



PATRIA MIRABAL MIDDLE SCHOOL 324

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: 06M324
ADDRESS: 21 JUMEL PLACE
TELEPHONE: 212-923-4057
FAX: 212-923-4626

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE 3

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE..... 5

Part A. Narrative Description 5

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot..... 7

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT 11

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS 20

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN..... 21

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010 29

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

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)..... 33

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION 17

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS 18

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: MS 324 **SCHOOL NAME:** Patria Mirabal Middle School
SCHOOL ADDRESS: 21 Jumel Place, New York, New York 10032
SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 212-923-4057 **FAX:** 212-923-4626
SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Janet Heller **EMAIL ADDRESS:** jheller@schools.nyc.gov

<u>POSITION/TITLE</u>	<u>PRINT/TYPE NAME</u>
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON:	<u>Juan DelaCruz</u>
PRINCIPAL:	<u>Janet Heller</u>
UFT CHAPTER LEADER:	<u>Benjamin Lev</u>
PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT:	<u>Martha Beato</u>
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE: <i>(Required for high schools)</i>	<u></u>

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 06 **SSO NAME:** CEI-PEA
SSO NETWORK LEADER: Linda Guarneri
SUPERINTENDENT: Martha Madera

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
Janet Heller	*Principal or Designee	
Benjamin Lev	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Martha Beato	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Cindy Sapp	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
Marinievas Alba, Children’s Aid Society	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Crystal Ringer	Member/Teacher	
Juan DelaCruz	Member/SLT Chair	
Noemi Taveras	Member/Parent	
Leona Torres	Member/Parent	
Carlton Burroughs	Member/Parent	
Domitila Quintuna	Member/Parent	

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

Patria Mirabal Middle School 324, in the Washington Heights section of Manhattan, has 420 students in grades six through eight. There are 13 monolingual, three bilingual and four special education classes, an increase of one 6th grade and one special education class. Thirty seven percent (37%) of the student population are English Language Learners (ELLs) of which one third are long term ELLs. Of the total population, 89% are eligible for Title 1.

MS 324 is in the top 7% of middle schools in New York City based on student performance, progress and the learning environment. The school's grade rose from a 96.8 to a 98.4. MS 324 received an A on the Progress Report, Well Developed on the School Quality Review, made New York State Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) and is a School in Good Standing. The school's mission, to prepare students for college, work and citizenship is the focus for what we do and reflects our high expectations for students.

MS 324 is the recipient of grants used to accelerate students learning. The General Electric Foundation grant focuses on science and math employing consultants from Bank Street College, New York University, Columbia University Education Research Center, Marilyn Burns, Global Friendship Through Space Exploration, Kaplan and NASA to provide professional development, mentoring, in-class coaching, study groups, math olympics and science expo. Funds will be used to provide collaboration with two different middle school cohorts for intervisitations. The TREES grant (Technology, Research, Ecology and Exchange for Students) will provide professional development for math and science teachers to develop a math and science literate student. Clearpool Education Center provides professional development on the physical science of the urban and natural wooded environments culminating in a three day camping trip for students, parents and teachers. A grant from Target is used to support the camping trip activities. The LT ELL SIFE grant will provide extended day and afterschool intervention classes using Achieve 3000 and guided reading. The Extended Day Violence Prevention funds are used to provide after school advisory and peer mediation.

Data is used for planning, monitoring and revising our work to accelerate student progress through effective interventions and programs for all subgroups, including those who are high achievers. A variety of data is generated, gathered and analyzed giving us hard evidence used to make informed professional judgments about instructional plans and practice with benchmarks for student achievement and school community. Data sources included class work, portfolios, running records, conferencing notes, teacher-made weekly quizzes and unit tests, interim assessments, formal student reading evaluations, state exam results, attendance rates, School Quality Review results, School Environment Survey results, and School Progress Report results.

The school has created a database of student academic and social development used to track achievement, involvement and progress, and then to set goals and develop targeted interventions.

Student behavior data is collected and addressed through a variety of school-developed methods and programs such as PACT, anecdotal reports, conduct logs, contracts and conduct slips.

The faculty uses ARIS but has found that our own database is more user-friendly, timely, and accurate in providing information used to move students forward. Teacher-made assessments provide timely feedback on student progress, leading to differentiated instruction and strategy lessons.

Teachers' understanding of adolescent learners results in mutual respect. Students' mindset toward education matures throughout their years at MS 324. Students participate in daily extended day activities, have more realistic plans, and are involved in their own development. Student needs are addressed through the mental health office, one guidance counselors, one social worker, after school programs and parent workshops to remove barriers to student achievement. Differentiated professional development supports all teachers, and encourages cross and interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Professional development is wrapped around the needs of students, and the observed and self-determined needs of teachers. Constant, ongoing communication exists between teachers through weekly scheduled meetings, intervisitations, and Update emails. This has built an environment of teamwork, collaboration and a school culture of critical friends. Collaboration between teachers results in teachers pushing each other to excel to provide exceptional instruction which in turn pushes students to excel.

TeacherEase, an online reporting system that can be accessed through email helps students kept track of assignments and informs parents on a daily basis of student work as well as to communicate with teachers and administration. School Messenger is a telephone messenger system that makes weekly announcements about school events. The use of this technology has lead to an increase in parent involvement as indicated by the number of parents who email, call, attend workshops, and drop in to visit. The school-developed website provides information about events in the school and the DOE school website provides statistics about the school.

SECTION III – Cont’d

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT				
School Name:	Patria Mirabal Middle School			
District:	06	DBN #:	06M324	School BEDS Code #: 310600010324

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	X 6	X 7
	X 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	X Ungraded			
Enrollment:				Attendance: % of days students attended					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09		
Pre-K					94.3	96	96.2		
Kindergarten									
Grade 1				Student Stability: % of Enrollment					
Grade 2				(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 3					94.3	93	TBD		
Grade 4									
Grade 5				Poverty Rate: % of Enrollment					
Grade 6	97	109	108	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 7	156	114	123		88	77.1	86		
Grade 8	140	153	123						
Grade 9				Students in Temporary Housing: Total Number					
Grade 10				(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 11					2	7	TBD		
Grade 12									
Ungraded	21	17	17	Recent Immigrants: Total Number					
				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Total	414	395	371		15	32	22		
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		

DEMOGRAPHICS							
Number in Self-Contained Classes	35	34	29				
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	0	Principal Suspensions	3	1	1
Number all others	43	39	44	Superintendent Suspensions	0	0	0
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>							
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				Special High School Programs: Total Number			
(BESIS Survey)				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	89	98	83	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	40	47	56	Number of Staff: Includes all full-time staff			
# ELLs with IEPs	25	0	3	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	24	24	26
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	5	16	17
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	13	13	14
	8	5	8				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100	100	100
American Indian or Alaska Native	.5	.8	.3	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	16.7	20.6	60
Black or African American	12.6	9.9	11.9	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	25	29.4	42.9
Hispanic or Latino	85	88.1	87.3				

DEMOGRAPHICS							
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	.7	.5	0	Percent Masters Degree or higher	83	74	77
White	1.2	.8	.5	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100	96	100
Multi-racial	0	0	0				
Male	53.4	53.4	51.8				
Female	46.6	46.6	48.2				

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:		
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvement – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvement – Year 2	
<input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action – Year 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Restructured – Year ____	

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

Individual Subject/Area Ratings	Elementary/Middle Level		Secondary Level	
	ELA:	In Good Standing (IGS)	ELA:	
	Math:	IGS	Math:	
	Science:	IGS	Grad. Rate:	

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-			
Black or African American	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	-			
Hispanic or Latino	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-			
White	-	-	-			
Multiracial	-	-	-			

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Other Groups					
Students with Disabilities	√	√	√		
Limited English Proficient	√	√	√		
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√		
Student groups making AYP in each subject	6	6	5		
Key: AYP Status					
√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status		
<i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i>					

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	Well Developed
Overall Score	98.4	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Well Developed
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	15	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Well Developed
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	25	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well Developed
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	53.9	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Well Developed
Additional Credit	4.5	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Well Developed
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

Student Progress in ELA

TOTAL SCHOOL - ELA PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS								
Year	PL 1		PL 2		PL 3		PL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	3	0.9	155	48.0	165	51.1	0	0
2008	18	5.1	237	66.8	100	28.2	0	0
2007	37	9.6	266	69.1	82	21.3	0	0
2006	45	19.4	137	59.1	47	20.3	3	1.3

Total School Trends:

From January 2008 to January 2009, there was an increase in our school's overall score in Student Performance from 20.5 to 25. The percentage of students scoring at PL 1 and PL 2 on the ELA state exam decreased from 71.9% to 48.9% and the percentage scoring at PL 3 increased from 28.2% to 51.1%. There were no students performing at PL 4.

From January 2008 to January 2009 there was an increase in our school's overall score in Student Progress from 53.8 to 53.9. The overall number of students scoring on grade level increased but the number of students making progress in ELA decreased.

From January 2008 to January 2009 the percentage of students making at least 1 year of progress decreased from 73.1% to 67.8% and the percentage of students in the school's lowest 1/3 students making at least 1 year of progress decreased from 94.0% to 89.1%. Fewer students were tested in 2009 which impacts on percentage rates. When the surveyed population is few in number, percentages are skewed.

We then looked at individual student's test results. This revealed that of the 95 students who did not make a year progress, 63 made extremely close to a year progress (-.01 to -.23). Of the 32 students who did not make close to a year (-.24 to -.81), 10 students were ELLs and two (2) were Special Education students.

The school did not receive extra credit for closing the achievement gap for ELLs, Special Education Students or Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide on the ELA exam. 16.5% of ELLs (14 students out of 85), 16.3% of Special Education Students (8 students out of 49) and 21.8% of Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide (22 students out of 101) made exemplary (1.5) proficiency gains in ELA. These percentages were below the cut off for extra credit for closing the achievement gap.

A review of test results indicated that 15 ELLs, 13 Special Education students and 29 Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide made between 1.31 and 1.49 years of progress which is close to the 1.5 years of progress needed to close the achievement gap. This points to the need to deeply analyze our instructional plans, teaching practices, methods of on-going assessments, class structure, schedule and professional development. Teachers need to attend professional development provided by the TCRWP and DOE ELL office on the specific needs of these populations.

Analyzing test scores on the ELA exam revealed that our students performed weakest in the areas of gathering meaning from written material, grammar, syntax, vocabulary and voice. When results were further analyzed looking at the performance of subgroups, specific subgroups' needs are highlighted. Students who are Black or Other did make progress. This points to a need to accelerate the learning of the ELL students, Special Education students and Hispanic student in the Lowest Third Citywide whether they are in monolingual or bilingual classes.

Tax Levy, Reimbursable and SIFE Grant funds will be used for professional development, after school intervention, TCWRP consultant and calendar days and purchase of professional journals and books.

Student Progress for Math:

TOTAL SCHOOL - MATH PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS								
Year	PL 1		PL 2		PL 3		PL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	7	2	44	12.6	240	69	57	16.4
2008	23	6.1	94	25.1	226	60.3	32	8.5
2007	47	12	193	49.2	146	37.2	6	1.5
2006	69	24	119	41.5	96	33.4	3	1.0

Total School Trends:

From January 2008 to January 2009, the percentage of students scoring at PL 1 and PL 2 on the Math state exam decreased from 31.4% to 14.6% and the percentage scoring at PL 3 and PL 4 increased from 68.8% to 85.3%. The percentage of students making at least 1 year of progress increased from 80.8% to 82.9% and the percentage of students in the school's lowest 1/3 of students making at least 1 year of progress increased from 87.8% to 92.6%.

The school received full additional credit for the subgroups of ELLs, Special Education Students, and Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide. The percentage of Special Education students who made at least 1.5 years of progress increased from 39.5% to 42.6. The percentage of Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third City increased from 52.8% to 74.1%. The percentage of ELL students decreased from 40% to 38.5%. 14.6% (51 students) are performing at PL 1 (7 students) and PL 2 (44 students) of which 66% (34 students) are ELLs. 38.5% of ELL students made at least 1.5 years of progress meaning that 61.5 did not.

Data from the School Accountability report indicated that we successfully closed the achievement gap by more than 10%. When we compared the results of the NAEP to the results of the State Math exam, students in New York City were not making progress in meeting national standards. External analysis of the gains of N.Y.C. students on state test scores indicated these gains to be inflated. Scores on the NAEP tests have flat-lined for several years. Though we have not participated in the NAEP test, we believe that our student gains are not as great as they seem. Research by the NEA and FairTest reported that during the same period that local test scores rose, the results on the NAEP test showed math scores rising only slightly and the achievement gap remaining the same.

Our unit assessments point out that our students perform better on rote questions rather than on those requiring higher-order thinking. This finding points to a need for a greater emphasis on math applications, including integrated curriculum and project-based learning.

Analyzing test scores on the Math exam revealed that our students perform weakest in the Statistics and Probability strand, followed by the Measurement strand. When results are filtered to show the performance of ELL students, the contrast is particularly startling. This points to a need for interdisciplinary and project-based learning and work between math and science, so that statistics and measurement can be learned with deep understanding. We need to accelerate the learning of the 13.2% of students who are performing below standards, ELLs and students in the lowest third.

Student Progress for Science:

8 th GRADE - SCIENCE PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS								
Year	PL 1		PL 2		PL 3		PL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	8	7	58	50	48	41	3	3
2008	8	5.3	69	46	67	44.7	6	4
2007	29	21	81	60	24	18	1	1

Total School Trends:

The school made AYP for science on the Eighth grade state Science exam. In 2009, the percentage of students scoring at PL 1 and PL 2 on the Science exam was 57% (66 students) of which eight students scored in PL 1 and 58 students scored in PL 2. The percentage scoring at PL 3 and PL 4 was 44% (51 students). Of the 117 students who took the Eighth grade Science exam 34.2% (40 students) were ELLs. Of these 40 ELL students, 52% (21 ELL students) scored at PL 1 and 2 and 47% (19 ELL students) scored at PL of 3 and 4. Analysis of our incoming students' fourth grade science test scores indicated that 51% enter below standard level and 57% of all students are performing below standard which indicates student science learning must be accelerated.

Review of incoming sixth grade students indicated they are entering without basic scientific knowledge. Observations indicate weaknesses in the hands-on skills of science and habits of mind. The science curriculum must include hands-on learning and a focus on science applications. There is a need for properly equipped laboratories, curriculum development and professional development in hands-on science instruction and an applications-rich, standards-based science curriculum.

The school needs to develop curriculum and extracurricular activities. Science clinics are needed to accelerate and support students' academic growth and clubs are needed to support student interests.

Last year sixth grade students received three periods of science a week taught by the math teacher. The seventh grade students received four periods of science a week taught by a science/social studies teacher. Sixth and seventh grade students need a minimum of four periods of science per week, which includes one double period a week for labs taught by licensed science teachers.

Tax Levy, Reimbursable and GE Foundation Middle School Success Grant funds will be use to achieve this goal.

Math and Science High Schools

Another measure used to assess student performance is the Specialized High School exam. In 2007 and 2008, we had 10 and 15 eighth grade students, respectively, in a preparation program. No students were accepted to the Specialized High Schools and seven students were accepted into Manhattan Center for Science and Math (MCSM). In 2009, of the 15 students who participated in the preparation program, only one was accepted into Brooklyn Technical High School. There is a need to prepare students beginning in sixth grade for acceptance to these specialized high schools.

Based on parent interviews, parents seem to be unaware of students' progress or interest in math and science. This indicates a need for the school to encourage parent participation in students' learning activities. During high school application workshops parents indicated that they were not aware of math and science high schools. There is a need to begin in sixth grade to educate students and parents of high school options and the criteria for entrance into math and science high schools.

We need to address the challenges of professional development, enrichment and strategic intervention student activities, curriculum development and inadequate facilities. Specifically, we need to address the following challenges:

- To provide support to all students in math, particularly in areas that connect math and science, and math and literacy
- To provide greater opportunities for integrated and project-based learning for all students, to boost performance in Statistics and Probability, Measurement, and to improve students' higher order thinking skills
- To provide intervention for our lowest-performing students in math and science
- To provide greater opportunities for math and science enrichment
- To revise the science curriculum and support teachers to include more hands-on science instruction and opportunities for applied science

We intend to fulfill these needs through a variety of approaches:

- Per session funding and PD for math and science enrichment activities and projects
- Per session funding and PD for curriculum development and cross-curricular planning
- Per session funding for math and science intervention instruction
- PD in Understanding By Design to support curricular planning
- PD in teaching the reading and writing skills required in mathematics and science
- PD in science lab instruction
- Trips, activities, projects and PD that support the integration of math and science
- Equip science labs to accelerate student learning
- A Lead Teacher and part-time science coach to provide ongoing and in-class support

Student Progress for Social Studies:

8 th GRADE - SOCIAL STUDIES PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS								
Year	PL 1		PL 2		PL 3		PL 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	9	8	73	65	27	24	4	4
2008	9	6	104	68	38	25	2	1
2007	23	17	93	69	19	14	0	0

Total School Trends: Over a two-year period from 2008 –2009, the percentage of students scoring at PL 1 and PL 2 on the Social Studies assessment increased from 6% to 8% but the number of students remained the same at 9 and the percentage scoring at PL 3 and PL 4 increased from 1% to 4% from 2 to 4 students.

Accountability Reports

The 2008 School Quality Review indicated that differentiated instruction was taking place in most classrooms but needed to be expanded. By June of 2009 we had successfully implemented differentiated instruction in all subject classes as evidenced by observations, curriculum maps, units of study, and instruction plans. We will now expand this through cross and interdisciplinary instruction and project based instruction.

Though the professional development and activities support by TCWRP we will accelerate student achievement in social studies and science.

Data from the N.Y. State School Accountability report indicated that MS 324 is a school in Good Standing. Adequate Yearly Progress was achieved for all six subgroups in ELA, math and science. Data from the N.Y.C. Progress report provided additional credit for all subgroups in math but none in ELA. There must be specific interventions for the subgroups to promote student progress.

Many patterns point to a need for increased targeted instruction and small intervention groups:

- Our test scores show that we are successful in moving students from level 1 to level 2 and from level 2 to 3, but less so at moving students from level 3 to 4. Students with PL 3 will be included in after school intervention groups.
- Our Challenge 6 initiative, in which each teacher took personal responsibility for targeting and improving the achievement of six students, was effective. This year 50% of the students in Challenge 6 will be from three subgroups. Analysis of the data indicated that ELL, Special Education and students performing in the lowest third citywide did not make significant gains. Last year these subgroups did not participate in Challenge 6. This shows a need to ensure that at least 50% of the students in the Challenge 6 are from these three subgroups and targeted instruction and differentiation.
- The results of our case study produced data on the effectiveness of Achieve 3000, a computer based intervention program on accelerating reading comprehension and vocabulary of ELL students. Analysis of data indicated that of the students who used Achieve 3000, the students who used the program and participated in supplementary activities showed the most gains. Also, students who used the program most frequently had the highest gains.

Other patterns pointed to a need for increased social/emotional and organizational support.

- Last year 30 students were late more than 10% of the time. This was a significant decrease from the previous year of 80 students. Our attendance team outreach to parents made this impact. Lateness is still a concern because it detracted from social development support because it cut into Advisory instructional time. School will start at 8:20 am with Advisory beginning at 8:30 am. Teachers are volunteering their time for this additional ten minutes so there is no financial burden on the school's budget.
- To address students' organizational skill development, advisory periods will offer direct instruction on organization tools and methods. These will then be used in each class.
- Social and emotional issues, students concerns about friendships and developing sexuality, and students' concerns about life outside of school interfere with students' ability to focus on school work. Students need support in all these areas. We will continue collaborating with the Promise program that will provide Job Club, Power Group and Family Living.

Data from the School Environment Survey shows our success compared to both the Citywide average and to schools in our Peer Horizon. In all areas we exceed both Peer Horizon and the Citywide Average by a substantial margin.

	MS 324	School Score Relative to Peer Horizon	School Score Relative to City Horizon
Academic Expectations	8.8	120%	111.1%
Engagement	8.4	122.2%	116.7%
Communication	8.1	125%	119.2%
Safety and Respect	8.6	120%	103%
Attendance	96.2%	112.5%	87%

Accomplishments:

Student Progress and Intervention

Our greatest accomplishment is in the area of Student Progress. Over a three year period the percent of 8th grade students in Proficiency Level (PL) 1 decreased from 8.9% to 1.8% on the state ELA exam and decreased from 8.8% to 2.6% on the state Math exam. Early intervention has been instrumental to student success. Seventh and eighth grade teachers had five periods for intervention programmed into their schedule. Students were selected to attend for six week cycles. This intervention program based on assessment results proved to be successful; teachers knew where and how students were struggling and had scheduled opportunities to work with the student on these areas. The extended day program was also successful because teachers provided direct instruction with specific strategy lessons for students who needed intervention and an enrichment setting based on students' talent and/or interest.

Throughout the year, on a weekly basis teachers met during common preps to review student work looking for evidence of learning. Based on this, teaching strategies were modified, plans revised and students attended intervention classes to address areas of need when they first arise. These meetings to review the assessments provided us with a much deeper understanding of the individual needs of students.

Collaboration

An area of strength is our collaborative and supportive school environment. Intervisitation, and collaboration within grade levels and within the department is the norm. This opportunity to move forward with increased collaboration, integrated curriculum, and critical conversations regarding ongoing improvement would be impossible in a closed, non-collaborative environment. The existence of our open climate, teacher initiated activities and share decision making is essential for teacher and student success. To expand this aspect of our school, curriculum plans include cross and interdisciplinary units and project based learning activities.

Inquiry Case Study

After analyzing the outcomes of the NYSESLAT, NYS ELA exam, Fountas and Pinnell running records, class grades, and our school progress report, we found that many of our students in the bottom third were long term English Language Learners who scored a 2 on the ELA but were not proficient on the NYSESLAT. These students also scored below grade level on the Fountas and Pinnell running record assessments. Further analysis of running record data, teacher assessments, and observations indicated that students' reading levels and investment in reading were hindering progress.

For the students in the target population, our goal was threefold: to increase each student's reading level 1.5 grade levels, move students one proficiency level on the NYSESLAT, improve each student's ability to retell a story and use context clues to determine the meaning of new words. Since a large majority of our students are ELLs or former ELLs, the strategies used with the target population helped improve instruction for the general student population.

The Achieve 3000 program was implemented in order achieve these goals. Achieve 3000 is an computer based, differentiated reading and writing program that assesses students' reading levels, provides individualized reading and writing assignments based on students' individual needs, and monitors student progress.

Of the students who used Achieve 3000, the students who used the program and participated in supplementary activities showed the most gains. Also, students who used the program most frequently had the highest gains.

Community Based Organizations

After analyzing student achievement data and its correlation with other data, we reduced the number of programs from outside vendors and maintained only those programs that resulted in the highest student achievement and engagement.

Columbia University's Teachers College Reading and Writing Workshop. TCRWP offers a staff developer on-site to run learning labs and provides several different calendars of professional development days at TC. These calendar days correlate with upcoming units of study and offer the latest innovations in teaching strategies. This has lead to teaching students strategies to master skills to improve independent work. Lessons are differentiated focusing on individual student levels. Our literacy, social studies and science including special education and bilingual teachers also participate calendar days. This resulted in more collaborative team planning.

TC's staff development will again be broken into cycles, each cycle will focus on reading and writing PD for literacy, social studies and science teachers. This will be expanded to include math teachers. A cycle specifically for strategy lessons will provide professional development for differentiated lesson. We also brought better cohesion to our literacy department by providing more targeted support for

ESL, ELL and Special Education through the professional development cycles, calendar days, and break-out groups in team meetings.

Bank Street College provides professional development using the model of professional development, observation, demonstrations, in-class coaching in and lab sites. This was implemented based on the TCWRP work that was conducted at the school.

In response to our requirement that all students complete community service with the number of hours different for each grade, we developed a variety of activities with CBOs. Fresh Youth Initiative provides community service opportunities for students during the school day, after school and on weekend focused on the homeless and elderly. Children's Aid Society provides Saturday Service focused on improving the school environment.

Intervention

Intervention classes were woven into the school program rather than separate from the school day. Students were grouped heterogeneously for whole class instruction and homogeneously for intervention activities. Homogeneous grouping is based on gender and/or ability in the focused learning point. Students who received ELL and special education services received the same curriculum as their general education counterparts and received additional intervention in the form of modified presentation strategies.

Teachers analyzed students' needs and offered intervention and enrichment programs based on this data. Data sources included student class work, portfolios, running records, teacher made weekly quizzes and unit tests, spelling inventories, DYO interim assessments, formal student reading evaluations, state exam results, and attendance rates. These sources of data were also used to measure the effectiveness of these programs.

Intervention programs worked into many parts of the school day:

- Lunch and Learn assisted students who had difficulty with the day's lesson. As they ate lunch with their teachers they received tutorials.
- Every student received a free home computer through Computers for Youth, providing access to intervention programs at home such as Achieve 3000.
- After school programs were provided intervention and enrichment. Based on needs, students attended intervention on Tuesdays and Thursdays until 4:05 pm and/or enrichment programs on Mondays and Wednesdays. The enrichment programs were based on student need and interest, and included chess, art portfolio, study skills, science club, NASA Global Friendship, book club, track, basketball, and Stage Write, a reader's theater. An after school recreation program developed with Children's Aid Society kept the school open until 6:00 pm and on Saturdays providing a variety of academic, athletic, and artistic activities. Students on or above grade level participated in Project BOOST enrichment activities. Enrichment activities continue through the summer. This summer five students attended the Summer Reading at College of William and Mary, which we will participate in again next summer.
- Math and Writing Labs occurred during the school day. Five of their formal teaching periods were used by teachers for small group, targeted instruction. Selected students attended math

lab or writing lab in lieu of gym or elective classes. Small group target instruction has been key to student progress.

Organizational Structures

The implementation of the interventions described above required thoughtful planning of organizational structures. These decisions were made after analyzing data on student achievement and social/emotional needs as well as studying research in these areas. Some of these organizational structures included:

- Dividing bilingual classes based on student language needs. Reviewing results of the NYSESLAT and teacher observation, all bilingual classes were divided based on language dominance. Ratio of language of instruction changed as student proficiency increased following the transitional model of bilingual education.
- An advisory program structured into the school day in a meaningful way. Referring to the work by Comer and Covey, daily advisory periods support student social development. The advisory period was used to build our sense of community and citizenship. Curriculum was written by the teachers and is modified as needs arise.
- Looping. Most teachers move on to the next grade with their students. Based on our observations, the sixth grade students need different support than seventh and eighth. The sixth grade team will not loop as they provide strong support for sixth grade students as they transition from elementary to middle school. Looping will take place between 7th and 8th grade.
- Math and Writing Labs. For these key interventions to take place, teachers teach 20 whole class periods a week, allowing 5 periods a week for intervention.
- Reduced teacher – student ratio: There is a 1:23 teacher-student ratio in most classes which provides for more direct and individual instructional time. Three class have inclusion students from P.S. 138 which raises the ratio to 1:25 with a PS 138 inclusion teacher in each class part time.
- Students at risk. Based on research that repeating a grade does not necessarily promote academic advancement, we have structures to specifically target supporting students at risk of failure. Math and literacy labs are offered during the school day and during extended day in addition to Saturday classes for ELLs in math and literacy.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

Goal 1: By June, 2010 accelerate and improve student performance in literacy for students within the three subgroups of English Language Learners, Special Education Students and Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide as indicated on the New York State ELA exam where more than one year of progress is demonstrated, 5% of students will demonstrate 1.5 years of progress. Specific strategies include work on fluency, phonological processing, grammar and syntax in reading and writing resulting in a minimum of half credit on the Progress Report. Results of analysis of the Progress Report indicated that progress for these subgroups was less than the progress for other subgroups.

Goal 2: GE Foundation Grant By June, 2010 increase students' engagement and performance in science and math through integrated and project based learning and to close the achievement gap by 10%. Results of a comprehensive needs assessment using a variety of data indicated that students are not as intrigued and engaged in math and science as they are in other subject areas and they do not internalized the subject matter.

GEF Grant

Goal 3: By June, 2010 establish an inquiry team that utilizes an action research approach to study and improve the performance of students. 90% of teachers will be involved in collaborative inquiry through six collaborative inquiry groups to studying six students each who did not make a year of progress as measured on the ELA and Math exams. Although we have made progress in these two areas, we must determine the specific areas of learning that are needed to accelerate student learning for this subgroup.

Goal 4: By June 2010 increase the use of cross disciplinary and inter disciplinary instruction in all content areas by a minimum of one teacher per grade in each subject area. Research has demonstrated that cross and inter disciplinary instruction results in essential information being internalized by students.

Goal 5: By June 2010 refine a system of intervention to close the achievement gap by 10% that includes identification of assessments, instructional practices and programs to provide targeted intervention to all students with 50% of each intervention group from the subgroup of

ELL, special education and Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide. Analysis of intervention systems indicated that not all subgroups progress as far as expected. As a result, we will refine our systems for intervention.

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): ELA

<p>Annual Goal 1 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010 accelerate and improve student performance in literacy for students within the three subgroups of English Language Learners, Special Education Students and Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide as indicated on the New York State ELA exam where more than one year of progress is demonstrated, 5% of students will demonstrate 1.5 years of progress. Specific strategies include work on fluency, phonological processing, grammar and syntax in reading and writing resulting in a minimum of half credit on the Progress Report. Results of analysis of the Progress Report indicated that progress for these subgroups was less than the progress for other subgroups.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire additional bilingual literacy teachers to reduce class size for ELLs in bilingual classes. • A staff developer from Teachers College Reading and Writing Project (TCRWP) will have specific onsite days devoted to PD focused on ELLS and bilingual student needs. • Teachers will attend calendar days at Teachers College specifically designed for ELLs and Special Education. • Bilingual teachers will attend PD provided by the DOE Office of ELL. • Achieve 3000 will be used to develop vocabulary, grammar and reading stamina. • Teachers will analyze student work, periodic assessments, portfolios and the ELA exam from the school year 2008-2009 to determine what strategies and skills were assessed and which students did not demonstrate mastery. • Two additional periods of literacy will be provided focused on Guided Reading, Words Their Way, vocabulary and grammar.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/Writing labs will be focused on those strategies and skills that students did not master. • Reading and Writing labs for small group intervention in sixth and seventh grade and two additional literacy periods in eighth grade will be scheduled for students. • Teachers will use assessments, conference notes, and classroom performance to monitor student progress in ELA with specific goals and benchmarks throughout the year. • The cycle of PD, instruction, assessment and observation will be used throughout the year.
<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"> • Funds will be used to hire additional bilingual literacy teachers to reduce class size for ELLs in bilingual classes. T1SWP, T1 One Time Allocation, TL Stabilization, TLFSG, C4E • Funds will be used to hire a staff developer from Teachers College Reading and Writing Project. (TCRWP) T1SWP • Funds will be used for teachers to attend calendar days at Teachers College specifically designed for ELLs and Special Education. T1SWP • Funds will be used for bilingual teachers to attend PD at DOE Office of ELL. T1SWP, SIFE/LT ELL • Funds will be used for extended day programs for ELLs using Achieve 3000 to develop vocabulary, grammar and reading stamina. SIFE/LT ELL
<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"> • <u>Initial indicator September 2009:</u> Initial examination of the student data to determine students in subgroups and other students most in need of intervention. • <u>Midterm:</u> TCRWP Reading and Writing Assessment will be used every nine weeks to determine students' reading and writing levels and growth in use of specific skills and strategies. • Specific goals and benchmarks will be outlined. These will be monitored and revised based on student growth. • Running records, conferencing notes, reading logs and teacher made assessments will be used to demonstrate growth in students' use of specific reading and writing strategies. • Agendas, sign in sheets and minutes of professional development. • Schedule for study and planning groups, PD and small group intervention.. • <u>End-term:</u> Use of multiple data to evaluate progress of students in subgroups.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Math and Science

<p>Annual Goal 2 <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>GEF Grant By June 2010 increase students’ engagement and performance in science and math through integrated and project based learning and to close the achievement gap by 10%. Results of a comprehensive needs assessment using a variety of data indicated that students are not as intrigued and engaged in math and science as they are in other subject areas and they do not internalized the subject matter. %.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a comprehensive, individualized math professional development series with Bank Street College. • Establish a comprehensive science professional development series with CERC and New York University. • Develop a Teacher Leader and hire a part-time science coach to provide ongoing and in-class support. • Develop curriculum and cross-curricular planning: interdisciplinary planning and teaching across multiple subject areas. • Establish critical friends and peer review to share best practices as measured by observation of improvement in teacher practice and student work and performance on DYO assessments. • Extended day program for math and science enrichment activities and projects. • Teacher schedules include departmental, grade and team meetings to support PD and interdisciplinary planning. • Provide math and science supportive instruction through intervention labs built into teacher and student schedules. • Provide project-based, constructivist learning in science and math that addresses real-life challenges through hands-on learning, and encourages higher-order thinking skills, problem solving, and application of science and math concepts and skills. • PD in Understanding By Design to support curricular planning

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD in teaching the reading and writing skills required in mathematics and science. • Activities, projects and PD that support the integration of math and science. • Equip science labs to accelerate student learning.
<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"> • Funds will be used to establish a comprehensive, individualized math professional development series with Bank Street College. GE Foundation • Funds will be used to establish a comprehensive science professional development series with CERC and New York University. GE Foundation • Funds will be used to develop a Teacher Leader and hire a part-time science coach to provide ongoing and in-class support. GE Foundation, TL One Time Allocation • Funds will be used for curriculum development and cross-curricular planning: interdisciplinary planning and teaching across multiple subject areas. GE Foundation
<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"> • Math professional development one time per week beginning in September with Bank Street College measured by teacher participation in workshops, teacher collaboration, inter-class visitations, direct classroom observation and student work . • Science professional development series twice a month with CERC and New York University as measured by teacher participation in workshops, teacher collaboration, inter-class visitations, direct classroom observation and student work. • Curriculum maps and lesson plans reflect backwards planning. • Teachers’ plans reflect understanding of curriculum for grades prior and forthcoming. • Each cycle of intervention will include assessments. Mid-cycle and post-cycle conferences with the classroom teachers will assess the impact intervention is having on the students’ affect, motivation and performance in class. • Nov – April Science interim assessments will show students more adept at laboratory skills and science concepts. • Nov – June Student projects will show application of scientific thinking and will make connections to real-life implications. • Unit assessments in math and science will show improvement on integrated math and science. • Observations of lessons will note evidence of project based and inquiry study. • Teachers will share findings from intervisitations at department meetings. • Fifteen students applied to math and science high schools.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate 100 hours of per session from inquiry team funds for meetings by inquiry team members after school hours.
Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i>	Funds for substitutes or coverage by teachers TLSFS Funds for Inquiry Team members and Data Specialist TL Children First Inquiry, TL Data Specialist Funds for Professional development classes TLSWP
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i>	<p><u>Initial indicator September and October 2009:</u> Identified targeted team members and targeted student population. Review of variety of student data. Established activities of student participation.</p> <p><u>Midterm:</u> Review of a variety of sources to indicated student progress; interim assessments, student work, running records, conference logs, writing journals, spelling inventory. Review minutes from inquiry team meetings.</p> <p><u>End-term:</u> Review of student achievement on state ELA exam and NYSESLAT. Identified targeted metacognitive and behavioral strategies employed and assessed for success. Published results of case study shared with all teachers.</p>

Cross Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Instruction in all content areas

Subject/Area (where relevant): _____

Annual Goal 4 <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i>	By June 2010 increase the use of cross disciplinary and inter disciplinary instruction in all content areas by a minimum of one teacher per grade in each subject area. Research has demonstrated that cross and inter disciplinary instruction results in essential information being internalized by students.
Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation</i>	Professional development will be provided for teachers on cross and interdisciplinary instruction by CERC (Columbia University). In class support will be provided by the coaches and consultants from TC, CERC and Bank Street. Coaching - in during teaching in the class as a mentoring and support for teacher learning.

<i>timelines.</i>	Teachers will participate in intervistations to observe best practices in at schools highlighted by university consultants. Teachers will participate in study groups lead by CERC consultant.
Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i>	Funds for substitutes or coverage by teachers TLFSF Funds for Teacher release time TLFSF Funds for Assistant Principals TLFSF Funds for mentoring by coaches and teachers T1SWP, T1ARRA SWP Funds for TCWRP Consultant Title I SWP Funds for NYU and Bank Street Consultant GE Foundation Funds for Inquiry Teams TL Data Specialist, TL Inquiry Team
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i>	<u>Initial indicator September 2009:</u> discussions for teachers about their use and understanding of differentiated instruction. Initial observation of teacher practices. <u>Midterm:</u> Teachers will be asked to share lesson plans and discuss how they are implementing differentiated process and product. <u>End-term:</u> Review of student work and progress. Formal and informal observations. Discussion with teachers on lesson planning using differentiated materials and strategies for instruction.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Academic Intervention Services

Annual Goal 5 <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i>	By June 2010 refine a system of intervention to close the achievement gap by 10% that includes identification of assessments, instructional practices and programs to provide targeted intervention to all students with 50% of each intervention group from the subgroup of ELL, special education and Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide. Analysis of intervention systems indicated that not all subgroups progress as far as expected. As a result, we will refine our systems for intervention.
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>	Teacher and student programs will include five periods for intervention in the form of math lab, writing lab. Student programs will include variable learning time scheduling. Specific intervention programs; Wilson, Achieve 3000, Words Their Way, Marilyn Burns, TCRWP and others will be selected and PD provided for intervention planning and assessment. Ongoing data analysis will be conducted to inform effective instruction. Intervention teachers will work in small groups of students based on identified specific needs

	<p>within four and a half week cycles. Mandated after school programs will be provided for students most in need.</p>	
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Funds for substitutes or coverage by teachers TLFSF Funds for teachers TLFSF, C4E Funds for purchase of software NYSTL Fund for supplies and materials T1SWP</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><u>Initial indicator September 2009:</u> Based on data, intervention groups will be formed and schedules established. <u>Midterm:</u> Written units of study, instructional plans and goals revised based on needs documented by observations and student assessment. Review of interim assessments to note student progress. <u>End-term:</u> Review of results of state math and ELA exams, student work.</p>	

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10 – SED REQUIREMENT FOR ALL

C4E-FUNDED SCHOOLS (NOTE: APPENDIX 8 WILL NOT BE REQUIRED FOR THIS YEAR)

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K			N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								
5								
6	74	66	15	20	10	20	30	
7	75	75	10	8	10	32	44	120
8	124	73	37	17	15	28	50	90
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:	Extended Day for small group tutorials for students from all sub groups Saturday small group tutoring for ELLs. Lunch and Learn one-to-one and small group tutoring Words Their Way during school day and after school in small group work Achieve 3000 small group instruction after school and Saturday program Writing Lab small group of 8 students during school day
Mathematics:	Extended Day for small group tutorials for students from all sub groups Saturday small group tutoring for ELLS. Lunch and Learn Math Lab small group of 8 students during school day
Science:	After school Science Labs Lunch and Learn
Social Studies:	After school for small group content area literacy strategies Lunch and Learn
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	Crisis Intervention during school Anti Bullying during school and after school
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	Crisis Intervention during school Family therapy during and after school
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	For 7 th and 8 th graders High School Application preparation and visitations.
At-risk Health-related Services:	Family Living classes provided during school day and extended school day.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

Part A LAP Program

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

Part I: School ELL Profile

Middle School 324 is located in Region 10 District 6 of New York City. The language allocation policy team includes Janet Heller (Principal), Lakisha McDaniel-Luke (Assistant Principal), Diana Smith (Assistant Principal), Judy Ortega (Parent Coordinator), Stephanie Douglas (Literacy Coach), Thelma Dolmo (Bilingual literacy teacher), Juan DeLaCruz (Bilingual math teacher), and Samuel Amador (ESL teacher).

There are 421 students enrolled at MS 324 for the 2009-2010 school year. Forty percent of our students (167 students) are English Language Learners. Of these students 144 came into our school identified as LEP and 23 of these students are identified LEP as per hand scoring of the LAB-R because the official scores are not yet released. The home language for all but three of the 167 students is Spanish. The other three students’ home languages are French, Arabic, and Twi.

Teacher Qualifications

All of our bilingual education and ESL teachers are certified professionals as per the New York State certification requirements. Their certificates are on file. All students are being served with the mandated number of minutes as per CR-154.

Number of Teachers 2009-2010				Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals***		Total
Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**		Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program			
4	3			4		10

Part II: ELL Identification Process

Students who are new to the New York City Schools are identified as ELLs through the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) and the LAB-R. Families are given the HLIS upon registration. If a student's home language is anything other than English then the LAB-R is administered within the first 10 days of admission. The documents are hand scored so that information is gathered quickly while we wait for the tests to be officially scored and entered into ATS. If a student is identified as an ELL the bilingual coordinator conferences with the family and explains the options available for ELL services. The student is then placed in the appropriate program and services begin. Students are assessed yearly using the NYSESLAT and teachers analyze and use the results of this assessment to plan and deliver instruction.

In order for parents to understand all three program choices, they are invited to meet with the Bilingual Education Coordinator within a week of their children's admission to learn about the school programs and facilities it offers its students. They are also shown a NYC Department of Education video explaining in detail the choices of program their children have as ELLs in a New York City school. This video is shown in a variety of languages, including Spanish. Apart from being shown the video and meeting personally with the staff in these meetings, the parents are also invited to two ELL Informational Parent Conferences. In these conferences they have an opportunity to view the video as a group and discuss its content and the TBE and ESL programs with each other as well as with the Bilingual Coordinator and the school's Parent Coordinator. The families complete the program selection forms and the child is placed in the appropriate program. Over the last few years we have noticed that families with children who are new to the country usually prefer a transitional bilingual program while families with children who have been receiving services for several years prefer a monolingual class with ESL.

The trend we have noticed during the last two years is that the majority of parents (53%) in Spanish speaking families have chosen the Transitional Bilingual Program. In interviews the parents expressed the wish to have their children moved to monolingual classes eventually, while receiving ESL services when necessary. The programs offered at the school are aligned with parents' requests. The number of students enrolled in each program closely mirrors the percentages of parental choices made in the Parent Program Surveys.

Part III: ELL Demographics and ELL Programs

Of the 167 students identified as English Language Learners, twenty-one are in a monolingual special education class with ESL and 6 are in transitional bilingual self-contained special education classes. Nine of the ELLs receive SETSS. Eighty-two of the students are in general education transitional bilingual classes with twenty-two in 6th grade, thirty-one in 7th grade, and twenty-nine in 8th grade. Twenty-seven ELLs are in self-contained special education classes. The remaining fifty-eight students are in general education monolingual classes and receive ESL from a certified ESL instructor. Of these students, thirty are in 6th grade, eleven are in 7th grade, and seventeen are in 8th grade.

Eighty-one students have received ELL services for 0-3 years and twenty-three students have received ELL services for 4-5 years. There are sixty-one students (37% of ELLs) identified as long term ELLs (six or more years as an ELL). Twenty-one students identified as long term ELLs are in self-contained special education classes, three are in a general education transitional bilingual program, and thirty-seven are in a monolingual class with ESL. Of the sixty-one long term ELLs, one student has received services for ten years, thirteen students for nine years, nine students for eight years, sixteen students for seven years, and twenty-two students for six years. Twenty-six of our 167 ELLs are identified as SIFE students (16% of ELLs).

Out of our 167 ELLs, 164 list Spanish as their home language. These students are in both transitional bilingual education programs and monolingual with ESL programs. The remaining three students are in monolingual classes with ESL services.

Programming and Scheduling

MS324 provides transitional bilingual education classes and monolingual classes with ESL services. We provide twenty-five periods of Transitional Bilingual Education in every grade. This instruction is delivered by a team of certified professionals. In sixth grade, we provide four periods of self contained ESL instruction and eight periods push-in ESL instruction for a total of twelve periods of sixth grade ESL. In the seventh grade we provide four periods of self-contained ESL instruction and four periods of push-in ESL instruction for a total of eight periods of seventh grade ESL. In the eighth grade we provide four periods of self-contained ESL instruction and six periods of push-in ESL instruction for a total of ten periods of eighth grade ESL. In total, we provide 45 periods a week (405 minutes) of instruction in the Transitional Bilingual Education program instruction from a licensed bilingual and ESL teacher and four periods of ESL instruction as a part of the Language Arts program.

ESL students in monolingual classes are provided three weekly periods (135 minutes) of push-in instruction during content area and/or ELA. They also receive 150 minutes of ESL instruction during mandated extended day sessions. Literacy teachers have been trained in ESL strategies in order to provide further ESL services to ELLs in their classes.

Because parents of students have the option of choosing bilingual or monolingual classes, this group of students is quite heterogeneous. Facility in listening and fluency in speaking English is what they have in common. All of their lessons are in English and in order to provide support for their language, an ESL teacher pushes in and collaborates with the subject area teacher.

We use differentiated instruction to address the language needs of these learners, as well as push-in models, literacy classes, and content-area classes. Many of our teachers are familiar with students' first language and provide support as needed; the ESL teacher provides English-language support. In addition to the regular instructional program, we also target our ELL population for Saturday Academy and after school programs, in which we reinforce native and English-language skills.

SIFE students receive individualized instruction in class. The teacher provides the student with texts that match the student's literacy level in Spanish and in English. The students work on reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary in class as well as in targeted after school intervention periods. These students also receive supports as they learn the structures and routines of school.

Newcomer ELLs (students in US schools less than 3 years) who are not SIFE are better prepared to do work at grade level in their native language, therefore the plan with these students differs from the plan for the SIFE in the kind of extra instruction they receive. They receive one-on-one instruction and take part in after-school activities with instruction for newcomers geared to maximize English language learning and acquisition. The plan is to have these students utilize their native language skills to aid them in their second language learning so they might be ready to be shifted to monolingual classes after three years of being at our school. Emphasis is put on Reading and Speaking, aided greatly by a focus on phonics, while Listening (using read-alouds and books on tape) and Writing skills are developed concurrently.

Long-term ELLs are placed in monolingual classes because their academic language is more developed in English than in their native language. They are overwhelmingly advanced on the NYSESLAT, and as test

records show, their weakest modality is writing. With a view to their successful performance on the NYSESLAT, the students are mandated to attend the extended 37.5 minute afternoon sessions in order to receive support in writing workshop, writing conventions as well as learning test taking techniques. This complements the work that the students do during their ESL push-in and pull-out periods. We plan on helping these students gain the knowledge to pass the NYSESLAT and be proficient in English as soon as possible.

Students with special needs receive services according to their IEP requirements. If they are SIFE students, they receive the services described above. They (and their parents) also receive counseling services provided by school staff.

This category also includes students who may have been born in the United States but have not attained academic mastery in neither English nor their native language even if they have been exposed to both languages since birth. The students are placed in the Transitional Bilingual Program and receive instruction in the 60-40 English-Spanish model.

Targeted Intervention Programs

Title III After School Program

Based on running records, interim assessment and review of student work, vocabulary, fluency, reading comprehension and decoding are areas that ELLs have the most difficulty in when reading in English. Based on NYSESLAT writing is another area of difficulty for ELL students. According to the 2009 NYSESLAT results, 31% of our students scored a 12 or lower on the writing section of the exam and 33% of our students scored a 12 or lower on the reading section. Reading and writing are the students' greatest areas of need in grades 6-8.

Based on these demonstrated needs, an after school literacy program taught by three certified bilingual teachers and two certified ESL teachers (5 total teachers) for 50 students from October to June will be provided Monday through Thursday from 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm to provide instruction to increase vocabulary, and the fluidity and automaticity of ELL reading and writing. Title III funds will be used to pay : (5 teachers x 22 Monday sessions x 1 hour per Monday x 49.98) +(5 teachers x 31 Wednesday sessions x 1 hour per Wednesday x 49.98) = \$13,244.70

Saturday Intervention Program

Based on running records, interim assessment and review of student work, vocabulary, fluency and decoding are areas that ELLs in grades 6-8 have the most difficulty in when reading in English. Based on NYSESLAT results writing is another area of difficulty for ELL students. According to the 2009 NYSESLAT results, 31% of our students scored a 12 or lower on the writing section of the exam and 33% of our students scored a 12 or lower on the reading section. Reading and writing are the students' greatest areas of need in grades 6-8. State math exams and teacher made Science assessments indicate that new arrival ELLs lack content area vocabulary skills in English. DYO math assessments and teacher made Science assessments indicate that the majority of ELLs in grades 6-8 lack basic math and science skills need additional instruction to meet more advanced standards.

Based on these demonstrated needs, a Saturday program will be provided by 4 bilingual teachers from 9:00 am to 1:00 pm for 60 students beginning October and continuing to June. During these 29 Saturday sessions,

teachers will provide additional instructional time in math and reading. There will be three classes. Based on review of student work, students need support in reading and English language acquisition, basic math skills and their application to support more advanced mathematical understanding, social studies and science. Other funds will be leveraged to support this program.

Other Intervention Programs

Students who need assistance with reading comprehension, vocabulary, and reading fluency work with the technology based Achieve 3000 literacy program. Students who have a demonstrated need in the area of decoding and vocabulary receive Words their Way intervention. Guided reading groups are held for students who need assistance in reading comprehension and in the acquisition of higher level reading skills and strategies. Students needing assistance in basic math skills participate in Do the Math intervention groups.

Instructional Materials

Independent reading books are an essential component of the Title III instructional program for ELLs. Students are assessed throughout the year and as they advance in reading levels they need additional independent reading books. Students' levels range from level D to Z and each student needs a large volume of texts on his/her level in order to gain the skills and knowledge necessary to advance to the next reading level.

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.

Professional Development and Support for School Staff

The following describes professional development at MS324 which is paid for by other funds.

Professional Development is held periodically to enable our teachers to identify and target the language needs of our students. It is also used to bring instruction in line with the relevant Performance Standards and practices. The Professional Development group is led by Assistant Principal L. McDaniel-Luke and Assistant Principal and ELL Coordinator Diana Smith. Professional development is provided in collaboration with Math and Literacy Coaches with supports from Bank Street College and Teacher's College. Included in Professional Development are all teachers who teach ELLs, which includes ELA, ESL, Math, Science and Arts teachers in bilingual and monolingual classes.

The literacy coach and the Bilingual Coordinator provide ongoing professional development on ESL strategies to support ELL learning for literacy and math bilingual and ESL teachers. Teachers will attend seminars at Teachers' College in the Continuing Education Department on ELL instructional strategies. The bilingual teachers will visit dual language schools to observe best practices and attend professional development workshops at these schools.

Teachers of bilingual classes attend professional development along with their monolingual counterpart during common preps, after school and provided by outside resources. Bilingual teachers are expected to provide the same standard based instruction as monolingual teachers. The bilingual science teacher will attend workshops focused on project based learning and will work a consultant from NYU who will provide feedback and workshops on content and pedagogy. In the fall of 2009 all bilingual teachers will participate in workshops provided by Teacher's College scheduled for Tuesday or Wednesday depending on the month.

ESL and Literacy teachers will receive in class support from the Teachers' College consultant as they participate in Lab Sites, modeling, demonstration and discussion. In collaboration with the literacy coach and ELL coordinator, bilingual teachers will participate in study groups using journal articles and books addressing the needs of the ELL. Planning meetings are held once a week to enable our teachers to identify and target the language needs of our students based on assessment of student work. Also included in Professional Development are all teachers who teach ELLs, which include ELA, Math, Science and Arts teachers.

Professional development will support teachers in providing high quality instruction in students' identified areas of need. Teachers will receive PD on the following topics: strengthening vocabulary in the content areas, developing reading fluency, using guided reading to increase reading comprehension and automaticity, using words their way to improve phonological and vocabulary skills, improving student writing in different genres, and implementing Achieve 3000 to increase students' acquisition of the English language. Teachers will also receive professional development in the Do the Math basic math skills program, writing in the content area, and interdisciplinary instruction.

The literacy coach and the Bilingual Coordinator will provide ongoing professional development on ESL strategies to support ELL learning for literacy and math bilingual teachers. Teachers will attend seminars at Teachers' College in the Continuing Education Department on ELL instructional strategies. The Wilson Program will be provided by literacy teachers who received Wilson Program training.

Parental Involvement

In order for parents to understand all three program choices, they are invited to meet with the Bilingual Education Coordinator within a week of their child's admission to learn about the school programs and facilities it offers its students. They are also shown a NYC Department of Education video explaining in detail the choices of program their children have as ELLs in a New York City school. This video is shown in a variety of languages, including Spanish. Apart from being shown the video and meeting personally with the staff in these meetings, the parents are also invited to two ELL Informational Parent Conferences. In these conferences they have an opportunity to view the video as a group and discuss its content and the TBP and ESL programs with each other as well as with the Bilingual Coordinator and the school's Parent Coordinator.

The school hosts monthly workshops for parents. In addition to these workshops the school will also host 4 ELL specific workshops and 2 trips to build community and improve students' academic outcomes. The school will host an introduction to middle school workshop where families can learn about ELL program options, school policies, and where they will also be able to meet with teachers to begin to build the school – home community. Families will also be invited to attend workshops on high school and college. The coaches and teachers will provide a workshop on strategies for improving at home reading. The bilingual coordinator and the parent coordinator will collaborate to target all parents of ELLs and will aim to have a minimum of 30 parents attend each workshop.

The workshops will require chart paper, markers, notecards, and binders for workshop presentations and activities. During the at home reading workshop parents will need post it notes, independent reading books, pens, pencils, and highlighters in order to learn at home reading strategies. All workshops require the use of paper and ink cartridges for the following materials: flyers, agendas, information sheets, copies of reading

logs, informational flyers about high school and college, and information sheets about ELL program choices. Each high school and college trip will require metro cards for 30 families and students.

The mission of MS324 is to prepare students for college, work, and citizenship. To support this goal we have college-themed advisories and will take students and families on high school and college trips to expose them to various high schools and colleges and prepare them for college requirements. These trips will be tailored to the needs of our families of students who are ELLs, many of whom are not familiar with the high school and college system in the United States.

All workshops are presented in both English and Spanish.

Part IV: Assessment Analysis

Students are assessed using a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments. In addition to the Math, ELA, and NYSESLAT assessments, students' reading levels are assessed using the Teachers' College Reading and Writing Project (TCRWP) Running Records. Students' developmental spelling stages are assessed using the Words Their Way and their writing is assessed using the writing continuum from TCRWP as well as by teacher made rubrics. Students' math levels are assessed using DY0 interim assessments and teacher made unit diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.

Students score better in tests in their Native Language if they meet two criteria:

- A) they are relative new-comers to the United States, and
- B) they have received uninterrupted formal education in their native countries.

However, as they receive their formal education in the United States over the years, their academic knowledge, and most importantly, language, is developed more deeply in English. Our seventh grade TBE class performs considerably better in ELA tests than in Native Language Arts tests. They are more aware of their limitations in the second language than in their own.

In Math and Science newcomers do considerably better in Spanish than they do in English, but as specialized knowledge and new concepts are introduced, their reliance in Spanish to be able to perform lessons, but their limited English Language skills prevent them from being adequately tested in anything other than their native language.

On the NYSESLAT our ELL students' scores are as follows: 21% are beginners, 20% are intermediate, 35% are advanced, and 18% are recent admits who will be tested for the first time in 2010.

Of our ELLs who took the ELA exam, 72% scored a level 2, 21% scored a level 3, and 7% scored a level 1. On the Math exam, 74% of ELL students scored a level 3, 30% of ELL students scored a level 2, and 7% of ELL students scored a level 1. Twenty five ELLs passed the ELE.

The patterns across proficiency levels and grades show a clear deficiency in writing. These are patterns that are not particular to this school, but indicative of the academic realities that ELLs in general face. The strongest modalities in this population are listening and speaking.

MS 324 has implemented an extensive program using the writing workshop format for all ELLs, since they generally show deficiencies in their writing skills. Writing workshop entails students generating multiple drafts of the same project using editing skills to produce a standard final product. Writing Workshops are typical components of ELA and ESL instruction, but in Science and Mathematics an increasing amount of

writing and speaking is being required for presentations, and the techniques learned in writing workshops are used for projects in these subjects.

Depending on the academic level of the students, special pull-out periods have been implemented to address the needs of the students. After initial testing, low performing students are enrolled in a program (Wilson) structured to improve reading skills. The monolingual and bilingual Literacy teachers provide targeted interventions for all ELLs after school and on Saturday. These students are selected using Teacher's College Reading Assessments, state test scores, classroom work, and teacher observations. These intervention programs emphasize reading strategies, vocabulary enhancement, and writing skills. In terms of writing skills development, reading summaries, character descriptions and identification of plot elements are emphasized.

In previous years, the Princeton Review was administered three times a year in Literacy and Math. The Teacher's College Reading Assessments and the McGraw-Hill predictive interim assessments will provide similar information. The Interim Assessment results are used for spotting trends in student performance and to drive individualized instruction, focusing on the needs of the students, i.e. areas where students are not making progress. Saturday programs and after school programs are driven by results obtained from test data analysis.

Certain incompatibilities arose with the interim assessment. The literacy assessments are mostly multiple-choice, reading-based tests, while the actual ELA and the NYSESLAT have considerable writing components. Furthermore, certain concepts are tested on the Princeton Review may not have been covered in Literacy or Math class so the pacing of the Assessments and instruction pacing calendar need to be more closely aligned.

In addition to interim assessments we use Kaplan materials which help to develop test-taking skills and enhance foundational reading and writing skills.

The implications for the school's LAP and instruction are mainly to apply all our resources to identify and minimize the academic areas where students struggle and reinforce the areas where students show strengths, so they might demonstrate improvement in all required standardized tests: the ELA, the State Math test or the NYSESLAT.

Native Language is used as a starting point for instruction, a scaffold to help the students in their comprehension of sentence structure, syntax and speech that can translate across languages. For example, while learning new vocabulary, if true cognates exist between first and second languages in the target vocabulary words, then the first language can be used to make the instruction more effective. Also, while studying syntax for Native Language Arts, similarities can be drawn between the syntactic structures of the first and second languages so that the rules that may apply in both languages can be learned simultaneously. For Math and Science, many higher order thinking questions are discussed in Spanish, particularly with newcomers, before their applications are explored in English. Native Language is also used with diaries in Native Language Arts as well as in newcomer ESL classes. Using their native language provides a way to facilitate a comfort with writing that may not be there at the beginning.

The success of the ELL programs are assessed using a variety of quantitative and qualitative data such as NYSESLAT, ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies Scores; observation data; teacher made assessments; and interim assessments.

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) 6, 7, 8 **Number of Students to be Served:** 167 LEP 167 Non-LEP **0**
Number of Teachers 8 **Other Staff (Specify)** Paraprofessionals (3)

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

School Profile

Middle School 324 is located in Region 10 District 6 of New York City. The language allocation policy team includes Janet Heller (Principal), Lakisha McDaniel-Luke (Assistant Principal), Diana Smith (Assistant Principal), Judy Ortega (Parent Coordinator), Stephanie Douglas (Literacy Coach), Thelma Dolmo (Bilingual literacy teacher), Juan DeLaCruz (Bilingual math teacher), and Samuel Amador (ESL teacher).

There are 421 students enrolled at MS 324 for the 2009-2010 school year. Forty percent of our students (167 students) are English Language Learners. Of these students 144 came into our school identified as LEP and 23 of these students are identified LEP as per hand scoring of the LAB-R because the official scores are not yet released. The home language for all but three of the 167 students is Spanish. The other three students' home languages are French, Arabic, and Twi.

Of the 167 students identified as English Language Learners, twenty-one are in a monolingual special education class with ESL and 6 are in transitional bilingual self-contained special education classes. Nine of the ELLs receive SETSS. Eighty-two of the students are in general education transitional bilingual classes with twenty-two in 6th grade, thirty-one in 7th grade, and twenty-nine in 8th grade. The remaining fifty-eight students are in general education monolingual classes and receive ESL from a certified ESL instructor. Of these students, thirty are in 6th grade, eleven are in 7th grade, and seventeen are in 8th grade.

Eighty-one students have received ELL services for 0-3 years and twenty-three students have received ELL services for 4-5 years. There are sixty-one students (37% of ELLs) identified as long term ELLs (six or more years as an ELL). Twenty-one students identified as long term ELLs are in self-contained special education classes, three are in a general education transitional bilingual program, and thirty-seven are in a monolingual class with ESL. Of the sixty-one long term ELLs, one student has received services for ten years, thirteen students for nine years, nine students for eight years, sixteen students for seven years, and twenty-two students for six years. Twenty-six of our 167 ELLs are identified as SIFE students (16% of ELLs).

Out of our 167 ELLs, 164 list Spanish as their home language. These students are in both transitional bilingual education programs and monolingual with ESL programs. The remaining three students are in monolingual classes with ESL services.

Assessment Analysis

Students are assessed using a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments. In addition to the Math, ELA, and NYSESLAT assessments, students' reading levels are assessed using the Teachers' College Reading and Writing Project (TCRWP) Running Records. Students' developmental spelling stages are assessed using the Words Their Way and their writing is assessed using the writing continuum from TCRWP as well as by teacher made rubrics. Students' math levels are assessed using DY0 interim assessments and teacher made unit diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.

Students score better in tests in their Native Language if they meet two criteria:

- C) they are relative new-comers to the United States, and
- D) they have received uninterrupted formal education in their native countries.

However, as they receive their formal education in the United States over the years, their academic knowledge, and most importantly, language, is developed more deeply in English. Our seventh grade TBE class performs considerably better in ELA tests than in Native Language Arts tests. They are more aware of their limitations in the second language than in their own.

In Math and Science newcomers do considerably better in Spanish than they do in English, but as specialized knowledge and new concepts are introduced, their reliance in Spanish to be able to perform lessons, but their limited English Language skills prevent them from being adequately tested in anything other than their native language.

On the NYSESLAT our ELL students' scores are as follows: 21% are beginners, 20% are intermediate, 35% are advanced, and 18% are recent admits who will be tested for the first time in 2010.

Of our ELLs who took the ELA exam, 72% scored a level 2, 21% scored a level 3, and 7% scored a level 1. On the Math exam, 74% of ELL students scored a level 3, 30% of ELL students scored a level 2, and 7% of ELL students scored a level 1. Twenty five ELLs passed the ELE.

The patterns across proficiency levels and grades show a clear deficiency in writing. These are patterns that are not particular to this school, but indicative of the academic realities that ELLs in general face. The strongest modalities in this population are listening and speaking.

MS 324 has implemented an extensive program using the writing workshop format for all ELLs, since they generally show deficiencies in their writing skills. Writing workshop entails students generating multiple drafts of the same project using editing skills to produce a standard final product. Writing Workshops are typical components of ELA and ESL instruction, but in Science and Mathematics an increasing amount of writing and speaking is being required for presentations, and the techniques learned in writing workshops are used for projects in these subjects.

Depending on the academic level of the students, special pull-out periods have been implemented to address the needs of the students. After initial testing, low performing students are enrolled in a program (Wilson) structured to improve reading skills. The monolingual and bilingual Literacy teachers provide targeted interventions for all ELLs after school and on Saturday. These students are selected using Teacher's College Reading Assessments, state test scores, classroom work, and teacher observations. These intervention programs emphasize reading strategies, vocabulary enhancement, and writing skills. In terms of writing skills development, reading summaries, character descriptions and identification of plot elements are emphasized.

In previous years, the Princeton Review was administered three times a year in Literacy and Math. The Teacher's College Reading Assessments and the McGraw-Hill predictive interim assessments will provide similar information. The Interim Assessment results are used for spotting trends in student performance and to

drive individualized instruction, focusing on the needs of the students, i.e. areas where students are not making progress. Saturday programs and after school programs are driven by results obtained from test data analysis.

Certain incompatibilities arose with the interim assessment. The literacy assessments are mostly multiple-choice, reading-based tests, while the actual ELA and the NYSESLAT have considerable writing components. Furthermore, certain concepts are tested on the Princeton Review may not have been covered in Literacy or Math class so the pacing of the Assessments and instruction pacing calendar need to be more closely aligned.

In addition to interim assessments we use Kaplan materials which help to develop test-taking skills and enhance foundational reading and writing skills.

The implications for the school’s LAP and instruction are mainly to apply all our resources to identify and minimize the academic areas where students struggle and reinforce the areas where students show strengths, so they might demonstrate improvement in all required standardized tests: the ELA, the State Math test or the NYSESLAT.

Native Language is used as a starting point for instruction, a scaffold to help the students in their comprehension of sentence structure, syntax and speech that can translate across languages. For example, while learning new vocabulary, if true cognates exist between first and second languages in the target vocabulary words, then the first language can be used to make the instruction more effective. Also, while studying syntax for Native Language Arts, similarities can be drawn between the syntactic structures of the first and second languages so that the rules that may apply in both languages can be learned simultaneously. For Math and Science, many higher order thinking questions are discussed in Spanish, particularly with newcomers, before their applications are explored in English. Native Language is also used with diaries in Native Language Arts as well as in newcomer ESL classes. Using their native language provides a way to facilitate a comfort with writing that may not be there at the beginning.

Teacher Qualifications

All of our bilingual education and ESL teachers are certified professionals as per the New York State certification requirements. Their certificates are on file. All students are being served with the mandated number of minutes as per CR-154.

Number of Teachers 2009-2010				Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals***		Total
Appropriately Certified*		Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers**		Bilingual Program	ESL Program	
Bilingual Program	ESL Program	Bilingual Program	ESL Program			
4	3			4		10

Targeted Intervention Programs

Title III After School Program

Based on running records, interim assessment and review of student work, vocabulary, fluency, reading comprehension and decoding are areas that ELLs have the most difficulty in when reading in English. Based

on NYSESLAT writing is another area of difficulty for ELL students. According to the 2009 NYSESLAT results, 31% of our students scored a 12 or lower on the writing section of the exam and 33% of our students scored a 12 or lower on the reading section. Reading and writing are the students' greatest areas of need in grades 6-8.

Based on these demonstrated needs, an after school literacy program taught by three certified bilingual teachers and two certified ESL teachers (5 total teachers) for 50 students from October to June will be provided Monday through Thursday from 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm to provide instruction to increase vocabulary, and the fluidity and automaticity of ELL reading and writing. Title III funds will be used to pay: (5 teachers x 22 Monday sessions x 1 hour per Monday x 49.98) + (5 teachers x 31 Wednesday sessions x 1 hour per Wednesday x 49.98) = \$13,244.70

Saturday Intervention Program

Based on running records, interim assessment and review of student work, vocabulary, fluency and decoding are areas that ELLs in grades 6-8 have the most difficulty in when reading in English. Based on NYSESLAT results writing is another area of difficulty for ELL students. According to the 2009 NYSESLAT results, 31% of our students scored a 12 or lower on the writing section of the exam and 33% of our students scored a 12 or lower on the reading section. Reading and writing are the students' greatest areas of need in grades 6-8. State math exams and teacher made Science assessments indicate that new arrival ELLs lack content area vocabulary skills in English. DYO math assessments and teacher made Science assessments indicate that the majority of ELLs in grades 6-8 lack basic math and science skills need additional instruction to meet more advanced standards.

Based on these demonstrated needs, a Saturday program will be provided by 4 bilingual teachers from 9:00 am to 1:00 pm for 60 students beginning October and continuing to June. During these 29 Saturday sessions, teachers will provide additional instructional time in math and reading. There will be three classes. Based on review of student work, students need support in reading and English language acquisition, basic math skills and their application to support more advanced mathematical understanding, social studies and science. Other funds will be leveraged to support this program.

Other Intervention Programs

Students who need assistance with reading comprehension, vocabulary, and reading fluency work with the technology based Achieve 3000 literacy program. Students who have a demonstrated need in the area of decoding and vocabulary receive Words their Way intervention. Guided reading groups are held for students who need assistance in reading comprehension and in the acquisition of higher level reading skills and strategies. Students needing assistance in basic math skills participate in Do the Math intervention groups.

Instructional Materials

Independent reading books are an essential component of the Title III instructional program for ELLs. Students are assessed throughout the year and as they advance in reading levels they need additional independent reading books. Students' levels range from level D to Z and each student needs a large volume of texts on his/her level in order to gain the skills and knowledge necessary to advance to the next reading level.

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.

Professional Development and Support for School Staff

The following describes professional development at MS324 which is paid for by other funds.

Professional Development is held periodically to enable our teachers to identify and target the language needs of our students. It is also used to bring instruction in line with the relevant Performance Standards and practices. The Professional Development group is led by Assistant Principal L. McDaniel-Luke and Assistant Principal and ELL Coordinator Diana Smith. Professional development is provided in collaboration with Math and Literacy Coaches with supports from Bank Street College and Teacher's College. Included in Professional Development are all teachers who teach ELLs, which includes ELA, ESL, Math, Science and Arts teachers in bilingual and monolingual classes.

The literacy coach and the Bilingual Coordinator provide ongoing professional development on ESL strategies to support ELL learning for literacy and math bilingual and ESL teachers. Teachers will attend seminars at Teachers' College in the Continuing Education Department on ELL instructional strategies. The bilingual teachers will visit dual language schools to observe best practices and attend professional development workshops at these schools.

Teachers of bilingual classes attend professional development along with their monolingual counterpart during common preps, after school and provided by outside resources. Bilingual teachers are expected to provide the same standard based instruction as monolingual teachers. The bilingual science teacher will attend workshops focused on project based learning and will work a consultant from NYU who will provide feedback and workshops on content and pedagogy. In the fall of 2009 all bilingual teachers will participate in workshops provided by Teacher's College scheduled for Tuesday or Wednesday depending on the month. ESL and Literacy teachers will receive in class support from the Teachers' College consultant as they participate in Lab Sites, modeling, demonstration and discussion. In collaboration with the literacy coach and ELL coordinator, bilingual teachers will participate in study groups using journal articles and books addressing the needs of the ELL. Planning meetings are held once a week to enable our teachers to identify and target the language needs of our students based on assessment of student work. Also included in Professional Development are all teachers who teach ELLs, which include ELA, Math, Science and Arts teachers.

Professional development will support teachers in providing high quality instruction in students' identified areas of need. Teachers will receive PD on the following topics: strengthening vocabulary in the content areas, developing reading fluency, using guided reading to increase reading comprehension and automaticity, using words their way to improve phonological and vocabulary skills, improving student writing in different genres, and implementing Achieve 3000 to increase students' acquisition of the English language. Teachers will also receive professional development in the Do the Math basic math skills program, writing in the content area, and interdisciplinary instruction.

The literacy coach and the Bilingual Coordinator will provide ongoing professional development on ESL strategies to support ELL learning for literacy and math bilingual teachers. Teachers will attend seminars at Teachers' College in the Continuing Education Department on ELL instructional strategies. The Wilson Program will be provided by literacy teachers who received Wilson Program training.

Parental Involvement

In order for parents to understand all three program choices, they are invited to meet with the Bilingual Education Coordinator within a week of their child's admission to learn about the school programs and facilities it offers its students. They are also shown a NYC Department of Education video explaining in detail the choices of program their children have as ELLs in a New York City school. This video is shown in a variety of languages, including Spanish. Apart from being shown the video and meeting personally with the staff in these meetings, the parents are also invited to two ELL Informational Parent Conferences. In these conferences they have an opportunity to view the video as a group and discuss its content and the TBP and ESL programs with each other as well as with the Bilingual Coordinator and the school's Parent Coordinator.

The school hosts monthly workshops for parents. In addition to these workshops the school will also host 4 ELL specific workshops and 2 trips to build community and improve students' academic outcomes. The school will host an introduction to middle school workshop where families can learn about ELL program options, school policies, and where they will also be able to meet with teachers to begin to build the school – home community. Families will also be invited to attend workshops on high school and college. The coaches and teachers will provide a workshop on strategies for improving at home reading. The bilingual coordinator and the parent coordinator will collaborate to target all parents of ELLs and will aim to have a minimum of 30 parents attend each workshop.

The workshops will require chart paper, markers, note cards, and binders for workshop presentations and activities. During the at home reading workshop parents will need post it notes, independent reading books, pens, pencils, and highlighters in order to learn at home reading strategies. All workshops require the use of paper and ink cartridges for the following materials: flyers, agendas, information sheets, copies of reading logs, informational flyers about high school and college, and information sheets about ELL program choices. Each high school and college trip will require metro cards for 30 families and students.

The mission of MS324 is to prepare students for college, work, and citizenship. To support this goal we have college-themed advisories and will take students and families on high school and college trips to expose them to various high schools and colleges and prepare them for college requirements. These trips will be tailored to the needs of our families of students who are ELLs, many of whom are not familiar with the high school and college system in the United States.

All workshops are presented in both English and Spanish.

The success of the ELL programs are assessed using a variety of quantitative and qualitative data such as NYSESLAT, ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies Scores; observation data; teacher made assessments; and interim assessments.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: 324

BEDS Code: .

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

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K–8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY
WORKSHEET

DIRECTIONS: This worksheet is an integral part of assisting school staff with creating and writing a school-based language allocation policy (LAP), which must be written in narrative form. Creating a school-based LAP now incorporates information required for CR Part 154 funding so that a separate submission is no longer required. This worksheet is a required appendix of the LAP, and is meant to assist LAP developers with compiling and analyzing the data necessary for planning quality ELL programs. Upon completion of the LAP, LAP team members should sign and certify that the information provided in the worksheet and plan is accurate. Agendas and minutes of LAP meetings should be kept readily available on file in the school. LAP developers are strongly encouraged to use and attach reports from available systems (e.g., ATS, ARIS) for the information requested in this worksheet.

Part I: School ELL Profile

A. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

SSO/District CEI-PEA	School MS324
Principal Janet Heller	Assistant Principal Lakisha McDaniel Luke
Coach AP: Diana Smith	Coach Stephanie Douglas
Teacher/Subject Area Thelma Dolmo (Bil. Lit)	Guidance Counselor Yadira Ortiz
Teacher/Subject Area Juan De La Cruz (Bil. Math)	Parent Domitila Quintuna
Teacher/Subject Area Samuel Amador (ESL)	Parent Coordinator Judy Ortega
Related Service Provider Jessica Baquero	SAF Roser Salavert
Network Leader Linda Guarneri	other type here

B. Teacher Qualifications

Please provide a report of all staff members' certifications referred to in this section

Number of Certified ESL Teachers	4	Number of Certified Bilingual Teachers	3	Number of Certified NLA/FL Teachers	1
Number of Content Area Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	2	Number of Special Ed. Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	2	Number of Teachers of ELLs without ESL/Bilingual Certification	0

C. School Demographics

Total Number of Students in School	421	Total Number of ELLs	167	ELLs as Share of Total Student Population (%)	39.67%
------------------------------------	------------	----------------------	------------	---	---------------

Part II: ELL Identification Process

Describe how you identify English Language Learners (ELLs) in your school. Answer the following:

- Describe the steps followed for the initial identification of those students who may possibly be ELLs. These steps must include administering the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) which includes the informal oral interview in English and in the native language, and the formal initial assessment. Identify the person(s) responsible, including their qualifications, for conducting the initial

screening, administering the HLIS, the LAB-R (if necessary), and the formal initial assessment. Also describe the steps taken to annually evaluate ELLs using the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT).

2. What structures are in place at your school to ensure that parents understand all three program choices (Transitional Bilingual, Dual Language, Freestanding ESL)? Please describe the process, outreach plan, and timelines.
3. Describe how your school ensures that entitlement letters are distributed and Parent Survey and Program Selection forms are returned? (If a form is not returned, the default program for ELLs is Transitional Bilingual Education as per CR Part 154 [see tool kit].)
4. Describe the criteria used and the procedures followed to place identified ELL students in bilingual or ESL instructional programs; description must also include any consultation/communication activities with parents in their native language.
5. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, what is the trend in program choices that parents have requested? (Please provide numbers.)
6. Are the program models offered at your school aligned with parent requests? If no, why not? How will you build alignment between parent choice and program offerings? Describe specific steps underway.

Part III: ELL Demographics

A. ELL Programs

Provide the number of classes for each ELL program model at your school. For all-day programs (e.g., Transitional Bilingual Education, Dual Language, and Self-Contained ESL), classes refer to a cohort of students served in a day. For push-in ESL classes refer to the separate periods in a day in which students are served.

ELL Program Breakdown										
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Transitional Bilingual Education <small>(60%:40% → 50%:50% → 75%:25%)</small>							22	31	29	82
Dual Language <small>(50%:50%)</small>										0
Freestanding ESL										
Self-Contained							15	5	7	27
Push-In							30	11	17	58
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	47	53	167

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs

Number of ELLs by Subgroups					
All ELLs	167	Newcomers (ELLs receiving service 0-3 years)	83	Special Education	27
SIFE	26	ELLs receiving service 4-6 years	23	Long-Term (completed 6 years)	61

Enter the number of ELLs by years of identification and program model in each box. Enter the number of ELLs within a subgroup who are also SIFE or special education.

	ELLs by Subgroups									Total
	ELLs (0-3 years)			ELLs (4-6 years)			Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years)			
	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	
TBE	72	20	0	10	4	4	3		1	85

Dual Language										0
ESL	11	1	1	13	1	3	58		18	82
Total	83	21	1	23	5	7	61	0	19	167

Number of ELLs in a TBE program who are in alternate placement: _____

C. Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs

Transitional Bilingual Education										
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group										
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOTAL
Spanish							22	31	29	82
Chinese										0
Russian										0
Bengali										0
Urdu										0
Arabic										0
Haitian Creole										0
French										0
Korean										0
Punjabi										0
Polish										0
Albanian										0
Yiddish										0
Other										0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	31	29	82

Dual Language (ELLs/EPs)																				
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group																				
	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		TOTAL	
	EL	EP																		
Spanish																			0	0
Chinese																			0	0
Russian																			0	0
Korean																			0	0
Haitian Creole																			0	0
French																			0	0
Other																			0	0
TOTAL	0																			

This Section for Dual Language Programs Only

Number of Bilingual students (students fluent in both languages): ___	Number of third language speakers: ___	
Ethnic breakdown of EPs (Number)		
African-American: ___	Asian: ___	Hispanic/Latino: ___
Native American: ___	White (Non-Hispanic/Latino): ___	Other: ___

Freestanding English as a Second Language

Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOTAL
Spanish							43	15	23	81
Chinese										0
Russian										0
Bengali										0
Urdu										0
Arabic								1		1
Haitian Creole										0
French									1	1
Korean										0
Punjabi										0
Polish										0
Albanian										0
Other							1			1

Programming and Scheduling Information

TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	16	24	84
--------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

1. How is instruction delivered?
 - a. What are the organizational models (e.g., Departmentalized, Push-In [Co-Teaching], Pull-Out, Collaborative, Self-Contained)?
 - b. What are the program models (e.g., Block [Class travels together as a group]; Ungraded [all students regardless of grade are in one class]; Heterogeneous [mixed proficiency levels], Homogeneous [proficiency level is the same in one class])?
2. How does the organization of your staff ensure that the mandated number of instructional minutes is provided according to proficiency levels in each program model (TBE, Dual Language, ESL)?
 - a. How are explicit ESL, ELA, and NLA instructional minutes delivered in each program model as per CR Part 154 (see table below)?
3. Describe how the content areas are delivered in each program model. Please specify language, and the instructional approaches and methods used to make content comprehensible to enrich language development.
4. How do you differentiate instruction for ELL subgroups?
 - a. Describe your instructional plan for SIFE.
 - b. Describe your plan for ELLs in US schools less than three years (newcomers). Additionally, because NCLB now requires ELA testing for ELLs after one year, specify your instructional plan for these ELLs.
 - c. Describe your plan for ELLs receiving service 4 to 6 years.
 - d. Describe your plan for Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years).
 - e. Describe your plan for ELLs identified as having special needs.

NYS CR Part 154 Mandated Number of Units of Support for ELLs, Grades K-8			
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced
FOR ALL PROGRAM MODELS			
ESL instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154	360 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week
ELA instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154			180 minutes per week
FOR TBE /DL PROGRAMS			
Native Language Arts	90 minutes per day	90 minutes per day	45 minutes per day



50%			
25%			
TIME	BEGINNERS	INTERMEDIATE	ADVANCED

Programming and Scheduling Information--Continued

- Describe your targeted intervention programs for ELLs in ELA, math, and other content areas (specify ELL subgroups targeted). Please list the range of intervention services offered in your school for the above areas as well as the language(s) in which they are offered.
- Describe your plan for continuing transitional support (2 years) for ELLs reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT.
- What new programs or improvements will be considered for the upcoming school year?
- What programs/services for ELLs will be discontinued and why?
- How are ELLs afforded equal access to all school programs? Describe after school and supplemental services offered to ELLs in your building.
- What instructional materials, including technology, are used to support ELLs (include content area as well as language materials; list ELL subgroups if necessary)?
- How is native language support delivered in each program model? (TBE, Dual Language, and ESL)
- Do required services support, and resources correspond to ELLs' ages and grade levels?
- Include a description of activities in your school to assist newly enrolled ELL students before the beginning of the school year.

Schools with Dual Language Programs

- How much time (%) is the target language used for EPs and ELLs in each grade?
- How much of the instructional day are EPs and ELLs integrated? What content areas are taught separately?
- How is language separated for instruction (time, subject, teacher, theme)?
- What Dual Language model is used (side-by-side, self-contained, other)?
- Is emergent literacy taught in child's native language first (sequential), or are both languages taught at the same time (simultaneous)?

Professional Development and Support for School Staff

- Describe the professional development plan for all ELL personnel at the school. (Please include all teachers of ELLs.)
- What support do you provide staff to assist ELLs as they transition from elementary to middle and/or middle to high school?
- Describe the minimum 7.5 hours of ELL training for all staff (including non-ELL teachers) as per Jose P.

Parental Involvement

- Describe parent involvement in your school, including parents of ELLs.
- Does the school partner with other agencies or Community Based Organizations to provide workshops or services to ELL parents?
- How do you evaluate the needs of the parents?
- How do your parental involvement activities address the needs of the parents?

Part IV: Assessment Analysis

A. Assessment Analysis

Enter the number of ELLs for each test, category, and modality.

OVERALL NYSESLAT* PROFICIENCY RESULTS (*LAB-R FOR NEW ADMITS)										
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOTAL
Beginner(B)							13	14	9	36
Intermediate(I)							16	6	12	34

Advanced (A)							31	15	15	61
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	35	36	131

NYSESLAT Modality Analysis										
Modality Aggregate	Proficiency Level	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
LISTENING / SPEAKING	B							9	8	2
	I							9	6	10
	A							23	19	11
	P							17	0	16
READING / WRITING	B							13	12	9
	I							16	6	12
	A							28	12	14
	P							4	3	1

NYS ELA					
Grade	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total
3					0
4					0
5					0
6	5	30	13	0	48
7	0	17	3	0	20
8	2	23	5	0	30
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed				6	6

NYS Math									
Grade	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
3									0
4									0
5									0
6	5	1	11	4	25	3	1		50
7	0	2	7	8	10	4	0		31
8	1		2		19	11	2		35
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed							6		6

- c. How are EPs performing on State and City Assessments?
6. Describe how you evaluate the success of your programs for ELLs.

Part V: LAP Team Assurances

Completing the LAP: Attach this worksheet to the LAP narrative as an appendix and have it reviewed and signed by required staff. Please include all members of the LAP team. Signatures certify that the information provided is accurate.

Name (PRINT)	Title	Signature	Date (mm/dd/yy)
	Assistant Principal		
	Parent Coordinator		
	ESL Teacher		
	Parent		
	Teacher/Subject Area		
	Teacher/Subject Area		
	Coach		
	Coach		
	Guidance Counselor		
	School Achievement Facilitator		
	Network Leader		
	Other		
	Other		

Signatures			
School Principal		Date	
Community Superintendent		Date	
Reviewed by ELL Compliance and Performance Specialist		Date	

Rev. 10/7/09

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

1. Describe the data and methodologies used to assess your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs to ensure that all parents are provided with appropriate and timely information in a language they can understand.

A Parent Home Language Survey is completed by every parent with the assistance of the parent coordinator and/or bilingual coordinator. Regular mail to parents about school activities is written in Spanish and English. In house translators translate all correspondence using clear and simple language for all outgoing correspondence

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.

Review of the home language survey indicated that the majority of parents speak and read Spanish only. The majority of the staff speaks Spanish, the language of the community the schools serves. Communication between school and the community is always in both languages, Spanish and English

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.

All correspondence is provided in English and Spanish. Written communications that is ongoing is translated into English and Spanish such as the Parent Handbook, Bell Schedule, and Progress Reports. Specific written communications are translated by the bilingual translation team composed of the parent coordinator, social worker and math teacher. The initial translation is conducted by one member and then reviewed by the other two to ensure accuracy. Traducelo, an IBM website is used to instantaneously translate all emails sent to Spanish reading parents into Spanish and for emails from Spanish writing parents into English.

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

Oral interpretation is available at all times conducted by the following school members who are bilingual Spanish/English: family worker, parent coordinator, school aid, guidance counselor, social worker and secretary

3. Describe how the school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services. Note: The full text of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 (Translations) is available via the following link: <http://docs.nycenet.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-151/A-663%20Translation%203-27-06%20.pdf>.

Translators are available at all times. Parents have full access to school activities and information regarding their children's academic performance. The majority of the school staff speaks Spanish. Parents have full participation in school events regardless of the language they speak as all activities are conducted in Spanish and English. Parents receive all letters and forms about school activities in their language.

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:	324,039	94,729	
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	3,240.39		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		947.29	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	16201.95		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		4736.45	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	32,403.90		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		9,472.90	

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: 100

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.

MS 324 agrees to implement the following statutory requirements:

- The school will put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents, consistent with section 1118 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Those programs, activities and procedures will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children.
- The school will ensure that the required school-level parental involvement policy meets the requirements of section 1118(b) of the ESEA, and includes, as a component, a school-parent compact consistent with section 1118(d) of the ESEA.
- The school will incorporate this parental involvement policy into its school improvement plan.
- In carrying out the Title I, Part A parental involvement requirements, to the extent practicable, the school will provide full opportunities for the participation of parents with limited English proficiency, parents with disabilities, and parents of migratory children, including providing information and school reports required under section 1111 of the ESEA in an understandable and uniform format and, including alternative formats upon request, and, to the extent practicable, in a language parents understand.
- The school will involve the parents of children served in Title I, Part A programs in decisions about how the 1 percent of Title I, Part A funds reserved for parental involvement is spent.
- The school will be governed by the following statutory definition of parental involvement, and will carry out programs, activities and procedures in accordance with this definition:
 - Parental involvement means the participation of parents in regular, two-way, and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring—

- that parents play an integral role in assisting their child’s learning;
- that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child’s education at school;
- that parents are full partners in their child’s education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child; the carrying out of other activities, such as those described in section 1118 of the ESEA.
- The school will inform parents and parental organizations of the purpose and existence of the Parental Information and Resource Center in the State.

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.

School Responsibilities

MS 324 will:

1. Provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables the participating children to meet the State’s student academic achievement standards as follows: Use data to inform instruction and make sound professional judgment, provide ongoing professional development to ensure that teachers are using best practices, provide intervention programs for child in need, provide enrichment programs to address student interests, following part 100 of the state educational requirements, review and revise plans based on student data.
2. Hold parent-teacher conferences in November, February and April during which this compact will be discussed as it relates to the individual child’s achievement. Specifically, those conferences will be held: November 16 and 17, 2009 and February 24 and 25 and April 23, 2010.

3. Provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress. Specifically, the school will provide reports as follows: November 16 and 17, 2009 and February 24 and 25 and April 23, 2010 and June 28, 2010. Progress reports will be sent at the midpoint of every marking period in October, December, January (PID), March, and May.
4. TeacherEase will be available to all parents and students for parents to be able to check their child's progress on a daily basis using the internet from any location.
5. Provide parents reasonable access to staff. Specifically, staff will be available for consultation with parents on a daily basis during teacher preparation periods. Parent may also make appointments to meet after school and work hours.
6. Provide parents opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class, and to observe classroom activities, as often as they wish, with specific dates: December 2 and 3 and April 24 for open house when parents will be sent invitations to visit classrooms.
7. Involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of the school's parental involvement policy, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way.
8. Involve parents in the joint development of any Schoolwide Program plan (for SWP schools), in an organized, ongoing, and timely way.
9. Hold an annual meeting on September 23rd at 9:30 am and at 6:00pm to inform parents of the school's participation in Title I, Part A programs, and to explain the Title I, Part A requirements, and the right of parents to be involved in Title I, Part A programs. The school will convene the meeting at a convenient time to parents, and will offer a flexible number of additional parental involvement meetings, such as in the morning or evening, so that as many parents as possible are able to attend. The school will invite to this meeting all parents of children participating in Title I, Part A programs (participating students), and will encourage them to attend.
10. Provide information to parents of participating students in an understandable and uniform format, including alternative formats upon the request of parents with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand.
11. Provide to parents of participating children information in a timely manner about Title I, Part A programs that includes a description and explanation of the school's curriculum, the forms of academic assessment used to measure children's progress, and the proficiency levels students are expected to meet.
12. On the request of parents, provide opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions, and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions about the education of their children. The school will respond to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible.
13. Provide to each parent an individual student report about the performance of their child on the State assessment in at least math, language arts and reading.
14. Provide each parent timely notice when their child has been assigned or has been taught for four (4) or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified within the meaning of the term in section 200.56 of the Title I.

Parent Responsibilities

We, as parents, will support our children's learning in the following ways:

- Monitoring attendance and contact school when child is absent.
- Making sure that homework is completed.
- Discuss with my child in a positive manner about school.

- Provide the school with accurate and current information about my child.
- Monitoring amount of television their children watch.
- Volunteering in my child’s classroom.
- Participating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to my children’s education.
- Promoting positive use of my child’s extracurricular time.
- Staying informed about my child’s education and communicating with the school by promptly reading all notices from the school or the school district either received by my child or by mail and responding, as appropriate.
- Serving, to the extent possible, on policy advisory groups, such as being the Title I, Part A parent representative on the school’s School Improvement Team, the Title I Policy Advisory Committee, the District wide Policy Advisory Council, the State’s Committee of Practitioners, the School Support Team or other school advisory or policy groups.
- Attend monthly parent workshops and monthly Parent Association meetings.
- Provide school with accurate contact phone numbers by completing and updating the Emergency Home Contact form.

On October 1, 2009 the School Leadership Team met to review and approved the Title 1 School Parent Invovlement Policy and School-Parent Compact. These documents were distributed to parents on November 17, 2009.

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.

This information is addressed in Section IV: Needs Assessment

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.

Based on standardized exam results and student records, intervention classes are weaved into the school program rather than separate from the school day. Students are grouped heterogeneously for whole class instruction and homogeneously for intervention activities. ELL and special education students receive the same curriculum as their general education counterpart with presentation strategies modified, not the curriculum. Lunch and Learn assists students who have difficulty with the day's lesson as they ate lunch with the teacher. There are two computers in each classroom using intervention software such as Focus on Fluency, Achieve 3000 and English in a Flash. Every student receives a free home computer through Computers for Youth, providing access to intervention programs at home.

Most students in 6th and 7th grade attend extended day on Monday through Thursdays until 4:00 pm. Most eighth graders attend extended day on Tuesdays and Thursdays until 4:00 pm and specific 8th graders selected to attend on Monday and Wednesday. Courses based on student need and interest includes Basketball, Tutorials, Art Portfolio, Study Skills, Track, Computers, Science Club, Book Club, Cheerleading, Pageant, Alvin Ailey and Drama Troupe. An after school recreational program developed with Children's Aid Society will keep the school opened until 6:00 pm. Students on or above grade level participate in Project BOOST enrichment activities such as concerts at Lincoln Center and theater on Broadway. During the summer, selected students attend the Specialized High School Institute or Summer Reading at College of William and Mary.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

All teachers are state certified teaching in their area of certification and are highly qualified.

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.

The school program is established to include a minimum of two common preps for subject meetings and two common preps for grade meetings each week. These common preps are used for planning units of study based on needs of the students and for professional development through study groups reviewing best practices in the professional literature, reviewing student work and reading professional books. Professional Development is planned and delivered in collaboration with Teacher's College and Bank Street College based on a review of a variety of data to make informed professional judgments. Pupil Personnel services support the student's academic progress and are planned in collaboration with parents and teachers.

5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

Beginning in April, administration collaborates with NYU Teaching and Learning Office, Bank Street College and Teachers College to recruit highly qualified teachers. In February and May, administration collaborates with Teaching Fellows and Teach for American to recruit highly qualified teachers. Vacancies are posted on Inside Schools, Teach for America and Teaching Fellows websites. Interviews are conducted throughout the year. Faculty members reach out to their colleagues and friends who are either already teaching or are graduating in June.

6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.

The social worker, guidance counselor and parent coordinator hold two parent workshops each month for parent education in many areas with the focus on student achievement. The school has an open door policy to encourage parent visitation and parent volunteerism. School messenger is used to call parents once a week with school announcements. TeacherEase is used to keep parents abreast of student progress. The school's website provides additional information for parents on school workshops and workshops through the DOE and private organizations. Traducelo is used to instantaneously translate all emails into Spanish and to translate emails from Spanish writing parents into English

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.

N/A

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.

Assessment is ongoing and analyzed during common planning time throughout the year. It is an integral part of the culture of our school. Every week students are assessed using teacher made quizzes and every month with teacher made assessments. DY0 is used for literacy and math.

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.

Identification of assessments and programs that helped us to provide targeted intervention to students is on-going. .

Our dual focus is to identify methods for assessing students in order to identify strengths and weaknesses and to identify programs and materials that can address identified weakness. From the beginning of the year we work to identify students' strengths and weaknesses. At first we are guided by students' state test results, in September running records and math basic skills tests are administered. As the year goes on we administer our own assessments such as the running records and math diagnostics designed by teachers. The results of these assessments, along

with teacher observation and student work samples, provide us with a much deeper understanding of the individual needs of students. Using the results we place students into intervention groups. Assessments and teacher observations are then used to determine whether the selected interventions were successful. After analyzing the results of the assessments that are given we identify areas that give students difficulty. As of now these areas include fundamental math operations, reading fluency, and word attack skills for multi-syllabic words.

While we work to identify new programs and assessments we also use guided reading and math tutorials to address our students' needs. By expanding the options available for interventions we will improve our ability to address students' weaknesses and to build on their strengths. As we go forward we will continue to look for new intervention programs and methods of assessment while continuing to use those that are already identified as successful.

Teachers' participation in intervention has been instrumental to the success of the program. Seventh and eighth grade teachers have five periods of intervention programmed into their schedule. An intervention teacher for literacy and a part time intervention teacher for math work with sixth grade students. These prove to be successful, because teachers have a true understanding of where and how students were struggling. The extended day program is successful because teachers have the opportunity to work with students in an intervention setting.

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.

In collaboration with Children's Aid Society students participate in recreation programs during and after school. The afterschool program provides a safe haven for students to receive academics integrated into the recreational programs such as Boys to Men program, Stage Write, Recycle A Bicycle, Carrera Program (Teen Pregnancy Prevention), Art and Music. Parent workshops in nutrition are held three times a week.

In collaboration with Fresh Youth Initiative students participate in tutorials, community service and student work programs throughout the year.

In collaboration with CEI-PEA students participate in Project BOOST to expose students to cultural events and to participate in advanced math and literacy classes.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

N/A

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 (SURRE)

All SURRE schools must complete this appendix.

SURRE Area(s) of Identification: _____

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

Part A: SURRE 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 SURRE. 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.

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.

- **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 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.

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on four occasions. Committee members included the principal, the data specialist and the school leadership team which included 2 members from our inquiry team. During each meeting one component of Key Finding 1A was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's data to look for gaps in our written curriculum, the effectiveness of our curriculum maps, the taught curriculum in ELA especially for ELLs and our materials. The result of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school educational program.

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

Applicable X 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?

Our literacy department uses Columbia University’s Teachers College Reading and Writing Project. The Reading and Writing Project curriculum is fully aligned with New York State standards. The TC curricular calendar offers grade-appropriate units of study, timeframes in which to complete them, and staff development to support teachers in execution. Professional development also includes support for Native Language Arts and English as a Second Language classes, as well as content area classes, since literacy is embedded in all subjects. Support is offered on site through coaching by a TC staff developer 15 times throughout the year and through our own literacy coach. Off site support is offered for our literacy coach through a TC coaching class and for teachers through all-day workshops at Teachers College.

Through vertical planning, our literacy team has established defined sets of student outcomes for each grade and assessments to exhibit mastery of skills, thoughtfully aligned with the Teachers College units of study. These assessments include Teachers College running records (based on Fountas and Pinnell’s lettered levels), student-teacher conferences, small group instruction, reading and writing process notebooks, class discussions and end of unit “published” pieces. A combination of these assessments helps teachers to identify which areas of reading and writing need to be addressed, in whole class, small group, and individual instruction.

With our thorough assessment and data tracking systems, we have been able to determine the materials we need to adequately meet the varied need of students. Since we have students reading across the gamut of reading levels (measured by the Fountas and Pinnell leveling system) from emergent to above-grade level, we have in-class libraries with appropriate and relevant books for every level reader.

Our classrooms emphasize accountable talk. All students have reading and writing partners with whom they discuss their learning process. We utilize the workshop model lesson structure, which allows roughly ten minutes direction instruction time (also called a mini-lesson), 20-25 minutes of independent engagement, and then ten minutes of partner and/or group share. All literacy classrooms, including ELL and Special Education classrooms are using the TC curriculum, pacing calendar, assessments and staff development.

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. N/A

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.

The Assistant Principal, Math Coach, and math teachers reviewed unit plans and New York State standards, both process and content strands. The committee met on four occasions. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's data to look for gaps in our written curriculum, the effectiveness of our curriculum maps, the taught curriculum and our materials. The result of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with parents at a PA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school educational program.

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

Applicable X 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?

Teachers plan their units using a backwards planning approach that takes into consideration the New York State process and content standards.

Utilizing Impact Math and supplementary materials, teachers combine constructivist exploration and direction instruction to support students' growth in math concepts, skills and applications in a progression aligned with New York State standards and good pedagogy. Process strands such as problem solving, representation and communication are also developed throughout the unit plans.

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.

N/A

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.

Our school conducts formal and informal direct observations and videotapes observations so that teachers, the literacy coach, the Teachers College staff developer and administration can assess that we are maintaining accountable talk and avoiding a pattern of direct instruction. The literacy coach visits classrooms on a regular basis to provide feedback and support to teachers. Teachers College staff developers and our school's coaches lead professional development to meet the needs of teachers. Development includes coaching into classroom work, demonstrating best practices, and classroom intervisitations.

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

Applicable X 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?

Our entire literacy department employs the workshop model lesson, with roughly ten minutes direct instruction time (the mini-lesson), 20-25 minutes of independent engagement, and then ten minutes of partner and/or group share. The literacy department umbrella includes Special Education and bilingual classes. Student partnerships are established in both Reading and Writing Workshop to foster accountable talk and a more student-directed classroom. Teachers analyze data in order to thoughtfully pair students by reading level, writing level, and/or dominant learning modality. Depending on the specific lesson or follow-up, students may temporarily shift to different partners. Teachers will temporarily group students with similar needs for small-group instruction to specifically target a skill.

To foster accountable talk, all literacy classrooms have tables and chairs that accommodate groupings of four students. Students are seated in partnerships, so that there is possibility of partner talk, whole table talk, or full class discussion. Teachers also utilize "meeting areas" where students leave their desks and gather in a common area, sometimes on a rug, in order to share in a group discussion.

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.

N/A

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.

The Assistant Principal, Math Coach and math teachers will conduct observations of lesson and intervisitations with math teachers to determine the percent of time that is direction instruction and percent of time of student individual, group and independent work and to ensure that the workshop model is the structure for all classroom instruction.

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

Applicable X 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?

All math classes use the structure of the workshop model to present instruction. Lesson observations and a review of bulletin boards, student work, assessments and interviews with teachers reveal a mix of pedagogy. Direct instruction, group work, independent work and problem solving activities are all included in math classes. Technology, including Smartboards and laptops is incorporated often. Instruction

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.

includes strategies to evaluate students' learning during the lesson. Lessons engage and challenge students at their cognitive level. Professional development both in-house conducted by the Math Coach and by a consultant from Bank Street College and through Math Solutions supports teachers in incorporating problem solving, constructivist approaches and developing mathematical communication.

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.

N/A

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school. Committee members included the principal, the data specialist and the school leadership team which included 2 members from our inquiry team. The committee reviewed our mobility rate for teachers, the number of new teachers, the number of transfer teachers and the number of not highly qualified teachers. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school educational program

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

Applicable N/A 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?

There is no evidence of a high turnover rate. Last year, only one teacher left the school of which one left to pursue a doctoral degree. Two years ago, two teachers left the school to return to college or care for elderly parent. 100% of the teachers are highly qualified.

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.

N/A

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.

Committee members reviewed our CEP and a variety of data to determine professional development offerings for ELLs, the effectiveness of professional development and the number of teachers who attended professional development. The result of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings were not relevant to our school educational program.

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

Applicable N/A 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?

All literacy teachers, including ELL, NLA, ESL and Bilingual teachers are using Teachers College Reading and Writing Project's curricular units of study, pacing calendars, and on- and off-site professional development. TCRWP is aligned with the New York State standards. On-site professional development includes weekly full-team literacy meetings, weekly grade team planning meetings, and in-class demonstrations and co-teaching with the literacy coach or Teachers College staff developer.

Our school has made ELL professional development an explicit priority. There are Lab Site staff development days specifically geared to support our ELL teachers. One of our ELL instructors has trained in QTEL, our literacy coach has brought back ELL work from NCTE conferences, and ELL teachers attend both NYC Department of Education and Teacher College professional development workshops specifically geared for the ELL community. This year our school has received two grants, totally over \$60,000, intended to academically support our ELL students and a third grant is pending.

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.

N/A

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

This finding is not applicable to our school community as evidenced by systems in place to disseminate and analyze data. In collaboration with the principal, assistant principal, and coaches, the data specialist disseminates student data (NYSESLAT scores, ELA scores, Math scores, LAB-R results, etc.) during team meetings as soon as the data is available. The data specialist and coaches assist teachers in analyzing this data and in making instructional plans based on demonstrated student needs. Our school community will continue to disseminate and analyze data and the principal, assistant principal, coaches, and data specialist will continue to monitor teachers' implementation of instructional practices based on student data. The data specialist and coaches will continue to provide support in the form of weekly meetings where student data is discussed, in class coaching, weekly professional development sessions, and other in house and outside professional development sessions as needed.

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

Applicable N/A 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?

In order to specifically monitor ELL progress, our school has an ELL coordinator and the ELL team meets regularly to review student progress data. Our inquiry team is currently studying how to better meet the needs of long-term ELLs in monolingual classrooms.

Analysis of a variety of data is used to inform instruction, intervention plans, school schedule and student placement. As incoming student records arrive, we review the contents to get an initial picture of the students' education and social/emotional status. Next we review the previous years' test results, including NYSESLAT, and any special needs reports such as anecdotal or IEPs. The elementary school guidance counselor is contacted to gather information that may not have been included in the record. All data is placed on a spread sheet that is analyzed during our summer grade meetings to formulate initial class placement.

Based on results of the NYSESLAT and teacher observation, all bilingual classes were divided based on language dominance and an additional teacher was hired. Ratio of language of instruction changed as student proficiency increased following the transitional model of bilingual education.

In September, the Teachers College predictive assessment and a language acquisition spelling inventory (Donald Bear's Words Their Way) are administered to every student to obtain a base line. A running record is conducted on every student to determine specific reading needs. Teachers College staff developers, the ELL coordinator and the literacy coach work with teachers to use collected data to inform meaningful instruction.

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.

N/A

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

accommodations and modifications that would help support the students with disabilities in their classrooms, and are not knowledgeable regarding behavioral support plans for these students.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

This finding is not applicable to our school's educational program as evidenced by the work of the special education coach, the collaborative efforts of general education and special education teachers, and systems that allow for dissemination and analysis of student information and special education resources. The special education coach will continue to provide professional development on special education services, legal mandates, and how to best provide instruction to students based on the IEP.

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

Applicable N/A 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?

At the beginning of the school year the special education coach meets with all of the general education and special education teachers to review student data and IEPs. At this meeting the special education coach reviews legal mandates outlined in FERPA and IDEA. The special education coach reviews information about classifications, services, and classroom accommodations/modifications that will assist each student in making academic progress. Teachers collaborate to review IEPs for new and returning students. Teachers refer to these IEPs as needed throughout the year.

The special education coach provides professional development and in class coaching to both special education and general education teachers on instructional and behavioral strategies. The special education teacher who provides SETSS sends out weekly updates on student progress to the general education teachers. She also provides support in modifying the process, product, and/or content of classroom material.

Special education teachers and general education teachers collaborate on a daily basis to help students succeed in the least restrictive environment.

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.

N/A

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.

This finding is not applicable to IEPs written in the school. Our school sometimes receives IEPs for new students that do not contain adequate yearly goals, behavior plans, or environmental modifications. However, our rigorous IEP process ensures that these IEPs are revised to reflect the services, modifications, and goals that will help each student make progress.

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

Applicable N/A 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?

IEPs written at MS 324 follow the legal mandates and also are subject to a rigorous review process. The special education coach reviews all IEPs written by teachers as well as by the school based support team to ensure that the IEPs are educationally sound and meet all legal requirements. This review process includes reviewing the alignment and educational benefit of goals, objectives, classroom environment modifications/accommodations, and modified promotional criteria. The special education coach collaborates with the special education team and the general education teachers to create behavior plans as needed.

After this process, the IEP team meets with the student's parent/guardian for the IEP meeting. Revisions are made to the draft IEP based on the outcome of the meeting and the special education coach reviews the IEP again to ensure that the IEP is educationally beneficial. The information in the IEP is reviewed with all general education and special education teacher to ensure that each professional knows the mandated services and how to best provide instruction to meet the student's needs.

Teachers also participate in professional development sessions led by the special education coordinator on a variety of special education topics such as writing effective IEP goals, reviewing IEPs to ensure that they are educationally sound, and implementing classroom modifications/accommodations. General education and special education teachers participate in professional development sessions geared towards their specific role in the delivery of services and the IEP process. The special education coordinator stays up to date on new mandates and requirements by attending monthly professional development. She then shares this information with the MS324 faculty and staff. The team is also collaborates with the district 75 team in the building.

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.

N/A

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.) 5
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). 5
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.

Students residing in temporary housing will be provided with comparable services offered to other students in the school, including educational services for which the child meets the eligibility criteria such as educational programs for the disabled and for students with limited English proficiency.

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.