional development seminars, host professional development seminars, and provide supplemental ESL instruction at the end of the school day. The foundation of the PS 183 ESL program begins with the development of oral language skills. The ESL curriculum scaffolds on the oral, using stories, folk tales and academic content.

Institutions surrounding the school and throughout the PS 183 community give our ESL students the vocabulary necessary to begin to read and write in English. Vocabulary from stories told in ESL is sent home and families are encouraged to retell the story in the child's native language and help the child write down the translation of these specific words, in order to minimize language attrition. Direct, small-group, and differentiated ESL instruction with scaffolded content and materials/lessons are adapted to each ELL's language needs. In the mainstream general education classroom, all academic content areas are taught using ESL strategies. These strategies are taught and reinforced in the professional development sessions provided by the ESL teachers, and they are archived in a resource binder kept in the school's professional library.

At the core of PS 183's ESL program is the belief that children learn to read and write by actually reading and writing. Fundamental to PS 183's approach to language arts instruction is that students explore their interests by selecting their own books to read from extensive

classroom libraries and topics on which to write and share with others. Because effective Language Arts learning requires the development of the students' spoken language, students spend time properly developing their oral language skills through purposeful practice in talking. There is an emphasis on accountable talk. PS 183 immerses ELLs in language experiences, providing context and meaning to engage students so they are willing and able to speak to, write on, and read about topics with passion and clear understanding. As part of a balanced literacy program, ELLs engage in shared, guided and independent reading. In addition, interactive writing and modeling are an essential part of our writing workshop. Students are given the opportunity to explore many genres in reading and writing.

Because the school's ELLs move in and out of the U.S. regularly, half our students are mandated for double services. This year there are 10 students in the older non-speaker group alone, and about as many of the kindergarten ELLs scored as beginners. Five ELLs have IEPs. Twenty-one students are new arrivals this year.

ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

On state tests, most of our ELLs score well. On the science exam as many students scored level 4 as scored level 3, with no scores below level 3, reflective of our students' families' special interest in science. The same group of students scored 3s and 4s on math, and 3s even on the ELA. Two of the longer term ELLs in a younger grade did score level 2 on the ELA, but all their ELL peers got 3s. None of the school's ELLs scored below level 3 in math, including those with IEPs. Some of this is undoubtedly attributable to parental encouragement and involvement, and to the quality of education the older children received in their home countries before arrival, but it is also reflective of the effort made by the entire faculty and the students themselves. Most students exit the program quickly, some even advancing from no English at all in the fall to an exit score on the famously challenging NYSESLAT. Four ELLs have received 4 years of service; of these one did not attend school at all for a year in another country, and another is now in special ed. We also have two NCLB transfers with five and six years respectively, one of whom is also in a CTT class. With the data obtained from the NYSESLAT and periodic assessments (both ELL and TC assessments done in general ed classrooms) we provide our ELL students with a Title III Supplementary program that best addresses their needs.

RESOURCES AND SUPPORT

In order to increase student achievement through technology, we have subscribed to: United Streaming as part of our Title III program. A special arrangement with United Streaming allows ESL parents to log on to a website, using a \$1256 subscription so they can access 80,000 video clips tied in to NY state standards, cross referenced by grade applicability and content relevance. It is the only digital video-based learning resource scientifically proven to increase student achievement. The subscription is extended to the entire school faculty, so ELL parents' access allows the students to re-watch (along with siblings and other family members) videos used in their ESL and other classroom lessons. There are also books on tape, computer programs (such as Muzzy and Math Blaster) available for short-term loan to ESL students.

Students that enter PS 183 and score as a beginner on the LAB-R are provided ESL laptops to be kept in their classrooms. ESL laptops are used by ELLs to access Rosetta Stone or Muzzy (for younger learners) to work on basic English vocabulary and letter recognition skills. These laptops are used in the general classroom during independent reading or choice time.

There is a weekly school-based support team of experts who offer guidance to teachers seeking support for problem students. In addition, both the principal and assistant principal are available by phone and email when their help is needed. External organizations whose services are utilized include Lenox Hill Neighborhood House and the NYC Public Library branches, both of which have ESOL classes for adults. Bilingual professionals working at scientific institutions in the neighborhood give their services as translators on a regular basis, as do graduate students from NYU.

PARENT COMMUNITY

Parents are polled for interest in parent classes and given information about free ESL classes provided by the city's public libraries. NYU graduate students assist at the parent-orientation and serve as translators as needed. The meeting is scheduled before the school's open house curriculum night so parents adjourned to attend their children's classroom orientation meetings, and then a PTA meeting. The following week all parents are emailed a summary of the meeting. A sign-in sheet gives a record of which parents attended, and the completed surveys are collected.

Title III funding provides an F-status former ESL teacher, Mrs. Weisberg, to work with select individual ESL students who need one on one literacy tutoring beyond what their mandated ESL classes can accomplish in the group setting. She confers with relevant school staff in making decisions about the individual ELLs' academic needs and progress. The language used for instruction on both the after-school

programs and the individual ESL tutoring is English. Monthly math workshops to help parents support the PS 183 math curriculum at home and are co-taught by an ESL teacher. The parent coordinator organizes and accompanies groups of ELL parents to city-sponsored conferences specifically designed for ELL adults, where they are provided breakfast, lunch, transportation reimbursement, and translator services. A school website that parents can view in translation (many of our parents are quite sophisticated computer users).

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The two full-time certified ESL teachers on the faculty are active in professional organizations and have been asked by other institutions to provide professional development workshops. They initiated a monthly dinner meeting for regional ESL teachers to share and discuss issues of concern, and host an annual PD for city ESL teachers on Election Day.

Staff development is extremely important to our learning community. PS 183 teachers have participated in ESL workshops provided by Teachers College Reading and Writing Project, as well as other prestigious institutions in this area. In addition, our teachers attend NYS TESOL conferences, as well as other related workshops throughout the 2009-2010 school year. One of PS 183's ESL instructors, Annette Burton, was on the executive board of the NYS TESOL as Chairman of Curriculum and Standards. She has led staff development workshops for teachers here at PS 183 and other schools in our region. These meetings and her expertise is made available to teachers in our school, and around the region, to increase awareness of ELLs and how to provide them further with appropriate support. Frequent conferences between classroom teachers and the ELL teachers also help everyone stay informed about ELLs and plan instruction accordingly. We continue to provide these professional learning opportunities and have one planned on the city-wide November 3rd Professional Development Day for ESL teachers from neighboring schools.

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED TO LEP STUDENTS

The school has a Pupil Personnel Team that meets weekly to discuss at-risk children, and whenever an ELL is on the agenda, one of the ESL teachers attends the meeting. As the years of ESL service mount for an individual ELL, the PPT is sure to have discussed and put in place additional interventions for that student, including parent outreach and support.

Supplemental ESL instruction funded by PS 183's Title III program takes place twice a week after the school day at 3:30pm for one hour. The ESL after-school programs are hour long sessions taught by our certified ESL instructor Molly Rusten, assisted by our recent NYU graduate and volunteer, Ms. Erzsebet Harskuti (who holds New York state certification in ESL K-12). The two programs are divided between a program for 1st, 2nd and 3rd graders who are developing their oral skills and 1st, 2nd and 3rd graders developing their reading and writing skills. The after-school ESL programs allow ESL students that are not involved in after-school activities and clubs to join her for content based learning. Both after-school programs begin with a guided or shared reading exercise and a retelling of the story (to reinforce meaning and vocabulary and provide accountable talk) and support the language arts curriculum.

These ESL after-school programs help to immerse ELLs in rich language experiences, providing context and meaning to engage students so they are willing and able to speak to, write on, and read about topics with passion and clear understanding.

One fully certified former trainee, Erzsebet Harskuti, is a regular unpaid volunteer in the program, since her diplomatic visa prohibits her earning money. Ms. Harskuti and other local volunteers often work as assistants to both ESL teachers during pull-out sessions and serve as translators for the PS 183 ESL students during ESL sessions and throughout the school day. In addition longer periods and extended day sessions with the ESL teachers for more intensive instruction for students who require additional English support (usually new immigrants).

Ps 183 offers continued support of transitional students who have exited the program, including them in ESL groups when requested. There are additional after-school sessions with children who do not perform well on standardized tests because of psychological interference or because of having entered school with few or no first language literacy skills. Hunter College has a program after-school every Wednesday for all students at PS 183 that have IEP's (this includes ESL students that have been 'x' coded specifically exempting them as per IEP, as well as current ESL students with IEPs).

Extracurricular activities available to all students (including LEP Students) include athletic groups (e.g., track), dance, and theater workshops. NDI and ballet are also available. Many of our ESL students participate in Wingspan after-school, Yorkville, Drama Kids and the Iberian- American Institute.

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.

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.

Part B: Strategies and Activities

PLEASE SEE LAP NARRATIVE

1. 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>.

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 (Not Applicable for PS 183)

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

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?

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

New York State assessments measure conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem solving. In the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, these are represented as *process strands* and *content strands*. These strands help to define what students should know and be able to do as a result of their engagement in the study of mathematics. The critical nature of the process strands in the teaching and learning of mathematics has been identified in the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, revised by NYS Board of Regents on March 15, 2005: The process strands (Problem Solving, Reasoning and Proof, Communication, Connections,

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

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?

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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.

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.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

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?

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

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?

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

While the DOE and individual schools have made a substantial investment in professional development for special and general education teachers, classroom observations, IEP reviews, and interviews indicate that many general education teachers, special education teachers,

and school administrators do not yet have sufficient understanding of or capacity to fully implement the range and types of instructional approaches that will help to increase access to the general education curriculum and improve student performance. Further, many general education teachers remain unfamiliar with the content of the IEPs of their students with disabilities, have a lack of familiarity with accommodations and modifications that would help support the students with disabilities in their classrooms, and are not knowledgeable regarding behavioral support plans for these students.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

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?

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

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?

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.